



## **MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION**

**WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2022, 4:30 PM**

**In person at City Hall, Room 604 -The Harry Maier Room.**

**Virtual attendance also available via Zoom.**

### **A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.**

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

### **B. ROLL CALL.**

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

Present: Ron Dehn, David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Brian Johnson, Rebecca Derenne (joined at 4:33 PM), Susan Ley (joined at 4:34 PM)

Excused:

### **C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.**

I. Approval of the agenda for the November 16, 2022, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

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

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

### **D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.**

I. Approval of the minutes from the October 19, 2022, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

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

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

### **E. REGULAR BUSINESS.**

1. (COA 22-41) Consideration with possible action on a design review for window replacements located at 240 N. Broadway - Held from October 19, 2022 meeting.

Alder Brian Johnson is abstaining from this item.

Moved by David Siegel, seconded by Paul Martzke to open the floor. Motion Passed.

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

Rebecca Derenne joined at 4:33 PM after floor opened.

Susan Ley joined at 4:34 PM after floor opened.

Moved by David Siegel, 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 David Siegel, seconded by Susan Ley to approve replacement of existing storefront windows on the north and southwest sides and deny replacement of the small windows on the northwest side with storefront windows. Motion Passed.

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

2. (COA 22-45) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a major exterior remodel at 711 Eliza Street.

Moved by Ian Griffiths, seconded by Susan Ley 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 Ian Griffiths, 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 Ian Griffiths, seconded by David Siegel to place the application on hold pending more information from the applicant. Motion Passed.

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

3. (COA 22-47) Consideration with possible action on a design review for door replacements at 837 S Jackson Street

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Susan Ley 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 Ald. Brian Johnson, 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 Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by David Siegel to approve as presented by staff. Motion Passed.

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

No- None, Abstain- None.

## **F. INFORMATIONAL.**

1. Public Meeting for Phases 5, 6, and a Portion of 7 for the Update to the Intensive Survey
2. Staff-Level COA Applications.
3. Review City Raze/Repair Orders and Demolitions.
4. Staff Update.
5. Date of next meeting: Wednesday, December 21, 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**

- Excuse me, okay. Got it, okay. Item number A, this meeting is available by Zoom as some of us can tell because we're all on here by Zoom. Item B, roll call, it looks like we're missing . and Rebecca tonight at this point.
- Yes. Hopefully they will be joining us here. So, item C, approval of the agenda for the November 16th meeting of the Landmarks Commission. Do we have a motion? or any discussion?
- Second.
- All in favor, aye.
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Aye. Any nays? Are there any nays? Okay, the eyes have it. The agenda for tonight is approved, approval of the minutes from the previous meeting?
- So moved.
- Second.
- All in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Are there any nays? Okay, the eyes have it. Regular business, item E, certificate of appropriateness 22-41 consideration with possible action on a design review for window replacements located at 240 North Broadway held over from the October 19th, 2022 meeting. We have a motion to open the floor to discuss this or? So move David. Okay.

- Second

- Okay. All in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye

- Aye, are there any nays? Okay, so the floor is open to discuss this. I personally didn't see anything that changed in there when I read through it. Jason, are you available?

- I'm available, yes. If you changed. I'm not aware of anything having changed.

- I beg your pardon?

- I don't know of anything that has changed.

- There was a small amount of text added to the beginning of the staff report that was an update from the applicant. He is also here, if you have additional questions .

- Stephanie and Jason, I'm having a real hard time hearing you and I've got my speaker up all the way up loud. I'm .

- We'll have to talk louder.

- Closer.

- The speaker's in the ceiling, so.

- I see.

- Not a lot of moving towards it can go on.

- Well, I mean the microphone. I'm sorry.

- So-

- Rebecca just joined.

- Hi Rebecca? Yes, Rebecca's joined. I guess, I'm confused on why this is on the agenda. What are we looking to do here?

- Well, it was held looking for, there wasn't a clear direction from the commission other than why the first story windows could not be repaired. That was addressed in the texts that was added to the staff report, as far as the storefront goes I did have any clear direction on additional information that was requested from the commission and was requested by the applicants places back on the agenda.

- And has the applicant submitted any further changes that we're aware of?

- No changes, just the clarifying text about the first story window replacement.

- I see. Paul, I'm going to revert to you here for a second. As I recall, you motioned last time that we approved like five of the six parts of this plan. Is that not correct? About the only thing that was outstanding was just the old bar windows, is that correct?

- Everything was approved aside from the first story replacement windows and then the addition of a new storefront on the first story. So, those two items were held.

- Okay. And is anyone here to address that today?

- Yes. Gary, if you'd like to ask him any questions. We don't really have like a format set up. You can just come to the table or stay there. The speakers right there so they can hear you. Actually, I didn't think anyone was going to come in person, so I didn't set up the room at all. So, we're a little behind here.

- Again, I'm having trouble hearing, I'm sorry. So, I'm at a loss. Are we doing anything with this at the... you say someone is here to talk about it?

- Yes, the applicant is here if you have questions, or would like to ask him any further questions.

- Okay. And who is that?

- Garritt Bader.

- Okay. I'm not seeing Garritt on here.

- He's in the room.

- Okay. I see.

- Thrills and jokes and nothing else.

- I know.

- Well I guess Garritt, there was the one... the bar windows I guess was the hang up on this piece of property and so, what have you come up with as far as a change to that?

