



MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 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: David Siegel, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Paul Martzke, Ian Griffiths, Rebecca Derenne, Brian Johnson (arrived at 4:36 PM during item E1), Excused:

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the October 19, 2022, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Susan Ley, seconded by David Siegel to approve the agenda. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ian Griffiths to revisit and amend the agenda to move Item E6 up after item E2. Motion Passed.

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the September 21, 2022, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by David Siegel, seconded by Ian Griffiths 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 22-38) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a new garage located at 727-729 S. Jackson Street.

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

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

*Brian Johnson joined at 4:36 PM after the floor was opened.

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

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

Moved by David Siegel, seconded by Susan Ley to take no position on this COA. Motion Passed.

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

2. (COA 22-40) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a new sign located at 115 N. Adams Street.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Paul Martzke to approve as requested. Motion Passed.

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

3. (COA 22-41) Consideration with possible action on a design review for window replacements located at 240 N. Broadway.

Moved by Susan Ley, seconded by Rebecca Derenne to open the floor. Motion Passed.

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

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- Brian Johnson.

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

Yes- David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Rebecca Derenne, No-

None, Abstain- Brian Johnson.

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

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

Moved by Ron Dehn, seconded by Ian Griffiths to open the floor. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Ian Griffiths to close the floor. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by David Siegel to approve of the replacement of the 2nd floor windows, the painting of the wood facade features and renovation to the single story building at the rear of the property. Motion Passed.

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

Moved by David Siegel, seconded by Ron Dehn to table the 1st floor replacement windows and 1st floor creation of a storefront on Broadway as well as if the applicant has something completed earlier than next month, we schedule a special meeting. Motion Passed.

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

4. (COA 22-42) Consideration with possible action on a design review for porch repairs located at 130 N. Oakland Avenue.

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, Brian Johnson, No- None, Abstain- None.

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

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

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Rebecca Derenne to approve as requested with the contingency that the deck boards must be tongue in groove. Motion Passed.

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

5. (COA 22-43) Consideration with possible action on a design review for deck work located at 840 S. Jackson Street.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Ron Dehn to approve as requested. Motion Passed.

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

No- None, Abstain- None.

6. (COA 22-44) Consideration with possible action on a design review for door and porch removal located at 840 S. Jefferson Street.

Moved by Ian Griffiths, seconded by Ald. Brian Johnson to approve as requested. Motion Passed.

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

No- None, Abstain- None.

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Staff-Level COA Applications.

2. Review City Raze/Repair Orders and Demolitions.

3. Staff Update.

4. Date of next meeting: Wednesday, November 16, 2022.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Susan Ley to adjourn. Motion Passed.

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

No- None, Abstain- None.

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Call, so everyone is here. Okay, that's weird. Okay.

- Yeah.

- I'm sorry. So, everyone is present except for Alder right now, Alder Johnson. Item number C, approval of tonight's agenda. Do we have a motion to approve?

- I'd like to make a change, if possible.

- Okay.

- My thought was that there was... The applicant for the Porleo property, if we could move that one ahead, but I don't see Jacqueline on the call.

- Oh, there is no Porleo property on the agenda.

- There was in the packet.

- Jefferson. It's on the corner.

- Oh, it's on the corner of Jefferson and Porleo, yeah.
- Oh, okay.
- Yeah. But I don't see the applicant on here, so .
- Well, that's the item number six. Do you wanna just leave it alone until we get to that item?
- Sure.
- And then you could motion at that point if he's not here we could...
- Yep.
- Okay. Go forward. Okay. And then do we have a motion? Oh, so do we have a motion to approve tonight's agenda?
- So moved.
- I'll second.
- Okay, all in favor, aye?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Are there any nays? Okay, tonight's agenda's approved with the possible exception that we might make a change a little bit later on. Item number D, approval of last month's minutes. Do we have a motion to approve those?
- I'll make that motion.
- Excellent.
- Okay. All in favor, aye?
- Aye.
- Okay. Are there any nays? Okay, the ayes have that as well. Item number E, regular business. Item EI, certificate of appropriateness 22-38. Consideration of possible action on a design review for a new garage located at 727729 South Jackson Street. Jason?
- Yes, so I think you've got a slide show up in front of you there. So, the location of the house, you can see on the map, it's in the Aster National Registry District. On the photo on the right here, if we could study that for just a moment, that photograph was taken, I think, in 2019 by me, awesome photographer that I am. If you look carefully towards the lower right portion, you can see a garage

behind the house. That garage is no longer present, but this gives you some sense of just how visible the garage is from the streetscape and rough idea of the form and scale of that garage. So, if we move to the next slide. Top left, you see a photograph also taken... No, wait, is that by me? I forget.

- That's an applicant picture.

- That's an applicant picture. Yeah, it's even better than my work. Anyway, you see they've got a new garage. So, the application retroactively is seeking approval to raise and replace the garage with this new garage that you see here. If we wanna move forward to my snarky recommendation, which I mean, in all sincerity, staff recommends that city follow procedure and not issue building permits for things before they come, before landmarks commission. I can say that the new garage as a new construction is generally appropriate for the district and the house. It's got the correct form, scale, orientation, that sort of stuff. But I can't really speak to the appropriateness of having raised the previous garage. Thank you.

- Yeah, I mean, when I went by the property, I guess I'd make a motion to open the floor real quick to discuss for a second.

- So moved.

- I'll second that.

- Okay. All in favor, aye?

- Aye.

- Okay, just briefly, I mean, I've been by these properties and yeah, that garage is definitely in place. In fact, my thought was that if they were gonna tear it down, I'll take it. 'Cause it's in pretty nice shape. But having said that, so this is a retroactive recommendation, correct? That's what you said?

- Okay.

- Yes. Work was done without a COA, building permit was mistakenly issued without following proper procedure.

- Gotcha, okay. Okay. Well, then I guess I motion you to go back to regular business.

- Actually, I do have a question for Jason about what you just said. You made it sound like the COA was not issued because there was an error on the part within the city. You mentioned the building permit. Is that accurate? If not, what exactly transpired?

- So, the applicants applied for a building permit when that person in city hall pulls up the property under computer, it has a flag that says, "Hey, this is in a designated historic district." Prior to issuing building permits, the Landmarks Commission has to issue a certificate of appropriateness. Despite that flag being there, somebody issued the building permits without letting Landmarks Commission know that any of this had transpired.

- I have found out about this 'cause they applied for a fence permit and I was reviewing the COA for that and saw the new garage listed on the site plan. So, inspection has received a talking to about this one.

- So, is it fair enough to say the error of not seeking a COA for the garage, the fault lies with the city rather than the applicants? Is that correct?

- Well, city on an annual basis sends a letter to all property owners in these districts saying you need to get a COA. So, it's easy enough to forget about that when you apply for your building permit, but it's not as though it's a total undocumented surprise.

