



MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 21, 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: David Siegel, Ron Dehn, Paul Martzke, Susan Ley, Ian Griffiths, Rebecca Derenne

Absent: Alder Brian Johnson

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the December 21, 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, Susan Ley, Rebecca Derenne, No- None, Abstain- None.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the November 16, 2022, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Rebecca Derenne 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 22-50) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a new cement staircase located at 736 S. Madison Street.

Moved by Ian Griffiths, seconded by Susan Ley to approve as requested. Motion Passed.

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

2. (COA 22-51) Consideration with possible action on a design review for rear porch and door removal, and partial window replacement located at 625 S. Quincy Street.

Moved by Paul Martzke, seconded by Ian Griffiths to approve as requested. Motion Passed.

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

F. INFORMATIONAL.

1. Staff-Level COA Applications.

2. Review City Raze/Repair Orders and Demolitions.

3. Staff Update.

4. Date of next meeting: Wednesday, January 18, 2023.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

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

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

VERBATIM MINUTES

- Oh, okay. Recording in progress it says. Let's call this meeting of Wednesday, December 21st order. Item A on our agenda is the Zoom meeting information, this item contains Zoom information, which I am using, by the way. And instructions and a link to the virtual comment forum. So there we go. Roll call. Everyone is present it looks like, except for Alder Johnson at the moment. Whether or not he joins, we'll find out. Item C. Approval of tonight's agenda. Has everybody taken a look? And do we have, oh by the way, I'm sorry. Do we need to have a motion, Stephanie, for you to discuss to put it on the agenda last night's event?

- No, we'll do that under the staff update.

- Oh, okay, sounds good. Okay, so then item C is approval of tonight's agenda.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Okay. All in favor, aye.

- Aye.

- Are there any nays? Are there any nays? Are there any nos? Okay, the ayes have it. The agenda is approved. Approval of the minutes from the November 16th meeting.

- Motion to approve.

- Second.

- Okay, all in favor, aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Are there any nays? Once again, are there any nays? Does anyone say no? Okay, the ayes have it unanimously. Item E, regular business. Number one, certificate of appropriateness 22-50 consideration with possible action on a design review for a new cement staircase. Located at 736 South Madison Street. Jason.

- So the house in question is the really big Queen Anne next to the church facing St. James Park completed right around January 1st, 1900, give or take. And here you see a picture of the front facade that's facing the southeast, but the staircase in question is near the west corner of the southwest facade. In the picture at the top there, it's hidden by the shrubs. You see the telltale sidewalk and path leading to where it is. Currently, there is some wooden stairs there. I don't know if they're old or not. I mean, they're clearly old enough to need replacement. But beyond that, I don't know much about them. The COA application calls for replacing the wooden steps with a precast concrete set of steps. And to cut to the end of the story, the staff recommendation is for approval. Recognizing that it's largely hidden from view and perhaps not entirely inappropriate. Also A, just for what it's worth, the primary facade at the southeast, the steps leading to the main front porch are concrete already. So this is in keeping with everything about the house. Thank you.

- Anybody have anything to add to that or like to comment?

- One of the compelling points that Jason made is that this is on a view. That we always talk about the sidewalk test. And as he pointed out with his picture, it is obscured by the shrubs.

- Right. So do we have a motion to approve or?

- Motion to approve.

- I second.

- Okay. All those in favor, aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Are there any nays?

- Aye.

- I big your pardon?

- Oh, nothing.

- Okay, are there any nays? Are there any nays? The ayes take it unanimously. I've been on that porch many time, and he also posted our Astor Neighborhood Wine Association, wine tasting, just for a little side comment there.

- Well, I didn't get invited to that, so I don't know.

- Hey, I will send you an invite for this year's. I do believe it's January 27th or 17th, so. It's gonna be held in a beautiful, beautiful, beautiful home this year. Huge. Item number E2, regular business certificate of appropriateness 22-51. Consideration with possible action on a design review for a rear porch and door removal, and a partial window replacement located at 625 South Quincy.

- So 625 South Quincy is in the center of the oval here. And for anyone who knows Cheryl Rainier Wig at city hall, it's her back door neighbor. There you go. Picture of the house. You see it is a contributing property, but the integrity of design, integrity of materials, these have all been altered quite a bit with the alteration of the second story porch. The addition of the vinyl siding. The replacement of windows. So it's there, it's contributing, but low-ish integrity. The COA application calls for replacing the vinyl siding with new vinyl siding. The COA application calls for replacing a kitchen window with a life size, like same size kitchen window. So that's a vinyl window, I believe, to be replaced with a new vinyl window. Bottom right, you see on the back of the house, there's a door, and I guess we call them jump porches here.