- Well really Ron, nothing has changed. We're open. I can speak? Ron, nothing has changed. When I was speaking with Stephanie last week or the week before, I forget. I was talking about what are next steps now, because yes, you're right. The committee approved four or five I believe, of the requests that were there. The fifth one I would still like the committee to approve, based on our discussion next time, I appreciate where you all are coming from, but I am thinking about this since that meeting. Some feedback that I received, as many probably saw, there was a Press Times article, which I was unaware of until it actually showed up at the paper. But I had a lot of feedback that folks actually called me on and maybe surprising or not, but really liked what I wanted to do to the building. what still saddens me a little bit is that I think myself and this commission have different ideas of what is saving and what is destroying. And I feel we're on opposite sides of both of those items. Everyone that reached out to me, you'll no doubt be surprised that I feel the same way that we are saving this building in doing what I'm proposing. We are acknowledging its past while also acknowledging what the present day tenant needs to successfully operate in a building like that. And I still disagree with assertions that were made last time that I am destroying it. I really, really disagree with that. I think we need only look on this side of the river, the east side where I am right now as to what happens when you don't take care of buildings and an error in which no one thought that they could be used properly, so we tore them all down. Here we're really trying to save it and I would never, ever threaten to tear something down because I wouldn't get my way. I like this building too much. That's why we bought it was to save it. And for those that have seen the image of the inside, I think there's no disagreement that we are saving it. So, I wish that this commission would not look at the issue of these windows and trying to save a moment in time for a long past operation on what that apparently meant and look at more of what we're trying to do today, what we're trying to do for Broadway, what we're trying to do for downtown. And that adding more windows is really a way of truly saving the structure for another 100 years.

- Garritt, I guess I have a quick question here. Given the fact that this commission is bound by the Department Of The Interior Standards For Historic Preservation, which the ordinance is written around, do you believe there are elements of that ordinance that we are not upholding?

- Well, and I don't mean this to come off snarky, but just say the part common sense in an ordinance is just looking at something the way it was in a moment in time does not, should not be the determining factor of why we reserve things today, in my opinion. Now to your direct question, is that an element in which you can consider, maybe not in the way that it's written, but what I'd love to hear more than anything is maybe some acknowledgement that giving a nod of present to a historic building can actually save it. And that if we need to find another way to do that or I need to find another way as I'm chatting Stephanie about in recent weeks, then maybe I need to do that. But maybe some acknowledgement of that is what I would love to hear.

- Ian, just a follow up question to that and as you guys know, I need to abstain on this vote. So, this is really just more of a, even for me seeking maybe some clarification as one of the newer members of this commission. Are we bound to those standards or does the ordinance give us leeway in terms of, are we guided by that versus bound by that? Does that make sense? And I don't know the answer to that.

- I guess, my understanding is that that is our directive that is guiding reference document. And so I'm not sure that... I guess, from what I know, I believe that it is there for us to enforce, not for us to interpret.

- I would simply ask the question, why do we have a commission then? Because if it's exclusively enforcement, then just let staff do that. And again, and so maybe just someone from staff or whoever could perhaps clarify how that ordinance is written in its language and what authority, I guess, does this commission have when making those decisions. I just, even as a commission member, this issue or any other issue, I think, it would be very beneficial to know that.

- So the ordinance language is accessible to all. It's clear that there's a purpose and intent behind this commission. It's clear that this commission shall consider several standards when evaluating any application for a COA as to having staff do enforcement in the absence of a commission. That would not be in legal best practice. Among other things, since these are quasi-judicial in nature, it's important to have a commission like this to consider each application to weigh those requests against some standards and to make a decision as you see fit, going beyond that to maintain our certified local government status, of course we need a commission like this and this ordinance is essentially, identical to hundreds if not thousands of ordinances across the country. Certainly, a hundredish or so within the state of Wisconsin. The arrangement and language is fairly standard and consistent and it's been upheld by the Supreme Court. So, I suppose I don't want to interpret the ordinance for you. It's written in black and white. You can see where it says shall consider purpose and intent shall consider secretary of interior standards. These are for you to consider, I believe.

- Well, I will add this having considered that, in my opinion, I think after considering that, one consideration is are we better to allow better off to allow some minor changes that don't necessarily fit the bill as opposed to letting this building crumble down to the ground? That's the alternative here and that's something we don't want to see for sure.

- No, that's not the alternative Ron.

- It certainly is one of them.

- Well, there's safeguards in place to make sure that property owners do not neglect a building and let it crumble to the ground. So, that's not what we're talking about. And that's certainly not the intent of the property owner tonight. So, I think that's an extreme viewpoint that I'm not going to make my decisions based on the fear that somebody's going to bulldoze a building.

- I still . Now, let me to both Ron and Paul there, as I said before, I don't want to be one of those dramatic people that says that or would threaten to do that because I care too much about the city to do that. However, one only need look at the photos I included in the original submittal to this to see that previous owners were very neglectful of this building. So sometimes Paul, that just happens by default, not because somebody's going to purposely let it happen. I shudder to think if we didn't come in and buy this building recently, what would've happened to this building in short order? When you see those second floor two by fours holding up the ceiling structure, sometimes that just happens. So, again, I'm going to go back a little bit to Brian's point then, which is, well, what is the lesser of two evils here? So, if what I just heard a moment ago, it doesn't sound like there's an automatic having to be held bound by something. Can't we find some more middle ground here, like I have found on these other items which were previously approved.

- Some come out.

- Just let me know when the screen is no longer helpful and I'll take it down so we can resume.

- Okay.

- Well does anyone else have anything to add to this?

- Yes.

- We do have a hand raised here, chair.

- Okay.

- Good evening Commissioners my name is Dan Theno, T-H-E-N-O. And I'm going to stand because I guess I'm close to the microphone here.

- Yes, you remembered.