- Okay. Other now additional procedures in place to safeguard this from happening in the future. Like you can't go to the next screen until you have uploaded the COA or, I mean, there has to be more foolproof process, I guess, if we have a...

- We can certainly work on something like that. At this point, this was our upgrade before it just listed historic women, whatever district it was in. Now it like flashes red at you. So, it's supposed to be more obvious. We have the same for our flood plain. We haven't had one of these as a building inspection mistake in quite some time. So, I think it's generally working, but I agree if we could have some sort of a popup that if it is historic like enter the COA number or something like that might be more effective.

- Yep. Yeah.

- Yeah.

- That would be my only additional recommendation. If we can make a suggestion to city that they look at a process improvement piece for that, that would be appropriate.

- Okay.

- Stephanie, what action is this commission required to do with this particular?

- Required? Nothing. It's your discretion how you review this COA application. If you find that the work is fitting and would've received a COA either way, you can go ahead and approve it. If you find that it is detrimental to the integrity of the structure or the district, you can deny, in which case we have some thumb recourse we can take, but the hammer is not as heavy now, obviously.

- I mean, fortunately it's pretty well tucked behind the existing home, but that's more happenstance it seems than anything else.

- Yeah, I can see in this case, if we were able to love you fine against the property owner, they would just say the city gave me the permit.

- Right.

- I completely concur with that, Susan. I think the homeowner has absolved. Jason, you mentioned how a letter goes out, but something like that can be forgotten. That's understandable. I think the

onus lies with the error, and it happens. It's no big deal. My thought is on this, because there's kind of a no effect here for this commission to perhaps take no position on this application. To just say that this is a pass.

- I agree.

- I like that as well.

- Well all..

- I'll make a motion that the commission take no position on this COA.

- How about a motion to return to regular business first and then we'll make that motion. So, I'll make a motion to return to regular business.

- Seconded.

- Okay. All in favor, aye.

- Aye.

- Okay, David, now you have a motion for us.

- Now make a motion that landmarks commission take no position on this COA application.

- I'll second.

- We have a motion and we have a second that we take no position on this. All in favor of that motion?

- Aye.

- Are there any nays? Okay, the ayes take it. We make no, whatever. However you just said that. We take no position on this matter. There we go. Yeah, having said that, I mean, I agree with what you said, David, that somehow or another, somehow the city's gotta work that out where that becomes a part of the application where they can't miss that. Item number two, regular business, certificate of appropriateness, 22-40, consideration with possible action on a design review for a new sign located at 115 North Adams.

- So, 115 North Adams was originally built as the Rocksdale Bakery building. I think it was a shoe store fairly recently until a pretty extensive rehabilitation. It's in the downtown district. You see it on the map here. We have a couple images on this slide showing the location of the proposed sign, roughly speaking and what it'll look like. Next slide gives a little more detail. There it is on the left. And this information just came in today. So, don't hold that against me. On the right you see it's mounted to relatively new material that was just installed as part of that new storefront and big rehabilitation project. So, it's a sign. Next slide. The recommendation is to approve, provided that the mounting hardware doesn't go into the stone, which we now see, obviously it won't. So, I have no issues to advise you of with this. Thank you.

- Move to approve.
- Second.
- All in favor?
- Aye.
- Are there any nays? Okay, the ayes have it. Motion to approve. Item number three, certificate of appropriateness. Consideration with possible action on design review for window replacements. I just lost my place. Located at 240 North Broadway.
- Ron?
- Yes.
- If I can interject quickly, I do see the applicant for item six on South Jackson, Jefferson Street present. If we could move that agenda item as I referred to earlier up, that may be appropriate.
- Are there any objections to that right now?
- Motion to reconsider the approval of the agenda.
- Oh, I'll second that motion. Okay. All in favor?
- Aye.
- Okay, we are gonna move item number E6. Is it?
- Is that correct?
- It just requires a motion then to approve the amended agenda as Ian suggested.
- Okay. So, we're on item number E6, is that correct?
- Yes.
- Okay. Consideration with possible action on a design review for door and porch removal located at 840 South Jefferson Street.
- So, 840 South Jefferson Street was the subject of a COA last year, I think. At which time we approved a number of exterior alterations. Several of them on the rear side, formalities here, you see the map. This is where we're at. It's at the corner, I think, 'cause he pointed out poorly in South Jefferson. The photo on the right shows the front of the house towards the right along South Jefferson and the side along Porleo, we're discussing stuff on the rear facade, which is here. So, this may look familiar. This particular COA calls for the removal of that stick-like second story balcony deck and the removal of the door at the top of that balcony. The door will be sealed over with cedar

clipboard siding, feathered in as best as possible to make it look as though the door was never there and then we're getting rid of the deck. That's great. The recommendation here is to approve.

- Make a motion to approve.

- Second.

- All in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Are there any nays? Okay, the ayes have it. A motion is approved. Item number E3. We'll go back to that consideration with possible action on a design review for window replacements. located at 240 North Broadway.

- So, 240 North Broadway is in the Elsmar Broadway historic district that was added to the National register in 1999. This particular building is a corner property. I think it actually has a Dousman address as well, or several perhaps, but you may recognize it as having more recently been the garden. Is that right?

- Yeah.

- So, here you see it on the map. At the top right is a photograph probably from the mid 1980s. It's here for reference. I want to point out you see a little sandborn map there. The newspaper article from 1909 describing this building as constructed makes it very clear that there were originally four storefronts, as you see divided here into four rectangles. The one on the corner was specifically intended to be Felix du Chateaus new saloon. It replaced an earlier saloon at this site, but the brick building was built primarily to accommodate this saloon. And oh by the way, it's got three other storefronts for income and then apartments upstairs. So, just keep that in mind as we move forward. The National Register nomination package describes the building. It was in your packet as well. I just wanna point out that in several spots it says, retains a high level of integrity and it talks about having original windows too, but I'm not gonna get too wrapped original versus replacement windows. Keep that integrity word in mind though as we move forward a little bit later. So, next slide. We've received some views of what the proposed exterior changes include. Just looking at this slide, take it in, the next slide is gonna be the same thing with some highlighted sections. So, a primary concern is along the Broadway side, you see a proposal to remove three small windows and a door and replace it with three very large storefront windows. And then on the Dousman facade, lesser concern here, removing a middle doorway or a hint of a doorway and substituting in glass and relocating a storefront doorway from a center area to the side. Again, these are lesser concerns. The primary concern here is that, as you recall, I just said that that corner store was a saloon and intended to be a saloon. So, a character defining feature of this property is the three small windows along Broadway. Those windows are up high enough such that you can't see in, you can't see who's in there drinking at the saloon or what they're up to, but it let's in light. So, I'll be harping on the windows quite a bit. Next slide. We've got a few more views. Top left is a view of the Broadway facade. Top right is a portion of that facade. Bottom left, again, the Broadway facade in the rear of the building. Bottom right, comparable photograph. Comparable angle. So, doing my little highlighting trick. Again, in the upper two views, very concerned that we're addressing a proposal to remove character defining little windows and replace it with large storefront windows. Some secondary concern, here at the back of