- Jump porch.

- Jump porch. The COA calls for removal of the jump porch and sealing up the door with a window. Now here, it's getting a little speculative and hypothetical. The COA application is requesting some sort of artistic sort of window, like a diamond shape one. The photo on the bottom left here is just for illustration purposes and not necessarily what'll be there, but replace the door since it would be a door to your death on the back without the porch. Replace that with a window. And maybe make it kind of a fancier window. So staff recommendation is to approve the COA. None of the proposed work has a significant impact on the historic integrity of the house. And the one speculative thing is verbally on the back where only Cheryl and the homeowner can really enjoy it. So nobody will know it's there. Thank you. Jason, I would like to add they're also called a shaker porch.

- Are they?

- And a broom porch.

- Yeah. Shake out your broom.

- Well, does anyone wanna open this up for discussion or do we have a motion or?

- I'll make a motion to approve.

- Second.

- Okay, all those in favor repeat the saying aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Are there any nays? Are there any nays? Are there any nays? Well, then the ayes take it unanimously. Okay. Item F, informational staff level COAs.

- We have received none since our last meeting.

- Okay. Item number two, review the city raise and report repair orders and demolitions.

- I did note this in the report on the raise repairs, but going forward in the new year, we will only be bringing forward raise repairs that need some sort of action from the commission or any sort of advisement that staff may need. We're switching the process here at City Hall so that way they are reviewed by Jason and myself prior to them even getting issued. So that way we can head off any historic issues that may come about instead of waiting till after they're already issued. So the process is gonna change a little bit at City Hall. So we won't be reviewing all of them like we're used to doing. You'll only be reviewing any that may need some consideration or action.

- Okay.

- And with that in mind, this first one here, it's a raise repair order. This actually I held up for a month or so because we were doing the intensive level survey for this portion of the city, and I had it in my head that these post-war, you know, modest houses might potentially form a district. So our inspections department was kind enough to delay the raise repair order until we had actually surveyed this area and like correctly come to the conclusion that this particular house would lie outside of the potential district that we had identified. But we took a hard look at this one, so.

- Good.

- 712 South Ashland. It is a nice old Dutch colonial revival in a nice old part of the city, but individually and within the neighborhood, none of this really rises to the level of national register significance. So, you know, I'm sad about it. It would be a loss if it is raised, but it's not designated historic and it's really never going to be designated historic, so. 515 South Roosevelt. You know, it's a cute house, but it's a cute house that you can see in most neighborhoods in Green Bay. So I don't remember what's wrong with it except that something's wrong with it. 1137 South Maple, again, modest home. Vinyl siding. Nothing remarkable, historically speaking, about the neighborhood. So I have no objections to raise repair orders on something like this. Here is 1875 Farland. The raise repair order is against the garage specifically. Can't tell much about the garage from the outside except that the door isn't gonna go up or down. So it's in the middle. And I think that was the extent of all the raise repair orders this month.

- Yes.

- Okay. Thank you for that, Jason And Stephanie. Item number three, staff update.

- So regarding last night's city council meeting, we had the appeal for COA 22-41, which is for Bangkok Garden. We gave testimony and answered questions for about an hour or so, and then they wanted to close sessions to deliberate for an additional hour. From that, they decided to hold the item to get written statements from both parties, in particular, to why, well, one section of our code, which is what we use to establish if a COA should be issued. So the written statements are supposed to detail the project against that section of code, which is basically what you all did the first time through. It's what our staff report did, and it's what our updates to the city council did. So you know, it's good news 'cause it didn't get overturned, but it's an additional meeting. It's gonna be held on January 17th for that. So Jason's gonna be working on our written brief to supply to city council for that. If you would like, I can send you the details that we received from the legal team on what that brief should include if you feel like you want to add anything. It can be definitely collaborative effort on our end, and then we'll get it to the legal team, our legal team, the Landmark's legal

team, to review prior to that meeting as well. So I think that it's a good indication that they're asking for more details on the code specifically 'cause that's kind of our bread and butter. So if anyone wanted to add any details about that section of code, I'd be happy to share that email with everyone.

- Thank you, Stephanie. Stephanie, was there anything in open session that was revealing during the course of the proceedings? Like was there, I wasn't there. I was a part of it, but I'm just curious if there was anything that came out of that review, the formal review process that we need to take consideration of? In general.