- 621 Schwartz Street here in Green Bay. I read the article in the Press Times and I thought, oh, what can I do to help preserve this building? And I called Garritt and he said that you folks were meeting tonight and that's why I'm here. Let me give you a little bit of my background so you don't think I'm just walking off the street supporting this project. I am the past president or the past chairman of the Green Bay Neighborhood Leadership Council. I am currently the chairman of the Green Bay Traffic Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission, and I am a newly elected member of the Brown County Board of Supervisors. In the past I served four terms in the Wisconsin State Senate and during most of that time I was a member of the Wisconsin State Building Commission, very important or organ of Wisconsin State government that approves all building projects, prisons, office buildings, campus remodelings, whatever it happens to be. During much of that tenure on the State Building Commission, I was part of a group that pushed for the restoration of our beautiful majestic Wisconsin State Capital and we got approval on that. It was a multi-year project to restore the beauty of the Wisconsin State Capital to the tune of almost 150 million dollars. I was also a member of the Board of Curators of the Wisconsin State Historical Society. So, my interest in history is very deep. And finally I brought a prop, I don't know if you've seen this on this second floor of the rotunda of Wisconsin State Capital. This is the encasement, the monument containing the constitution, the original constitution of the State of Wisconsin. That was a project that I spearheaded. And so Governor Tony Evers, or not Tony Evers. Governor Tony... What's his name? Not Evers.

- Walker.

- No, no, before Walker.

- Thompson?

- Thompson. When you get 75 years old, you forget something. Tony Earl, Governor Tony Earl presented this to me because of my efforts to preserve the Wisconsin State Constitution. I'll make three points very quickly about this particular project. When I read about this project in the newspaper, I thought, why? Why should these three little windows be holding up a major restoration on the west side of the Fox River? First of all, I think if you did a survey of a hundred people that live or work on Broadway and asked them what are the windows on the west side of that building?

Maybe one of them could say the correct answer. They are nondescript windows. Secondly, the object of historic preservation doesn't mean that you keep everything the same. It doesn't mean that. What it means is you keep everything architecturally sound in keeping with the overall architecture of the structure. But it doesn't mean that you don't change anything. And I guess I would make a third point, it was alluded to by Mr. Bader and that is that in preserving many historic buildings, they have to be economically viable. And if they're not economically viable, they can't be preserved. I don't think that the changes that were proposed by the developer do harm at all to the building. I don't believe that these three non-descript windows should be an impediment to the preservation of this historic building in Green Bay. Thank you. Anybody have any questions?

- Okay.

- I would like to respond to those points, the discussion there. The reality is all of those arguments can be applied to just about every application that we ever see. That if there are overreaching ideals to go for, such as economic development, it applies to every I'll ever see, which as is a concern of this commission repeatedly, precedent setting. So while, for the applicant your goals are so audible and I appreciate the fact that they stood in the historic nature, you want to provide a economic support and prevent a blight. But we do need to look at the long term reality here that if we do okay removal of those windows and the dramatic change in the presentation, every applicant from now on is going to have a substantial argument to do the same is my major concern.

- I'd like to add something as well.

- Go right ahead.

- Thank you. I really appreciate the thoughtfulness in which Garritt and others have put together information on this issue. As someone who's lived in this area my entire life, now, I'm very interested in seeing both these beautiful buildings kept and upheld, as well as progress being made. And I think there's some good points on both sides. I will say that in considering everything and I do remember Dan from other work that I did in the past in a different realm, and you have good perspective as well. But I would say that I tend to line up with David here where if we make exception, and this is a pretty significant exception in terms of all the guidelines whereby, if we make this exception for this building and this building is a prominent building in a prominent district, then I really don't know that we have much ground to not do that every other time when someone comes through with a plausible argument. And so to me it's a bit of a slippery slope if we allow this to go through, this particular window change particularly.

- Thank you Rebecca. Anyone else have anything to add?

- Yeah, if I can, so Grant Keebler Platon Place, 241 Broadway, right across the street. We got that notification from Stephanie inviting us to appear and just thought I'd stop by because we're probably most impacted neighbor of anybody. And I just wanted to say, I've been upstairs at the building we're talking about here. Garritt took the good pictures. It's worse than what we think it really is and we're just fearful. I'm grateful I'm not in Garritt's spot. We're grateful that we didn't end up having to buy this to make sure it didn't fall apart. And we're just concerned that there's not going to be an economic solution here unless, there's a good tenant. And without the right, I don't know, the right situation you might not have for a long time. And that's our fear. And we just want to do what we can to support, a use going into that building.

- Thank you Grant. Anyone else? Anything to add? Any other thoughts on this?

- Is raising his hand.

- Do we have a motion to close the floor and...

- There's someone waiting, who just rose their hand to speak Ron in here in the room.

- It's just Jason, so he can do it now or after it's up to you.

- Can I even say something before we-

- That's up to the chair, Ron, Garritt would like to speak again.

- Sure, absolutely.

- One final thought to leave you here with before you close the floor and I feel more so than our last meeting today, at the risk of maybe assuming too much. I feel like I have more commission members thinking today about maybe this could be a good thing that I did last time. And a brief story I'll relay is years ago I'm working on one of my first projects here in Green Bay. I was meeting with some staff members and was told right away opening up a code book, why I couldn't look and close the code book. And I said, "But do you want it?" And the answer was, "Well yeah, it could be good." I said, "Well, then let's find a way." So, what I heard just Dave and Rebecca say was, "Well, we'd set precedent if we did this." But this is a building on a corner that is worthy of precedent. Not every structure needs to be reviewed in the same context and there's enough backing up to support why this property's maybe more vital and important than others. So, I would really hope, again, if people really want to see a building preserved and in the best way that is feasible for today, that we find a way and not hide behind a fear of precedent or of obligatory statutes that may not be that obligatory. Thank you.

- Thank you Garritt.

- Just go ahead, you are set up.

- Ron. May I say just a few words?

- I'm sorry, who's speaking?

- Jason here. May I say a few words?

- Yes, sure.