the building, we know there were two storefronts. So, currently we see a door. It's not highlighted here for that northern of the two storefronts. And in the southern storefront where there's that second story, Orle or bay window, if you like. We've lost sight of where that door might have been to that store. Okay, that happens. But to just emphasize here, my primary concern is with the substitution of large storefront windows, where we currently have three smaller character defining windows. One last view, next slide. The rear of the building. The building currently has a later intrusion sort of addition on the back. It's a non-contributing addition probably from the 1980s. I haven't researched it too much here. I'm not terribly concerned. Secretary of the interior standards make it clear that we can do a lot of things with this edition as long as we keep it sympathetic to the contributing primary building. So, if you'll prevent me the grace to go into some details, I've mentioned the secretary of the interior standards. At a high level, those standards involve 10 discreet things. Here you see I've taken a screenshot of the National Park Service website. The proposal in changing these windows, the altering of the fenestration. Well, let's read number one here. It says minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building. Well, the changing of the windows is not a minimal change. Number two, historic character of the property shall be retained and preserved. Removal of historic materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided. Know the proposal is not aligned to this requirement. Number three, this one's a little bit abstract perhaps where I say that. Number three says that changes that create a false sense of historical development such as conjecture features shall not be undertaken. So, altering the fenestration along Broadway effectively is a conjectural exercise that creates a false sense of historical development. It erases a character defining feature and substitutes in a storefront window. That would've been more common for a bank or maybe a drugstore, but not a saloon. Number five, distinctive features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship. The characterized property shall be preserved. That's to say that the little windows should stay. Number six, this is about deteriorated features to be repaired rather than replaced. I'm not going to get too deep into that. I know the Landmarks Commission has been very, very much in favor of replacing old windows with new windows. Number nine, exterior alterations shouldn't destroy historic materials that characterize a property. So, altering the fenestration, particularly along North Broadway does just that. It destroys historic materials that characterize the property. Moving on, doing a deep dive into the Secretary of the Interior standards. There's a book published by the National Park Service Department of the Interior. This book looks at those 10 standards that we've just addressed and does a deep dive on each of those. So, with regard to windows, you see recommended column and not recommended. It's a bit of an eye chart. I can't read it from here, Stephanie. I think it basically says, don't mess with the size of the windows. So, that was included in your packets where I copy pasted the recommended, not recommended verbiage. Just wanna emphasize, shouldn't mess with the windows per the Secretary of Interior Standards. Next slide. Wisconsin State Historic Preservation Office has requirements. In the top left, you see a little square snippet that says this pamphlet's been prepared to help you interpret Secretary of Interior's standards. Great. Within this pamphlet we see bottom left as a rule, primary facades should be left intact while rear facades may sometimes be altered more substantially. This building has two primary facades, that's Dousman and Broadway. Top right, when it comes time to discuss windows specifics, Wisconsin's clear that the light transmittance value needs to be 72 or higher. We don't yet know what the proposed replacements are. Bottom right here, we're seeing that new windows should be just like the old windows going so far to say that wood should be wood. But then at the bottom, metal clad or aluminum cannot have an anadized finish, but must have a powder coat, paint, or baked on finish. Information provided by the applicant says that they favor an anadized finish that is no good per Wisconsin Shipo. Moving on, National Register eligibility hinges on two things. There's criterion via criterion A, B, C, or D plus integrity. So I've discussed this kind of generally in the past, but I want to

point out integrity has seven aspects. So, if we look at the National Register Bulletin on how to apply national register criteria, they identify these seven aspects of integrity. And I want to call your attention to these paragraphs there that say, to be listed in the National Register, property must not only have whatever criteria satisfied, but it must have integrity. And then going on a little bit lower, to retain integrity, a property always possess several and usually most of the aspects of integrity. Integrity is important. So in your packets, and repeat it again here on the next slide, there's some details on the seven aspects of integrity. I don't so much want to read them to you, they're in your packet. But I'll point out that location and setting are not really impacted by the proposed changes. There are very severe impacts to the integrity of design, materials, workmanship and feeling. In particular, the building was designed to have this three small windows substituting three large windows for those would rewrite the design of the building. It impacts the materials because we're getting rid of the character defining windows and the brick and the mortar, which speaks also to workmanship. And then ultimately feeling, does it still feel like a turn of this century last time round saloon or is it now start to feel like something else? Like a bank or a jewelry store or something else. To a lesser degree too, I put in Yellow Association, the building is currently associated with Felix du Chatto and his saloon in changing these other aspects of integrity or kind of taking a subtle dig at the integrity of association as well. So, quick refresher on the City of Green Day ordinance, you have purpose and intent for the Landmarks Commission. I put a little green star next to certain things I wanted to point out. So Landmark's Commission is to protect historic buildings, architectural history. Kinda said you're in a couple ways. On the right, guidelines for renovation of existing buildings. You'll see most of these correlate with the Secretary of the Interior's standards, those 10 points mentioned before. And on number nine here, in case there's any doubt, Number nine calls out the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, which we've reviewed in previous slides. So these are the things landmarks Commission should consider when evaluating proposals for changes to existing buildings. Continuing with the ordinance, it's clear that the Landmarks Commission must issue a permit or the COA for anything that an applicant wants. Unless, number one, the proposed work would detrimentally change, destroy, or adversely affect the exterior features. Or number three, the proposed construction, reconstruction, alteration or demolition does not conform to the purpose and intent of this commission or to the objectives and design criteria for historic preservation play and for said district. So, worth keeping in mind. All of that said, staff's recommendation is to deny the application for reasons listed here. The proposed work does not conform to the Secretary of the Interior standards, does not conform to Wisconsin Shipco requirements, does not satisfy Landmark's Commission Ordinance mandate. And at the time of this recommendation, some details weren't yet provided by the applicant. So, I suppose that sums it up. Sorry, I'm talking, I don't know how to stop talking. Thank you.

- And one question, is the applicant present at this meeting?
- Yes.
- Okay, there he is. Okay. Do we have a motion to open up the floor for discussion?
- So moved.
- Second.
- Second.

- Okay. All in favor, aye?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Okay. Any opposed? Okay, the floor is open.

- Just like... I'd just like to address the commission. I think Jason's argument is entirely compelling that this is, frankly in my thought, devastating to the historical integrity of the building. I certainly understand why somebody would wanna make these renovations because as you in that window design, particularly on Broadway, is appropriate for saloon. I imagine not the intention of the developers, but the reality is it is devastating to the historical integrity. That's all.