- I don't think so. I mean, we didn't hear anything new from the applicant. I feel like it was the same conversation and information that was shared here. I was trying to get a feel for some of the different council opinion, and I think a lot of it was leaning towards the, you know, buildings gotta move with the times. They gotta adjust as they need to. To which we responded, we did approve the other items. The building's not in danger of collapsing by any means. It's not even a danger of not being redeveloped. So there wasn't anything really new to add. We didn't really add anything new either.

- No, it was clear in open session the city's attorney requested that each elder person state if they'd had contact with the applicants and with city staff specifically about this issue. And if I recall correctly, every elder person had been approached individually by the applicants to discuss this, and some of them did or didn't have opportunity to discuss it, but they'd all had contact with the applicant about it.

- Yes.

- My personal opinion is that our verbal testimony last night was heard and had an impact on the decision making process. So-

- I agree.

- I think we may have changed some minds as we spoke.

- Well, I think it is a reflection of the depth that you went into in the preparation for the first meeting that your recommendations that were made and what this commission followed were well recent and complete.

- You know, COA stands for cover our something.

- Yeah, so I think that it will go okay. But it definitely if anyone has any additional comments or suggestions on things that we should be adding to this brief, it does need to be specific to that certain section of code, so I can send that along, but we would be happy to get another person's reflection or opinion of that as well.

- Okay.

- I did get a chance to listen in on that in between interruptions. And I just want to take a moment and really commend Jason and Stephanie for an outstanding job. They did a very good job of representing this commission, our positions, our thoughts, and I just want to take a moment and commend them for a very comprehensive, well put together, articulated presentation. And I just wanna commend them. I'm very pleased and very proud of them.

- Thank you.

- Good job.

- Jason just sent you a kiss. I don't know if you could see that that far away.

- I would like to retract.

- So I'd like to just take a minute to offer up an explanation on something. And if you remember last month, the vote that we had on this, I voted against the rest of this commission. And I wanted to explain that vote, that I am essentially in agreement with the way the commission voted on this issue. I voted no because I didn't like the way the motion was written and probably should've pushed harder to rewrite it. So it was a procedural issue that I took with it. But at the end of the day, I guess I wanted everybody else to know that I do feel the same way. I think that the bulk of the commission does the bulk of project. So for better worse, I think we were unanimously in the same feeling on this project.

- Well, thank you for that, Paul.

- Actually as a side, well, related issue to this, my question to this commission is, did anybody else get a phone call from the media? Because yesterday afternoon about two hours before the Common Council, I did get a phone call from NBC 26 on my personal cell. I'm okay with that, but I was taken by surprise. Never encountered this before. So I just said I'm not gonna comment because I don't know the appropriateness or permissibility. I did talk to Stephanie about it, and I asked her if she could at some point see about that position in terms of us as commissioners. So my first question is, did anybody else get a phone call from the medium?

- No.

- No. Yeah, they initially contacted Jason at first, and Jason was advised by our legal team not to comment because we are technically in a quasi-judicial process. So they didn't want us commenting on it. And we don't give out your contact information. So if they have it, they found it themselves 'cause we don't supply that to the media. We don't encourage the media to contact our commissioners. That doesn't mean you can't comment, you're still members of the public, but it's completely at your discretion. I don't know when there's an appeal process necessarily if there are different rules involved 'cause there are for staff. But generally speaking, we don't give out your contact information. You should never feel like you need to give a statement.

- I never suspected that came from you. That information is pretty public, and I'm okay with that. The reporter was very courteous in understanding. But I guess it would be a good idea for us to firm up the position about what commission members can and can't do when contacted by the media. Certainly that is not a rush topic. So that's just a request to staff to see about addressing.

- Will do.

- Yeah. Thank you, David. Well put.

- Yep.

- Anything else under the staff update?

- I will be out for the majority of January. So if anything comes up, please email both Jason and Pam. Pam is sitting next to me, she's our secretarial staff. She does all of our minutes and lovely things. So they will be putting together your January packet. So if you can't attend or have any questions, please contact both of them.

- Okay, thank you. The date of our next meeting will be Wednesday, January 18th. I would personally like to wish you all a Merry Christmas and Happy Holidays. And that can be on the record as well, so. And then without further ado, we have a motion to adjourn.

- Motion.

- The second.

- Okay, all in favor of adjourn?
- Aye.
- Merry Christmas.
- Merry Christmas, everybody.