- Could you set us? So earlier today, Jason Tish from Shipo had a little discussion with city staff, just part of a four year check in on our CLG status. And I suppose just for my own benefit to demonstrate what city staff does is, we are a messenger to the Landmarks Commission. We don't write preservation philosophy, we don't control what preservation philosophy is, but the secretary of the interior standards are codified in the Code of Federal Regulations chapter 36. And so as part of

what we do for the Landmarks Commission, is we present this information to you and what we've presented last month, if we just slowly go through these slides as we discussed what the national register nominations said of this building, pointing out the importance of the windows, we've shown you what the changes proposed are and what the existing window configuration is. We've noted that the existing window configuration is a character defining feature of the property intrinsically linked to its importance in history. I brought to you the Secretary of the interior standards as they are in 36 CFR 67. I've shown you clearly what the standards call for as recommended and not recommended practice. I've pointed out to you the Wisconsin State to start preservation office requirements which state that primary facades should be left in intact. The two facades that we're discussing here, are primary facades of the building, again, I'm the messenger, I don't control this. I have addressed for you the seven aspects of integrity and I've color coded for you how those aspects of integrity will be impacted by the proposed change to the windows. I've pointed out your local ordinance. Again, I'm not a lawyer, don't want to interpret things. I'm providing you this information. I've given you my recommendation as a messenger. You don't need to take my recommendation. That's clear in the ordinance, you do as you please. I just want to point out that Jason Tish from Shipo, please note we do this. We have provided this information. This I believe is in keeping with our requirements as a certified local government community. From there Landmarks Commission, I believe you can do as you please. And if you don't find in favor of the applicants, the applicant has recourse to appeal this to council. So, this is a cover my own interests given that Jason Tish is watching me to say, "Hey, we did our job and now you do whatever it is that you do is your job Landmark's Commission." Thank you.

- Thank you Jason. Anyone else? I have a motion to close the floor and-

- Could I just ask one question of the applicant? I know we discussed this at last month's meeting about wanting to basically put in a wall of window the west wall facing Broadway. Discussion about the higher windows there because that was a bar. What are your thoughts on not doing that wall of windows on the west wall that faces Broadway, just keep the same size window but replace them? And the same size opening.

- Keep the same size opening on the Broadway side you're saying?

- Correct.

- Well, that's-

- Not do the big windows there.

- That's at the first ordinance agreement right now, is that what I'm saying is that it's very difficult to find a proper market rate tenant that can operate in that facility. Excuse me. The way that that's designed today. I'd argue that the reason that the building is in the condition in which we find it is that for the better part of 40 years, a less than ideal tenant was allowed to operate in because the conditions would not warrant its rehab and repair for a quality tenant. Those windows or a lack thereof being the largest reason.

- Does that answer your question, Susan?

- Somewhat. I'd want to work around that, but I don't know. I'm not a landlord. I don't have that experience. But just thinking about compromises, people are willing to make at times with real estate.

- Anyone else? Anything? Jason, are you waving your hand? Jason Tish. Okay. It looked like you were waving your hand for attention there so.

- I make a motion to close the floor then.

- I'll second.

- All in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Anyone opposed to closing the floor? Anyone opposed? Is there anyone opposed? Okay, the floor is closed. And does anyone have any motion or thoughts of moving forward in any direction? Anyone at all? I mean, David, you seemed pretty convinced in one area. Rebecca, you as well. I mean, is there a motion that you'd like to make or?

- Well, if I could just get a clarification from staff, previously we approved everything but the first floor windows, correct? So, the only thing that would be open right now would be the first floor windows, is that correct?

- The replacement of the existing first floor windows and then also the addition of the storefront, which we had kind of broke out as two separate items.

- It's replacing the first floor windows on the north side of the building and different size opening and then also putting in the storefront windows on that whole west wall?

- No, let me pull up a photo that might be more helpful.

- Now, Stephanie, you were broken up when you gave that summary.

- Okay. It's the first floor replacements for the existing storefront windows and then additionally the addition of the storefronts here. So, I would say those are two separate items. Existing window replacement and then new window installation.

- It was my understanding that what we did not approve was just the replacement of those three higher bar windows, correct?

- No.

- That one part of the wall.

- Because-

- This replacement also was not done. Everything on the first floor was not touched in your last approval. Only the second story in that rear addition.

- I see.
- So, we could have approval replacement of the north windows, but the west wall remains as is?
- There are existing storefront windows on the south end of the west wall.
- Right. But not allow the windows added to cut into that west wall where those higher bar windows are?
- Yes. Right.
- No changes in window opening size or can replace windows but not change the size, make them larger.
- Stephanie if you responded to that, I couldn't hear you.
- I couldn't hear anything either.
- What do you need clarification on? The two separate issues are that you can replace the existing storefront windows on the first floor and then secondary would be the addition of new windows on that storefront area that is currently bricked off.
- On the renderings, Garritt's renderings, did we not approve basically his design on the north side of the building completely?
- No.
- No, we did not?
- No.
- Hey, what I will make a motion then based on the two renderings that were just presented. My motion would be to approve what is on the north side but deny what is on the west side.
- There are existing storefront windows on the west side though, so if you're hoping to capture all existing storefront windows, a different wording would be required. Because the west side does have existing large storefronts, just not at the corner. Here where the awnings are, those are existing windows underneath. So, north side has the windows, west side has windows.
- Replaced existing north star front windows and west Star front windows?
- Yes.
- But not create any new window openings.
- Yes.

- Or enlarge anything.
- In line with materials.
- David, do you want to re-clarify the motion you were about to make?
- Yeah.
- Sure. I'll amend or adjust it to reflect exactly that, that we would accept the north and the southwest presentations in the rendering, but deny what would be in the northwest corner where the small current openings exist.
- Perfect. Thank you.
- Do we have a second?
- I'll second.
- So having that and a second, all favor? Aye.
- Aye.
- Three.
- All opposed? Calls opposed.
- Ron, I need to be reflected as abstaining.
- Okay.
- I say this at counts all the time, but Garritt is a member of my executive committee that oversees my compensation. That's why I need to abstain.
- Okay. And Ian, did you vote?
- Yeah. To approve. To approve, presented.
- Okay.
- But no change in the window opening size,
- Right. That was stated.
- Yeah.
- I just want to clarify.
- Yeah.