- Anyone else?

- The floor is now open. I would like to speak.

- Yes, absolutely.

- Wonderful. Well, good afternoon, everyone. Garritt Bader, 300 North Van Buren Street. First off, thank you for being here today. I can address a few items that were raised in the staff report and items that were not ready at the time of the report for the commission. And I'll start there and go from easiest to maybe the most complicated. So, signage. Tenants will apply for that separately, most likely. I know that may need to come back in front of here, but unknowns yet are with specific tenants and those needs. So, that will come at a different time. The rear addition to the building was noted as an item, as Jason mentioned there. And I believe we discussed on our walkthrough step. And Jason and I, I don't know if there's any discussion what's needed on that part. I'm happy to answer questions on it in terms of what would happen there. I think you saw from some of the imagery the plans for it. But if there's any other questions on there, let me know. Regarding window transparency, we can get to 75%. I believe the request was a minimum of 72%. The earlier windows that were spec'd were about 53%. So we can get to 75, and shockingly at no extra charge, which everything else is these days. Those will be second floor openable sash windows for the apartments up there. And I would reiterate again, we're gonna create six apartment units up there that have been loft balled, as I think you saw in the imagery sent for about 40 years. The window framing, the PE purview used on the second floor actually comes as a powder coated shockingly. So, that one is good to go. The first floor storefront does come spec as an anadized dark bronze. If that is something that is desired to go par coded, we can do that. It's 10% more in costs, not the end of the world. But every dollar matters at this point. The window placement is obviously the biggest ticket item. I respectfully disagree, the suggestion that it's devastating to the building. I disagree that it does anything bad to the building. I'm a developer, shocking. I know I feel that way. But I think I also have some street cred to express those views, and that's where maybe if the commission will indulge me a few personal notes. I've given a lot of time and energy and love to this city and different projects that I've pursued. And I would dare anyone to name a project I've done that you don't like the finished product better than what was there. I would never do anything that destroys the building, especially one like this. In fact, the Gold buy net was to save it. If you saw those photos from a second floor and

more that I could share with you, this building's in bad shape. The worst scenario I would argue is to do nothing and let the building fall apart. And I care too much about the city, about the Broadway district, all the efforts that we are doing there to let that happen. So, when we met on site, and today in some of those items I just discussed, I'm trying to extend an olive branch and meet with the commission somewhere in the middle. I think it's, especially these, say, the political climate that we have where everyone's kind of on their sides and very few people wanna meet in the middle, I'm trying. I've given on the windows as I talked about, I'm willing to spend the 10% more for the power to coder. I'm asking the commission to relax some standards for the windows. I do not think adding the sore front is devastating. I really don't. In fact, and on the contrary, given the work that we're doing on Broadway for the street front, pedestrian, lively atmosphere we are seeking to create, it's actually necessary to have more windows in a building like this today. I would respectfully opine that buildings need to advance with each. There is nothing wrong with the fact that this was a saloon however many ago. It is not a saloon anymore. The district has changed. It's evolved, and buildings should breathe and evolve with them. So again, what I would ask the commission, as part of my being willing to meet on certain items, is to meet me somewhere in the middle and allow some extra openings along that Broadway storefront. Thank you.

- Thank you, Garritt.

- Anyone?

- Garritt, why are you replacing the storefront at all? What's wrong with the existing storefront that's on the building?

- Well, the glass is not in the best shape. It's not, of course, a modern storefront. It's the ability to create a nice presence for it. Update the glass much better for tenants, much better, I'd argue for the building aesthetics.

- Right. But the existing storefront can be reglazed.

- Maybe something that I'd argue would not match or look harmonious around the building as it's proposed, even in part.

- Anyone else? Any other questions for Garritt?

- Well, I would like to say it's very intriguing argument, very compelling, well thought out and articulate. Perhaps your way of improving it, except it comes up against the preservation aspect, which is the mission of this group. It is substantially affecting the original historic character. And yeah, I'm gonna stick by the word devastating to the historic integrity. It doesn't fit with a modern building. Absolutely right. I concur. But our mission is to preserve the historic nature. And I think, Jason established that very well. The first issues you talked about, I think I agree with you, the little addition, the windows, I'm familiar with the building from my work. My only real problem, my only problem at all actually is altering that first floor imagery from the sidewalk.

- Yeah. The west wall. I agree too. Big picture windows on the Broadway side. Just isn't honoring the integrity of the property.

- I mean, I'd concur with Jason's analysis. I went through, after this package came through, I went back through the Department of the Interior standards as well as the ordinance specifically. And it doesn't matter which way I read it, I could not come to the conclusion that this was not substantially deviating from what our mission and our requirements as part of this commission is. So, that's my analysis.

- And that's our task to maintain the integrity.

- Among other things, but certainly the integrity, it's not one line item. There are multiple line items.

- I mean, from everything that we saw and we heard, there are quite a few of the items that can be done. It's wall of windows. That's the biggest objection here. Correct? I mean, that's what really...

- Yeah, that .

- Right.

- I would just say this is Rebecca that I appreciate Garritt seeking to save a property and do something with a property that may not be in wonderful shape. And you're very eloquent in how you put together your reasoning. So, I do understand from where you're coming from, but I agree with the others that in terms of preservation of a property and following guidelines for best practices to allow the change in windows would be extremely different than those best practices, unfortunately.

- Garritt, are you gonna pursue historic tax credits for the project?

- No.

- Well, any other people wanna contribute here? Anything else? Any other points? And should we make a motion to return to regular business?

- Garritt, I'd like to ask another question. So, I'm still hung up on the existing storefront. I mean, you're repainting and redoing all the woodwork on the corners and on the second floor bay windows. So, if you reglaze that existing storefront and renovate that so that it matches everything else, is there another functional concern with replacing it or, I'm just concerned about going to a new aluminum storefront. It just doesn't fit the building.

- I just offered Paula to make it powder coated if the committee met me in the middle for some more windows. So respectfully, and don't take this wrong way, why do you care? I'm offering to do that.

- Well, because it's not just the finish of it, you're still changing the appearance of those existing storefronts.

- Anyone?

- If I may, and it's not my place, but kind of meeting in the middle, I know from what I had heard from you guys, you had indicated the high windows where you couldn't see in was the desire and was the way for a saloon, could there, and again, I'm not part of the committee, I'm here for item D or something, but what about a long set of windows that goes along the length that he's talking about

but only at that certain height? Would that be a meet in the middle compromise that would be viable for both? Okay.

- Not in my opinion.

- Not for me.

- No. Unfortunately, I don't feel there's room for compromise or meeting in the middle because we're up against law. We're up against green-based supported so much as, as Jason put, unfortunately, I just don't feel we've got the ability to compromise on this. It is an absolute.

- Anyone else? Anyone? Anyone else? Okay with that, I'll make a motion to return to regular business.

- Second.

- Second.

- All in favor, aye?

- Aye.

- Before you start discussing I just... I'm like sliding the computer over so you can see, I'm looking the COA application down to six different pieces. So, I think it might be useful to discuss them as those pieces or give recommendations so that way we have the total pitcher taken care of when we're processing this application. So the first one is the signage, which we are pulling from the application and they will take care of on their own. The next portion is that rear work on that edition. Were there any... We didn't have much discussion about that. Is there any that's needed?

- No. Okay.

- Is what exactly are they gonna do there?

- Right.

- I can that up again. We've been lovingly calling it a Burger King style rear entry. It's got those glass windows that all the Burger Kings had back in the day, back here. It's like Greenhouse Burger King. So, taking that out.

- Yeah, the main things here that I note are in the second story you see we're introducing windows or doors or both, that's generally permissible on a secondary facade like this. So, I don't have much... I can't point out anything that would necessarily say this is bad. I don't have any details though on, is this anadized finished stuff as a powder coated, what are we doing to the wall itself? Is it just painting? I dunno details.

- That was my question. I guess what's happening to the brick, is it being painted, rendered over in this? It's obviously not the same color. Not sure if it's the rendering or if it's...

- I believe this was called paint. I think that's what I remember from our site visit.
- In the absence of written details, I was recommending just blanket denial here until we have an opportunity to review this with more details.
- So, as it relates to the rear addition, I think Jason, you pointed out in your review, that was a subsequent addition to the property. We don't even know the vintage, but it wouldn't be from the period of significance. And so, my advice on that is I don't really care what's done to that addition 'cause anything that the property owner does is gonna be an improvement on what's there now. So, as far as I'm concerned, if we're gonna look at this application based on the six items that Stephanie pointed out, I'm just gonna offer up that everything I've heard is a dramatic improvement to the property. And the only objection I've heard to the six items, not with withstanding subsequent approval of signage in that process is the windows, the new storefront windows on the Broadway facade. I'm gonna offer up that the other five items, everybody on this commission agrees are an improvement to the building and hopefully that would move forward.
- Are these separate buildings currently or are they one building?
- One building.
- The parcels have been merged or were they...
- I think it's always been like that. I can't look that way.
- Look like it was always one parcel.
- It's like to say I concur with what Paul said for motion remain to approve all but the first floor window effect. I would approve that.
- I would approve that as well.
- Just to clarify, would that be no new storefront windows on the Broadway side or no... Or would it include the replacement windows also powder coated first floor?
- I don't think we're there yet.
- Okay.
- So that would be on the Dousman side.
- I guess I wanna go back to ENU question that the accessory building on the back side, are you concerned about that? I guess 'cause my opinion is again, it's not part of the...
- I'm just looking at that elevation and you have the red brick building now opening out onto the roof of the adjacent building. And I was curious as to if that was one like a legal means of escape that's not really covered by our commission, but that's kind of why I'm curious. Is this is one building or is it two buildings that just look very different from each other?

- These are one building on one parcel.
- Standards would treat the one story addition as an addition to the historic building.
- It's an addition to the existing historic building.
- Yes.
- It's model independent building.
- No. And from secretary of the interior standards perspective, my caution there would be that if we're looking at an ethos type change to the exterior, that might not be harmonious with the district at large. But if we're looking at painted brick, then okay, maybe.
- I guess I'd like some clarification around what the intent of the finishes and so forth are on that small single story addition before I'd feel comfortable that I understand enough to approve something or deny it.
- From the floor back up.
- Yeah.
- I'll make that motion to open floor back up.
- Second.
- Second.
- Okay. All in favor, aye?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Okay. And Garritt, you're obviously still with us?
- Once I can find the unmute. Yes.
- There you go. Did you hear that last question?
- What is the specific question that I can ask?
- You're looking at for that small single story building, what is the treatment I guess of the exterior wall.
- Nijiha-ish, if not nijiha directly.
- I'm sorry, I didn't catch that.

- What was that?

- Nijiha.

- Siding?

- It's a fiber cement panel.

- Yep.

- Fantastic product, may I say. So, depending on what happens with the second floor that is on that building right now, we're gonna try to test and chip away up part of it to see what the brick condition is like underneath it. If it can be taken off and the brick re-exposed, I would personally like that. If it can, the ethos says it probably will drive the coloring of the first floor part there so it looks a little more harmonious.

- Where is the coloring of ethos?

- The second floor where it says Bangkok Garden on that south face of the second floor.

- That's an insulating foam on that?

- Yeah.

- Really?

- I thought it was painted brick, but I don't know.

- It's ethos.

- I would say painted brick too from the photograph. But I'm sure you know, it's your building.

- I disagree with all of you. I think it's just a paring coat.

- Right. But I don't know if it has an exterior insulation finishing system on it. I don't think it's got insulation on, but again, I don't know.

- But bottom line is, I guess my comment remains, I don't know that this commission needs to concern itself with the secondary one story building because it's not contributing to the historic building that we're talking about. And so, if I throw the precedent word out there, even in the historic district where we've had non-contributing buildings, we've essentially allowed the applicants in the past to do things that might not be considered part of the historic. They weren't contributing to the historic district. And I don't think, Jason, correct me if I'm wrong, but this addition on the back is insignificant to what we're talking about. Am I wrong there?

- Well, this addition on the back is very visible, so, anything done here is going to have some sort of impact on the district as a whole. And that's where I'm voicing my caution that I don't know the

details. Looking at the rendering there, that looks pretty ultramodern contemporary to me, which might be considered as detracting. Whereas what exists is a red brick of a similar shade to that of the big building that's, it kind of blends in disappears. So, I don't know this white thing with the little pent roof fawning or whatever that, I don't think is gonna blend in, but that's just my shooting from the holster, kind of.

- I guess it still goes back to my question, if it's a single building or if it's an independent piece, are we looking at adding ethos to, or the mature panel to the, essentially the historic building? Even though it's an addition, it's still one and part of the building.

- Asking to add in ethos? Did I hear that right? You're asking if we would add ethos anywhere?

- Your paneling that you're looking to add.

- A .

- Yeah. Right. I'm asking this, it's considered that we're adding that paneling to a historic building because it's part of the other building or is it independent and the separate building? But it seems like it's an addition to the existing building.

- It is.

- Right.

- That's where I'm getting at.

- But it's not historic, so it doesn't matter.

- Well, the section...

- So, if half of a building isn't historic, then you can do what you want to it. But it just seems a very odd situation.

- Does secretary standards address additions? In fact, if we wanted to go back, number 10, I think is specific to additions, but here as an addition, it should be of an appropriate scale, differential from the old but but not overpowering the old.

- Yeah. Not a mimic. Right.

- You can draw inspiration from the original building but don't try to mirror it.

- Right. I don't have any additional questions.