- Well, then it sounds like we had a five to one vote here in favor of that recommendation so, is approved.
- First .
- Am I correct in those numbers there?
- Four, one, one.
- What was abstaining?
- Yeah, they abstained.
- Yeah. Four, one, one.
- I beg your pardon?
- Five, one, one. We have seven members.
- Right? And one... Right and one abstention. Correct. I'm sorry about that. Shall we move forward to the next item?
- Please.
- Formal denial while I'm done. So I-
- That is your denial, so I'll send you a letter tomorrow.
- Okay.
- Well, I believe that closes that item for tonight, is that correct?
- Yes.
- Okay. It's okay. Item number E two, certificate of appropriateness 22-45 consideration with possible action on a design review for a major exterior remodel at 711 Eliza Street.
- Is this the place, Stephanie?
- That's the place, yes.
- Quite clear.
- That little round-
- That thing. Yeah.

- All right, this COA application involves a major rehabilitation of the house at 711 Eliza Street.

- Yeah.

- You likely remember this house because not too long ago, I think you found a demolition by neglect ruling on this one and it has continued to be neglected, but I think now we've got a new buyer on the line that's proposing large scale rehabilitation. I'm jumping the gun a little bit. I want to say that the COA application does not include any sketches or details as to what it's going to look like if you approve the application. So, here you see a few pictures of the front porch and the slides and on the next slide I think you see some additional photographs. It's got a character defining two story front porch. It's in bad shape, it needs work. We all know this. The next few slides basically, this is the extent of the COA application details. It's some material cut sheets from Menards and I put a few arrows on some items where, even as an engineer it's hard for me to try to guess what the intent is, but these are areas of concern. In addition to that, my eyesight is poor. So Stephanie, what does that first arrow point to?

- Green railing.

- So, for the railing, I'm guessing that the applicant is specking out some green treated lumber for the porch railing. I guess, I don't think that's a good idea. My opinion. The next arrow is?

- Upper deck pillars.

- Upper deck pillars. Does that mean the columns upstairs? I would hope not. The next one.

- Deck, first floor.

- So, if you recall last month we talked about appropriate porch flooring here. What's being proposed again as like backyard deck flooring wide with a radius edge. And then the arrow on the right is?

- Upper deck molding.

- Molding.

- So, it's a profile molding that I presume goes around the header at the top of the front porch. It's a cute little OG profile kind of thing. Next page, more of the same. The first arrow on the left is for? What is?

- Ceilings.

- Ceiling material, wasn't it like car siding or something?

- Uh-huh.

- Okay, so that's not exactly a tongue and groove ceiling, make of it what you will. Then on the right also part of the ceiling application had a couple of concerns. I know I'm walking away from the microphone each time. What's that say? Upper porch.

- The front porch replace damaged deteriorated ceiling.
- So, replace ceiling, fascia, soffits. It's not entirely clear to me what they're replacing it with. Next one down is.
- Repair, replace all that are missing.
- Repair/replace all the screens, storm windows that are missing. So like which ones are being replaced and with what then-
- Replaced East storm door and screen door.
- Replacing exterior doors. Again, I don't know what the new door is going to look like and I'm pretty sure that last arrow is repair/replace windows. And you know how I get about windows, don't know what the proposed replacements are. So, that's a concern. Moving ahead, like I said, I jumped the gun. I fully recommend repairing stuff where existing material is rehabilitated and repaired using existing material. Going out of my lane and extrapolating a bit. I would specifically recommend that the existing porch columns are repaired. Yes, they have holes in them. I'm pretty sure woodpeckers have been living in them. Okay. Again, I don't know what the proposed replacements might be because that's absent in the application. Strongly recommend that the Landmarks Commission discussed what the final design is going to look like because I don't know, and perhaps most importantly conspicuously absent is any discussion to date about using the state historic preservation tax credit for this. Because I imagine it's going to be a fairly intensive and costly enterprise to rehabilitate this house and a lot of that work would qualify for the state historic preservation income tax credit, 25% on each dollar cents for qualifying rehabilitation expenses. This is my recommendation. Thank you for letting me talk.
- I've got a question for you, Jason. What I find remarkable about your presentation is a lot of the gaps in your understanding. Your, I don't know, I think, I question, is it fair to say that this application is incomplete in comparison to the scope of the work?
- So, I would be speculating, I usually don't like to speculate, but the application, some of the text in the application suggests that the applicant was under the impression that they didn't need certain approvals. And it could just be the applicant is not familiar with the expectations of the Landmarks Commission and Staff and perhaps an innocence oversight that more information would be necessary, not just helpful, so.
- Well, I am familiar with the building and it's quite the character. It's beautiful, it's absolutely worth saving and it sure needs the work done. It seems as if they've done a great deal of effort to move forward. But as you're suggesting, Jason, they have been incomplete or perhaps don't understand the full process.
- We do have members of the public here, just in case you guys were looking to make the motions sooner than later, I think they would like to speak.
- You need to read that email.

- There was also an email that was sent to me but went to my junk mail. So, I will forward that along, but he is here to speak on that email as well.

- I'll make a motion open the floor.

- Second.

- Okay. All in favor? Aye

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Anyone opposed? Okay. The floor is now open.

- Would you like me to pull up that email?