- Motion to move to go back to regular business. I'll make that motion.

- Second.

- Okay. All in favor, aye?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Anyone opposed? Okay, we're back in regular business. I'm at a loss on this one. Does anybody have motion or any proposal or anything they would like to throw out there.

- Ron? Before a motion's made, I'll just disclose this now, for anyone who watches city council meetings, which I'm sure you all do because they're ragingly interesting. You probably know that anything with Garritt, I abstain from because he's on my executive committee and oversees my compensation. So, that is also why I'll be abstaining from this and why I haven't participated in the conversation. So, staff could just make sure that when the vote is taken on whatever the motion is, that I am shown as abstaining.

- Okay.

- Thank you.

- And Stephanie, you had started talking about six different aspects before. Are you suggesting that we break this down into six different recommendations or that we... It sounds to me like Jason's... Is that correct, Jason?

- You froze. Sorry.

- I'm sorry. Did you hear me?

- No.

- Oh, I'm sorry. I said, Stephanie, you started talking about this in six different aspects, yet Jason seems to recommend that it stay all as one recommendation as a denial. Is that correct?

- Yes. That recommendation came before we had other details. So, like Garritt had just provided that the trans... Like the window, what's it called?

- .

- No, the transmission. Yes. Like do we have that data now, that we know that the powder coded ones are on the second floor. Like we have more information now, so it'd be appropriate for you guys to, if you wanted to approve portions of the COA but not all of it. Now that we have more details, we would've given that as a recommendation. So, but you can't deny a wholesale if you want to also, if you want more information, I mean, that's up to you all.

- Yeah.

- I will add though, I don't know if the monton pattern, the grid pattern of the proposed storefronts match historic ones. I wasn't able to do that kinda a deeper analysis on this.

- Okay.
- Maybe it would be better if we voted on the whole thing.
- I'll make that motion that, I think we've expressed our thoughts adequately, but I will make a motion that we deny it in whole.
- I second the motion.
- And all in favor of that motion...
- Well, hang on.
- Hold on. Okay.
- Point of discussion. So if we deny this, are we telling the applicant in theory to come back next month with a revised submittal with more information or are we telling the applicant that no, we don't like anything that's been presented today? What is our guidance to the applicant because as I expressed a few minutes ago, I'm more than happy to approve five of the six items that were talked about tonight or four of the six items that were talked about, because I think clearly the building need... The second floor windows need replacement. We're not changing the original openings on the second floor. The applicant stated that the windows are gonna have a powder coated finish and a light transmission that is historically appropriate. So, a good percentage of the renovation work that's been discussed, I'm in favor of. I don't know what the applicant's timetable is for starting the work and the rest of his building permit process, but there's no reason to send the applicant away without some sort of guidance as to what this commission really intends to do. I mean, the building is, in historic architecture in the Broadway district, it needs to be preserved, but I guess I'm just trying to determine what a denial of the application says tonight. Where are we going with this? How do we get this thing back on track so that the preservation of the building can move forward in the future?
- I concur with Paul on this. I really do. I mean, five of the six things are pretty much up to standard here, and everything he just said is true. And if we were to approve the project minus those windows, it sounds to me like Garritt would be able to get started on this and maybe come back with a different idea for...
- Ron, without offering an opinion on the application from a procedural perspective, the commission could split the items.
- I believe that we can.
- Right. That's what I'm suggesting. You could do that if the commission chose to do so.
- And that's correct.
- Maybe we should open the floor and ask Garritt if that would be helpful in terms of his timeline and approval or if it makes no difference.
- I'll make that motion to open the floor. All in favor, aye?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any opposed? Okay. Garritt, did you hear that question?

- I did. My answer would be from a simple respect of work position, approving what you think is good and the agreements that I've made is a good thing. Respectfully to approve her in this case, likely deny it all in one chunk. I'm not gonna lie, kind of a slap on the face.

- I just wasn't sure if by not having the window approval that your direction was gonna be different or not.

- Well, given the applicant's response like that, I will withdraw my motion to deny and hold.

- Paul, would you like to brief forth a different motion.

- Do we need to close the floor?

- Before we close the floor so we don't have to go back and forth a dozen more times, thanks to Robert's rules of order, I guess, do we have more discussion with the applicants? So Garritt, bottom line is, we think what you're doing is rolling, we wanna help you get this thing going. Are you looking for more from us as far as a new application a month from now in that fashion? If there was a called a special meeting if time became an issue, are we giving you the tools to figure out how to move forward or?

- I don't know yet, Paul, quite honestly. Like I said a moment ago, approving and accepting the items where we all have agreement I think is a positive sign of respect tonight. What steps would be regarding that design? I don't know yet.

- Okay. Well, that's where I'm trying to take this, is rather than a full out denial, I'd like to give you some positive thoughts to move forward because again, what you're trying to do here needs to be done. We don't want the property to continue deteriorate, and so maybe we've got a problem with the historic guidelines with some of what you're proposing, but the majority of what you're trying to do is obviously a positive improvement to the building in the district. So I guess that's my point, is I'm trying to move forward what we can and deny what we can't.

- I'm fine with that. I just wasn't sure if it was gonna able to advance any timelines for Garritt. That that was my only...

- Okay, so I'll make a motion to close the floor.

- Second.

- All in favor, aye?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Okay. Anyone oppose? Okay. The floor is closed. With that, Paul, do you have a motion or do we wanna refer back to Jason to break this down appropriately where we could approve large segments and we could hold a special meeting? Stephanie, I'm sorry. Stephanie, and where we could hold a special meeting and get the big parts approved for Garritt as quickly as possible.

- Would we like to make a...

- We could go through and have the five and four on them individually now?

- Sure. I guess I'll make a motion to approve the application replacement of the second floor windows, painting of the facade, the wood facade features, and renovation to the single story building at the rear of the property.

- The windows.

- I think the applicant was saying they were powder coded.

- Or powder coded. That's right.

- I'll second Paul's motion.

- All in favor of that motion say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Is there anyone who's opposed? I ask again, is anyone opposed? Is anyone opposed? Okay. The ayes have it. So, we will host portions of the project for tonight. We'll need to revisit this project obviously though the other portions of it. Everyone in agreement with that?

- Yes.

- Okay.

- And then we'll table the discussion about the windows on the west wall facing Broadway.

- Correct.

- That's what we have for further discussion.

- And the first floor replacement windows. So, there's motion on .

- .

- Yep.

- Say again, Ian.

- I think Stephanie had it.

- Yep.

- So, what would motion be? I'm sorry, Steph?

- So, the approval is for the second floor windows as presented, painting in the rear renovation all approved. And then if you would like to make a motion to hold any of the items, it would be for the first floor replacement windows and the first floor creation of a storefront along Broadway.

- I'll make that motion as Stephanie just mentioned and add the caveat that if the applicant has something completed earlier than next month, that we look for a special meeting.

- I'll second that motion.

- So that motion again is that okay, you just said it well. All in favor of that motion.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Anyone opposed? Anyone opposed? Anyone opposed? Okay. That motion carries as well. Okay, thank you, Garritt. With that, we move to item number, a regular business for consideration with possible action on design review for porch repairs located at 130 North Oakland Avenue. Jason.

- Awesome. 130 North Oakland Avenue is in the, what do we call it? The Oakland Delman. Is that the district? It's a residential district on the west side. Here you see it on the map. Towards the top right, I've got a black and white photograph from the mid 1980s. I've got a much more recent photograph top right and then an even more recent photograph showing storm damage to the porch roof bottom. So, there's a bigger version of that. This COA calls for rehabilitating the existing columns, the one new post on the porch deck and the porch railings with the spindles, railings, bottom rails. Beyond that, the stone pier footings below the porch, those will be leveled or reinforced appropriately with some subterranean stuff. The roof structure will be replaced matching what was here with a new wood beadboard ceiling, new wood sawits, a header beam of same dimensions and then new wood stairs. I'm sorry. I said wood. Shouldn't have said wood there. New stairs with a composite tread. New stair railings, probably one of the two picture there. And then the porch deck itself, I believe it's currently tongue and groove wood. The proposal calls for a composite material that would look like this. These are relatively wide planks, I think it says on there five inch wide on the face. And you see they're a bit gappy, something like you'd expect on a back deck for a house. Nice material. But I would cautiously propose that something more appropriate for a front porch could be found. That's still a composite material. Here's one, it's a tongue and groove composite material that is available. I can't really speak to it whether it's good product or not. I'm just

saying you could come up with a porch floor in composite that looks more like a porch floor rather than back deck floor. I'm kicking that to you to discuss. If we look at the recommendation, I'm recommending approval. I'm recommending that you maybe spend a little bit of time considering and discussing porch flooring material and whether or not you like those stair railing systems that are proposed. But that's what I have. Thank you.

- So, do we have a motion to open up the floor to discuss?

- So moved.

- I'll second that.

- All in favor?

- Aye.

- Anyone nay? Okay. The ayes have it. Okay. The floor is open. Any thoughts on what Jason just said? I know I drove by there and it's definitely in need of this work. There's no doubt about that. Most definitely needs the work. Is the applicant on the call?

- I'm indeed.

- Oh, there you're. Okay.

- And yes, I agree it definitely needs to get worked.

- And what are your thoughts about what Jason said about a different composite and the structure of those rails?

- I mean, I know that the construction company that I have secured tends to only go through Menards, but I don't know if that's necessarily an argument that I think I would lose. If we're looking for something that seems to have more of a tongue and groove approach where there's not as much gaping, I'm fine. The one thing that I do wanna strongly stay with is the composite, if that's okay. The reason being is the house was built in 1900. I could tell it's been painted over multiple times and as you can, I don't know if they have any closeups of it, but you can see the paint starts to flex and it starts to look very grungy. And so I'm very excited for the, potentially for the composite so that we can be able to keep this looking nice for a lot longer.

- Okay.

- I don't have a problem with the composite as long as it looks more like a porch material.

- So that tongue and groove where you don't see as much of the gap?

- Right.

- Okay. I don't think that's an argument that I'll lose. We've already decided against what we had originally talked about after we had talked to Stephanie and Jason and Matt anyway. So...

- And generally the composition of the elevation is remaining the same.
- Stairs remain the same location.
- Most definitely.
- Same location. The only thing that we are changing is, Jason, if you wanna bring the picture up again, one of the comments that had been, oh sorry, Stephanie. One of the comments, when you look directly at the porch, if you notice the stairs going up, they don't quite go all the way to the width of the column. So there's a little bit of a gap.
- They used to.
- Yep. So they had asked that we widen that, which I am totally fine with. But aside from that, nothing else would change. It would be the same elevation. We wouldn't be touching the windows. We'd be looking for the roofing material to be the exact same color as the rest of the roof. I am looking at keeping the same pillars but probably painting it instead of that ugly, dull brown, may be more of a gray or something that could match the rest of the house that makes it look a little bit nicer. But aside from that, we're gonna keep every single thing the same and reuse where we can, replace where we have to. The only thing that's going to be straight up new, no apologies, is the decking and then the roof. But it would look similar.
- Looks like great improvement.
- Thank you. I've itching to do this since it got damaged.
- Make a motion to close the floor.
- Second.
- Second that.
- All in favor, aye?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Anyone against that? Okay. Floor is closed.
- Motion to approve with the contingency that the deck board be a tongue .
- Second. All in favor, aye?
- Aye.
- Aye.

- Any nays? Okay, the ayes have it. Thank you, Renee.
- Thank you.
- Item number E5, consideration of possible action on a design review for deck work located at 840 South Jackson Street.
- So, 840 South Jackson Street is a corner property. again?
- Yes.
- Thank you. Perfect. On the right you see a picture of the front of the house. Lovely home. We're talking about a rear deck visible from Porleo. And again, this is work already completed. It's actually pretty remarkable because the vertical posts have been replaced, but somehow they manage to keep the deck and the railings present. Adding another board or two here and there. But that's kinda neat. What can I say about that? I've recommended approval noting that it's not an aesthetic improvement or step backwards, it's basically replacing wood with wood, like for like in a novel economical fashion. So, yeah. Thank you.
- Motion to approve.
- I'll second that.
- Okay. All in favor, aye?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Are there any nays? Okay. Motion carries. Next F on the agenda, staff level COA applications.
- There were none.
- Okay. Number two, review city raise, repair orders and demolitions.
- There's several. And only one of them, which I've saved for last is really worth talking about. So, going through these 820 South Alaida, the big blue patch on the roof is not historically appropriate. Recommends that somebody do something about that. No big loss if perhaps this goes down the path. 979 Mather, number of issues with the roof, doors, hvac, plumbing, electrical, when in doubt just cite everything you can, I suppose. So, it needs some work. Again, not identified as potentially eligible. Doesn't jump out as being particularly remarkable from a historic preservation perspective. Next step. The garage at 1226, is it ? Or do we say it parrot or something here?
- I have no idea.
- Okay, I'll go with... So, the garage, again, not in a historic district, it's a cute old garage, but city says it's not safe. So, there's that. Last one, of the easy ones, 1555 East Mason, again, hvac, plumbing,

electrical, etc. Not in a district. Doesn't jump out. Highly altered, cute house. But the next one, this one, you as a Landmarks Commission may want to talk about. 1218 Velp is a portion of the old willow grass rug company. So in the map on the right, you'll see there's an intersection of Velp and, is it Rug Street towards the top left of the map?

- Rug road.