- Sure, you can pull that email up. My name is Gordon Johnson. I live on the corner of South Quincy and Eliza Street and the north side of my house faces 711 Eliza Street. the property we're speaking of today. This property is incredibly run down the building. It's going to require extremely extensive repairs to both the interior and the exterior. The interior, the building will basically have to be gutted and rebuilt. I have been in there several years ago and nothing has been done since that time. So, it has continued to fall into disrepair. I'm thinking, my opinion is that the cost of bringing this up to the historic standards, both interior and exterior would be prohibitively expensive for a single family home, even with tax credits. Therefore, I expect this building will be divided up into apartments. Now, maybe some discussions have gone on about this that I'm... Of which I'm unaware, but if it's going to be divided up into apartments, I'd just like to point out that this property has, for the last 17 years, at least 17 years, been a drug house with drug selling, drug use, and resulting numerous police visits that go along with this type of activity. I don't know the exact number of police visits, but I'd say it's almost on a monthly basis if not more frequent than that. Because Aldo Leopold Elementary School's within 200 feet of this building. I really don't think anyone wants to have a drug house this close to a school. The surrounding areas in the Astor District are predominantly single family homes zoned, as I understand it, R1 low density residential. And if this building is not going to be a single family home, then how many units will it have? And I feel that if this building is not developed as a single family home, any other use of this building would be inappropriate and incompatible with a surrounding area. And I love historic preservation. I've nothing against that at all. But my feeling is just because a building is old and located in a historic district, it does not mean that that building must be saved especially, if the building is in as bad a condition and has no real historic value to the City of Green Bay. Due to the extensive repairs that this building will require before any release of funds should take place. I think we need to know the plan for the interior of this building as well as the exterior. If there is no concrete plan for the interior of the building that locks in the developer of the building, then I don't think any funds should be released for improving the exterior of the building, as it may well be a waste of money. And I say this because if the exterior of the building is done by one party and they don't have the wherewithal to finish up the interior, whoever comes along to do the interior may not like the way the exterior had been improved, hence the funds would be wasted. I think there's so many unknowns about what the folks that plan on doing this work, I think, there's so many unknowns with what they want to do with the building that I just don't see how funds can be released right now. I'm not saying they should never be released, I'm just saying let's find out what the

actual intent is and can they be locked into that intent. Dave, you look like you might have something to say.

- Yeah. You keep referring to a release of funds. What exactly are you referring to?

- Well, we're here to discuss the certificate of appropriateness for major extensive repairs, and I was under the impression that meant a release of funds to do that. Now, maybe I'm wrong about that and maybe that's a separate issue down the road, but in chatting with some city personnel through the last, I don't know, probably two years that this has been vacant, I was under the impression that there were funds available to do the rehabilitation of this building. And perhaps I'm getting confused with things that I've heard that may not actually transpire.

- Staff, do you have any insight into what is meant by release of funds? Because my initial impression is all the monies are coming from the current owner.

- That's what I thought. Unless, he's thinking of that low interest city loan program.

- I think that's what put the seed in my head.

- Yeah.

- Fund wise.

- There are funding sources available because it's in a historic district, but they're not taking advantage of any of those.

- Okay. All right.

- So, it's privately funded at this point.

- Okay.

- What we're saying is they're eligible for the tax credit program, which is run through the state, but they haven't applied for that either. So, at this point there's no city funding or no other outside funding that we're part of-

- Okay. That's fine.

- Yes.

- Just to clarify, we do have in their statement that they are remodeling to do a single family home by zoning what they have to do at most a two family. So, right now it's a fourplex. At the minimum it has to be a two family, but they're designed as for a single family home.

- You mean-

- I just looked at the City of Green Bay assessment records and they've got that zoned as commercial and total living units four.

- It's not zone commercial. They assess anything more than three units as commercial just to be annoying. Mostly, it doesn't make any sense because-
- But you know the city's already saying it's four units.
- Yes, it was four-
- I could see that the owner could keep it as a multifamily if they wanted to because they've got the zoning part.
- They can't actually. The zoning is R1 and the requirement for that is at most two units, but they are doing the remodel as a single family.
- Well, Susan brings up an interesting point, because apparently, there's a conflict there. So, we're in doubt as to which way it might actually go.
- No, not at all. It's just when a building is assessed as a multifamily, it has a commercial assessment value. The zoning is R1, so, it has to be a single or two family and they're going for a single family.
- But they do have it now that it's four units.
- It's listed as four units because it is currently four units.
- Right.
- It cannot remain four units.
- Okay. Cannot-
- It cannot.
- Okay, that's what I wanted to hear.
- Yeah, so anybody who would want to redo that, even if this person falls through, it cannot be a four unit any longer.
- Okay.
- There are remnants of four kitchens in that building. I've toured that building and there are good points, beautiful architectural points and staircases in that building. And then are in this remnants of four kitchens as well. So again, the design and the amount of work that would have to go into that house and and redoing it is substantial. It really is substantial. And the outside is literally crumbling. I mean, it's falling apart.
- Looks like it in pictures.
- I guess, I have a question, that was condemned at one point, correct?

- Yes.
- Yeah.
- Has the building changed hands since that point?
- Yes.
- And somebody has bought the property with the intent of doing something with it?
- Yes. To make a single family home.
- Okay. But the application as presented really doesn't provide sufficient information for us, as a Landmarks Commission to substantiate that it will be done in a manner consistent with the historic preservation guidelines that we have in front of us.
- Yes.
- We need more detail.
- Right from the roof shingles. We think we have that information, they have a leaking problem, we can approve that at a staff level. So that would be fine.
- Yep. I think we need to cut to the chase here. My recommendation is one to close the floor and then two to deny the application.
- Motion to close the floor. Do we have a second for that?
- Second.
- Second.
- Okay. All in favor? Any opposed? Okay. The floor is now closed.
- I would like the motion to begin.
- Ian, if I just might make a suggestion, rather than denying the application can, I mean, maybe refer it back to staff to create a more complete application.
- I hear you Brian. My concern is that some of the very generic materials called out in that proposal and where they're being placed and what is being done is just simply not clear enough in my mind to... I'm not sure if staff is comfortable, but that's my presumption. I guess, I'm more than open to hearing from Jason and Stephanie if they feel that that would be within the-
- The difference between a denial and a hold is really the same for us. We're still going to have to do the outreach to them. It's still bringing it back to you all. So, holding versus denial doesn't really have much of a ramification here.