- Rug road. Not a coincidence. This building is part of that big complex there. That big complex was identified as eligible for national register listing in 2019 and reaffirmed as part of our intensive level survey in 2021. The raise order is a raise order, not a repair. I don't know if it applies just to this more interesting part of the building or the whole complex. I want to point out that since it is national register eligible, anybody could nominate this for local designation. If there is a nomination for local designation, the Landmarks Commission has the authority to impose a don't touch it until we talk about it moratorium on it. I dunno what you wanna do here. It's kind of, I the beholder. It's a really neat property. Could be turned into something cool, but it's outta my lane. You do what you wanna do here.

- Additionally, this was called out in the Velp corridor area plan as a redevelopment site. So, there's been previously some interest in redevelopment of this property as a whole. There was not a lot of information from our inspection division about this. Just that a hole has arrived in the ceiling and this building is in receivership. So that's really the only context we have to give you. I don't know if it was done intentionally, if it was just from it being a disrepair, if it was storm damage, we don't really have much context to give you.

- It certainly is a neat looking building. Yeah. It would seem to me that maybe that is something that we wanna consider saving. I don't know what the rest of the billing is like. I don't know how long that roof has been like that. If it's compromising the integrity of the exterior wall, then maybe there's more imminent concern. But if it's been identified as potentially eligible for nomination, then I think it would be full hard of us to just bypass that knowledge and consider the raise and repair or the raise order as its final destination.

- Well, I have just a little bit of insight about that building. We are on the fire department have got a no-entry into that entire building because of the condition. I don't know firsthand, but I strongly suspect that that entire building is in really bad shape. Ian, I share your concern, but I would suggest before we make any motion on it or take any action or even recommendation, we get much better firsthand information from building inspection or other appropriate agency.

- So right now, if we take no action, the raise order will proceed, right?

- Yes.

- Yeah. But it's government so slow is molasses over here.

- I will tell you I drive by there regularly and that roof, from what you can see there, if you get up closer, you can see that it is just total rot. I mean, it's in really bad shape.

- So I would...

- It'd be my guess that that entire roof would have to come off that building. That would be my guess, just by looking at it when I go by it. Yeah.

- Been a resident in Green Bay now for 26 years, something like that. And have been driving by this building and have always thought that it was a very eloquent little facade. Clearly, it's got a harkens back to some manufacturing from a long time ago. And I mean, so it's great. And I always wish somebody would do something with this. And after 26 years, nobody's done anything with it and now it's near gone. The fact that the property is truly in receivership, at this point, there's nobody that's gonna wanna save this 'cause the bank is just gonna try and do whatever they can to get out from under there. I'm more than happy to support this commission if we wanna intervene here to save this thing. But I feel like...

- If it was designated or nominated, would that then give the potential developer opportunity for additional tax credits to redevelop that pass?

- So, when I say it's been identified as eligible, I mean, it's been formally, by the Wisconsin Shipco, identified as eligible. And that part one stamp of approval automatically means that it's now eligible for state tax credits. And it would then be eligible for the federal tax credits if they took the time to fill out the nomination paperwork. So, it's basically been green flagged, clear sailing for all the tax credit incentives from the preservation perspective.

- And when did that happen? In '19?

- In 2019 as part of the industrial survey, it happened, and we reaffirmed it last year with our Intensive Level Survey. So, it's recent enough such that the current owner could apply for state tax credits today and provided they follow Secretary of Interior standards, it's approvable today with no hoops to jump through.

- But the problem is there is no owner.

- That's a problem. Yeah.

- Yes.

- You had nobody that cares about this property at this point.

- The last time we had a similar property, it was not a receivership, but they had a raise-only order, not raise repair, we switched it to be a raise repair and then marketed it with like our internal ability to do so in our department. And that is in the process of getting renovated now because they got a new owner in on it. But with this one that is more challenging because there is no owner to target to say, "Hey, if you redo this, here are the programs that you're eligible for." So, you're able to make different recommendations. There's a lot of different things you can do, but I mean, for us to have any teeth, it would have to get nominated somehow. But I mean, the the lowest level thing that we're able to do is recommend to our inspection division that it's a raised repair order. So they have the option to do repairs and not just to demo the building.

- Stephanie, if I'm looking at this right, I mean, this is an informational item only, which means we cannot make any action on this tonight. So, either it shows up on next month's agenda or staff can

just go ahead and make those inquiries, as an administrative function, get that information, find out if we can't convert it, and then we can put it on as an action item next month, right?

- Yes.

- That's a good point, Brian.

- So it seems to me, I think staff ought to at least do that so that we're making an informed decision.

- Yep, I would agree.

- I would agree.

- Information that I wanna share and highlight is that any person in the community could nominate this to the Landmarks Commission, which would trigger it as an action item on the next agenda.

- He's winking at all of you.

- No, I'm doing that 'cause I don't know...

- I'm winking back.

- But anyway, information there is that anybody can nominate it, then you guys have to talk about it more. And that nomination I think is fairly simple to Stephanie knows how.

- All mine.

- But yes, we as staff can dig into it a little bit more and we can place it back on if we feel like there's actionable things that can be taken for our next agenda. If not, I can just follow up via email to see if there's anything further that we need.

- That would seem wholly appropriate.

- I agree.

- Agree with Brian. A hundred percent.

- Thank you.

- Great.

- Okay. So, we can do nothing right now. Correct?

- Just give me your gentle nudge on what you'd like me to do.

- It would seem like you might get a recommendation to nominate it, and as such, maybe some further investigations warrant.

- Is that a motion?
- Can't have a motion.
- We can't make a motion, right?
- No, we can't make a motion.
- But I like the idea.
- It's information.
- Look, Ron and I say as the chair of the Landmarks Commission, if you felt, I mean, consult is a warranted action, perhaps that's a burden you're willing to carry is filling out that application.
- So again, that would have to be brought up as a...
- I'm not saying you do it as Landmarks Commission, I'm saying you do that as a resident of the city of Green Bay as Jason suggested.
- So, I should just get ahold of Stephanie tomorrow, perhaps?
- Yeah.
- Okay, I gotcha. Okay. I will do this, Stephanie, I'll give you a call tomorrow.
- Sounds good.
- Okay.
- Thank you, everyone.
- Okay. Let's see. Item number three, our staff update.
- We signed our contract with Legacy Architecture to continue on for phases five, six and portion of seven, I believe you guys start next week with field work.
- Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, driving around looking suspicious.
- But we're getting started on our next phase, which is great.
- Okay.
- I think that's it.
- Excellent.

- Oh, Mason Manor goes to the state review board, November, that right or no? November 18th. So, I get to give a presentation.
- Okay. Does anyone have anything else they'd like to throw out there tonight? No? The date of our next meeting is Wednesday, November 16th. With that, do we need a motion to adjourn?
- To adjourn.
- Okay.
- Second.
- All in favor?
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Have a good evening, everyone.