- But I think Brian suggested that we turn it back to you for approval once you have a completed application. If I'm not incorrect, Brian.
- No. I meant to hold it to allow the applicant to provide the additional information that we need.
- Yep. Okay. I'm sorry-
- Because at this point. It's a non-factor for her. But my preference is generally not to deny something if what we really want is more information.
- Yep. I hear you. I'm sorry, I thought you were sending it back for staff approval.
- Oh God. Don't give Jason that much power. He'll take it.
- Well that's what I was fearful of .
- I'd like to see that.
- So then Ian would you like to rephrase your motion?
- I'd like to make a motion to place this application on hall pending more information and we'll pick it up at the next commission meeting if that information is submitted appropriately for that next meeting.
- Okay.
- I'll second that.
- Okay. All in favor? Aye
- Aye.
- Aye.
- Anyone opposed? Anyone opposed? Nope. Okay, the ayes take it. Next item up on the on the floor is item number E three, certificate of appropriateness 22-47, consideration with possible action on a design review for door replacements at 837 South Jackson.
- Here you see on the map where is 837 South Jackson. It's there two photographs that I took. One in 2019 and the lower one in 2015. We go to the next page. The house sold recently, so the realtor took some much prettier pictures than I did. Here you see them. I just want to point out that we're talking about a bulk Victorian style house. We know it was there prior to 1907, somebody knew well enough to put 1895 on a plaque, but I don't know how they knew that. Call it Circa 1900, maybe 1895. Very pretty house. The CLA application calls for the removal and replacement of the front doors and the back doors. So, the front doors as they currently appear, there's a storm door and a wooden panel door with a glass window of some sort. The proposed replacements are, as you see here, a new metal frame storm door, mostly glass or whatever is glass nowadays. And then a

craftsman style front door as you see on the right, jumping ahead at the back of the house. Similar situation, you see an existing storm door on the left and an existing old four panel door that gives you access to the house proper on the rights. The proposed replacements are here. A new metal storm door and a new metal personal door, not a storm door, door, door, I don't know, the door. These are the doors. So again, as the messenger I have to point out that the Secretary of Interior standards would say you should keep the historic doors. I don't know if these are original, but they're certainly appropriate to be curated. If you don't keep the original ones, then you should probably get a new one that looks a lot like the old ones. The proposed replacements here don't look a lot like the old ones, but I have to circle back and say that the integrity of this particular house is largely compromised by the vinyl siding that's already been added. I don't know that to most observers replacing an old door with a new door at this point is going to make any difference. Again, as the messenger, I just have to point out that for a fault Victorian house from Circa 1900, putting a craftsman style door on the front from Circa 1910 through 1930 is a peculiar choice. I'm not going to say it's bad choice or a good choice, but it's an odd choice. So, I leave that to you sort of, fully expecting you to approve replacement doors. I don't know if you want to talk about the style or not, but that's what I have. Thank you.

- Looks like there's probably some folks here that want to speak to this unless they just really love hanging out at Landmarks Commission meetings . So, I would make a motion to open the floor to hear from interested parties.

- Second

- All in favor? Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Anyone opposed to opening the floor? Okay, the floor is open.

- Alex is the applicant. It looks like he's on.

- Yep. I apologize for jumping on late, but I appreciate the chance to be able to speak. I just want to make sure audio's coming through clear.

- Loud and clear.

- Yep.

- Perfect. So the doors themselves, so my wife and I purchased the home October, 2020, similar to what I've been mentioned earlier. A lot of the changes that already been made, the doors for both the front and back were original to when we moved in. We were fine with it except for the fact that they kept letting in more and more cold air, kept dealing with it, replaced the windows appropriately, to keep everything nice and warm and toasty. This most recent windstorm, however, went through and ripped the front storm door or screen door open, shattered the glass panes and damaged the door itself. So, at the moment, I just have some screen on there to prevent any critters from getting inside. And then it's a wooden door. So, it is obviously with the cold temperatures getting

exceptionally cold, wanting to go through and replace the doors with something that is going to be at least somewhat similar, though not exact to the time period because our home, we've heard that it's from 1895. We've heard it's from 1910. We tried to go with something that at least, had some character and charm of the time period but wanted something obviously that was going to be both secure, which is the reason why we wanted to go with either a metal or fiberglass style door composite as well as, screen door to let in as much light as possible. Similar with the back door. At the moment, the door itself doesn't actually have a peephole at the back door, so we wanted to make sure we had something to be able to see out the back as well. So not looking to do anything crazy, obviously, we want it to be somewhat appropriate, but we want to make sure that the home is both safe, secure, warm, and we're able to see both in the front and back.

- Thank you Alex.

- Yep, that's it. I appreciate the time.

- Anyone else?

- Motion to close the floor?

- Second that.

- All in favor? Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Anyone opposed? The floor is now closed. Do we have any motions?

- Yeah, look, I don't have a problem with what he is selected here and maybe just recognizing what Jason had said, that a big chunk of the property's already been compromised. I don't want to jump to the motion in case anybody else wants something with comments, but I would just off up that I don't have a big problem with it, but just maybe relay that additional insight to Alex that was shared by Jason, that if it were to perhaps influence his decision if it's even possible to find something more historically appropriate, if that makes sense. But I don't see the need to direct him to change it.

- Well said. So are you making a motion?

- Yeah, like I said, I didn't want to jump to a motion in case someone had a differing opinion.

- Okay. Anyone have a differing opinion?

- If not, I would make that motion that we approve as presented by staff.

- Second that.

- All in favor? Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Are there any nays? Okay, the motion carries unanimously.

- I'm more hawkish at the council meeting Ron, when I want to push something through .

- All right, next item on the agenda. Item F public meeting for phases five, six and a portion of seven for the update to the intensive survey.

- Thanks. We've got Rowan and Jason here. You guys have seen them a few times before. This is our kickoff to the next phases for our intensive survey. So we are completing phases five and six and I think about half of phase seven, a little bit of phase seven. Jason's making motions at me, so both Rowan and Jason are here to just give some general information about that. I'm sure you guys have heard it before, but we do have some members of the public here so, it's good for a refresher.

- Okay.

- first?

- Sure.

- Go ahead, Jason.

- Why don't I go first Rowan because I'll be really quick. Because you all have largely heard this before. You've embarked on a multi-phase survey of the entire city of Green Bay. So this is nothing new, but for anyone who is new who is not familiar with this process, this process is funded by my office, the State Historic Preservation office because Green Bay is a certified local government and formalized partner with our office and the National Park Service. The methodology is pretty simple. Maybe I'll skip that and let Rowan talk about that. But basically in the survey area, Rowan and his colleagues, they will look at every property in the survey area and set it based on the criteria of eligibility for the national register historic places. They'll make recommendations in a final report. That report will include recommendations of properties that are likely eligible to be listed in the national register of historical places. I'll let Rowan talk a little bit more about that. But I want to emphasize one thing, and that is that I recommend that once you get this report and also the past reports from previous phases, I encourage you to use these reports not as just catalogs of nice historic places in your city, although that's what they are, but also, as a tool for economic development and community development. And by that I mean all of the places that this report recommends that are eligible for the national register can be then designated and listed on the national register using CLG funding. The same funding that's funding this program, this survey. The city can grant funding to then nominate and designate those properties and make those owners eligible for historic tax credits. The state and federal tax credit programs are significant financing tools for owners of historic properties. And I encourage you to take advantage of those and encourage property owners to take advantage of those. But that there's some follow through with these surveys and these are follow through on the recommendations, get those properties designated and get them eligible for tax credits. Okay. Rowan, go ahead.

- Thank you, Jason. Stephanie, is it possible to share my screen?

- You should be able to, are you not able to?

- I may be able to. Let's find out. Okay. Can everyone see that right?

- Yes.

- Mm-hmm.

- As Jason already alluded to, the main purpose of these intensive survey reports is to identify properties for potential listing in the National Register of Historic Places. We've already done two series of these surveys work in the last two years, and this is really just a continuation of the same process. The survey report will look very similar and language used will also be very similar. The most recent one completed just this last year was phases two, three, and four, which included much of the core of the city. Especially, on the west side of the far west side and the east side of the river. It was quite large and encompassed almost 2000 properties that were discussed in the document and identified 19 individual eligible buildings, all of them. And a couple of large districts and some smaller church complexes as well. We've actually already gotten a start on the next phases, phases six, five and seven. As you see, seven is actually just a little bit of a sliver of part of a larger area. And the flavor of these areas is distinctly different from the core of the city. We're moving out of 19th and early 20th century buildings and into mid 20th century and suburban growth along University Avenue, near Lambo Field and areas close by. And that's it. Essentially, that's what we're going to continue to do. If there are any questions for either Jason and I, we'd be happy to answer them.

- Anyone, any questions? Okay, well thank you. Gentlemen.

- Okay, thank you.

- Thank you.

- Steph .

- We had a couple of COAs at the staff level. This house should look familiar. They have a fence going in. Here's the fence. It's a 15 foot long section between the back of the house and the garage and a 30 foot section between the house and the neighboring property line where an existing fence is at. So there's a picture of the fence. Good stuff. Don't have much more to say about that. Other one, the Bellon Building is getting a new roof. It should look a lot like the current roof. It'll be a membrane roof. This was conditionally approved on the condition that the new roofing membrane doesn't ramp around the top of the parapet walls and become visible from around the building. And I left it ambiguous anywhere around the building. So finally, Stephanie, I got this one done too.

- Okay.

- A new shed. Not terribly fancy shed at the back corner of 123 North Oakland. Largely hidden from view, but I wouldn't expect the shed to last 50 years. So, these little accessory structures come and go. We approved that. I think that was it for staff level COAs.

- Yep.

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

- Just one this month, 1121 South Broadway. It's got a lot of deterioration and damage. If you read the raise repair report architecturally, there's nothing particularly significant about this. I did a brief search through newspaper.com records to see if star quarterback was born here or anything. No, individuals of significance, no business of particular significance. It was primarily a business for many years, but nothing jumped out at me as being remarkable about this property, so.

- Okay. Thank you. Jason. Item number four, staff update.

- I think the only update we have is that I have been discussing with our inspection department and our legal team the raise order that was on belt that we discussed last month. So, our legal team is currently reviewing if we are able to make any adjustments to that to make it a raised repair order so that way, if anyone are interested in the property, they would be able to repair it. There are some legal issues that don't involve the city that are at play here, so they're just trying to make sure that we don't throw a wrench into that by reissuing this order. But I met with them on Monday and I have not gotten an update yet. So as that progresses, I will let you know.

- Thank you for that. And date of our next meeting will be Wednesday, December 21st. Does anyone have anything else I'd like to add before we cut out? All right, everyone have a good evening.

- Adjourn.

- Permission to adjourn.

- Second.

- Yeah, all in favor?

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Any nays? Anybody want to stay? Okay, thank you.

- Thank you.

- Thanks.