



MINUTES OF THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2023, 4:30 PM
In person at City Hall, Room 604 - The Harry Maier Room.
Virtual attendance is 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: Brian Johnson, David Siegel, Ian Griffiths, Paul Martzke, Ron Dehn, Susan Ley, Rebecca Derenne
Excused: None

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda for the February 15, 2023, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

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

Yes- 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 December 21, 2022, meeting of the Landmarks Commission.

Moved by Susan Ley, seconded by Paul Martzke to approve the minutes. Motion Passed.

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

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

1. (COA 22-45) Consideration with possible action on a design review for a major exterior remodel at 711 Eliza Street- Held from November 16, 2022, meeting.

Speakers:

Jason Flatt

Stephanie Hummel

Helen Kotke

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Susan Ley to approve COA 22-45 as recommended by staff. Motion Passed.

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

2. (COA 23-02) Consideration with possible action on a design review for new porch step railings located at 809 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.

Speakers:

Jason Flatt

Stephanie Hummel

Randy Kubichek

Moved by Ald. Brian Johnson, seconded by Susan Ley 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 Paul Martzke to deny COA 23-02. 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.

Jason Flatt presented the Staff-Level COA Applications.

2. Staff Update.

Jason Flatt and Stephanie Hummel presented the Staff Update.

3. Date of next meeting: Wednesday, March 15, 2023.

Paul Martzke and Susan Ley will not be able to attend the next scheduled meeting.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Susan Ley, seconded by Rebecca Derenne 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

- Okay. Who just walked into the room?
- Alder Johnson.
- Oh, okay. Again, you're very small on my screen, so I couldn't tell. Got it, here.
- It's our way of being incognito. We're just hiding from you.
- Okay well, shall we begin the meeting?
- Yes.
- Okay Item A, this item contains zoom information, which apparently everybody understands, because we're all using it right now. Item B, the roll call. It appears everyone's present except for, who'd I say, David? And he will--
- And Ian.
- Most likely be jumping in, I would guess.
- And Ian?
- Ian's here.
- Yeah, he's here.
- Oh, okay.
- I'm here.
- Yeah, everyone's good. Except for our, just missing David. So, item number C, approval of the agenda for tonight. Everybody take a look at it and okay with it? Do we have a motion to approve?
- Motion to approve.
- I have a motion to approve.
- Okay, do we have a second?
- Second.
- Okay, all those in favor, aye?
- [Group] Aye.
- Aye, anyone disapprove? Okay, motion carries. Agenda is approved for tonight. Approval of the minutes from the December 21st meeting, I looked at them, they looked good to me. Do we, anybody else or any questions or anything to add? No, do we have a motion to approve those?

- So moved.

- Second.

- Okay, we have a motion and a second. All those in favor say, aye.

- [Group] Aye.

- Anyone opposed? Okay, once again the motion carries. Item number E, two items on there tonight. Certificate of appropriateness number 22 dash 45. Consideration with possible action on a design review for major exterior remodel at 711 Eliza Street, held from the November 16th, 2022 meeting. Jason?

- Yes, so you may recall in November 2022, we discussed and approved the roofing replacement here, and we asked for some additional information about windows, doors, and the front porch rehabilitation. So, moving forward a slide, here you see a picture of the house from a few years ago, and like I said, we're discussing windows, doors, and front porches. So next slide on the windows. I think I've matched up the pictures of the existing windows to the locations on the exterior, but, I was a little confused. The cardinal directions weren't right and the like but, regardless here you see three windows, a ribbon of three windows on the rear of the house, proposed to be replaced with these one over one new windows, and then a couple of windows. Let's see here, there's a window on the front, and then I think there are two windows on the side to the east, Southeast facing the neighbor's house. I think that's the way it came out. Anyway, here in this slide you see the cut sheet if you will, of the Jeld Wen replacement window. It's one over one vinyl. If we could go back a slide on the front of the house, I'm presuming it's one of the three windows on the front of the house here, near the corner. Not all three of the three, but you know again, we have the property owner here to discuss that.

- Yes.

- That's what I've got on windows anyway.

- Just that, I think that it's, for, yes, yes, you're correct sorry. Yes.

- Okay--

- But uh, if it helps, the reason that, the one was meant to be of the upstairs, the one that is slashed out, one of the upstairs windows, is damaged. And so, the idea is that there are two downstairs and then the one upstairs, and then the three, the set of three is what we'd be replacing. And then, we are going to be trying where possible to just replace the glass on some of the windows where the window has been broken, but the window itself still works. So we're trying to just replace the glass on some of those. So not all of them are meant to be full replacement windows, unless that is what, what is required. And then we will do that. But, where possible we're trying to retain the original windows.

- Awesome, thank you. Replacement doors on the sides of the house, one to the east, one to the west, the doors will be steel. One of them has a window in it. It's replacing the doors shown here, not on the front of the house, want to emphasize that. Then moving on to the porch, we received some additional details within the last day or two. Important stuff to note here is that the existing columns would be reused, the existing balusters would be reused. The rail height would remain the same. And we have a little additional information on porch skirt material, some vertical slats that look really nice. You know at this point I don't really have any concerns on the porch. Should point out too that instead of the, is it one by six or? Yeah instead of the one by six decking, it's moving to the one by four tongue and groove. So that's nice. So at the end of my assessment for this, all I can tell you is I recommend approval of the proposed changes. Everything appears to satisfy the Secretary of the interior standards. And so far as I can tell you, and based on our previous examples of replacing windows. So, thank you.

- Well, I would like to add that, you know, I can see this property from my backyard and it, this is, as we all know, this is one that was, what was it? What am I determined? It was repair, raise and repair. And, and like I saying earlier at the beginning of the meeting before we started the interior of this house, if none of, if any of you walked through it when they had the open house, the woodwork is just absolutely beautiful. Turn of the century woodwork inside that place. And, it's definitely a house that's worth saving in my opinion. And it looks to me, I mean I looked at these diagrams really, really closely and it, like Jason just said, it sure seems like everything's leaning in the right direction. So that, I'd like to throw that in there just for everybody.

- Thank you.

- Would anybody like to add anything or does anybody have any motions or?

- Jason just to clarify here, when I look at the staff recommendation on this, you mentioned that you recommended the denial of the porch deck material. Have they since shifted to, to what the recommendation is?

- They have.

- Okay, so there's no no issues there at all?

- No issues.

- All right. I make a motion to approve.

- I'll second.

- And Susan is the second. Any other discussion, any anybody want add anything?

- If I could add briefly in the revised information that we received. I think there was mention of tongue and groove on the steps? If it makes your life any easier, that's certainly not necessary. You can go with the one by six stairs.

- Oh nice. Thank you.

- One by four and groove is primarily for the decking.

- Okay, perfect. Thank you very much, I really appreciate that.

- Or if you could find a one by 10 for the steps or something.

- Okay, thank you.

- The only question I had was, I guess that that'll get painted to match--

- Yes.

- The house once it gets painted?

- Right. And what we really wanna do is, I noticed on the Landmark Commission's website there was an original photo of the house that is gorgeous. And so our goal is to kind of return it to what it looked like then with like the red roof, the white trim, the white pillars, and then more of like a brownish color. And so yes, everything will be painted to try to mimic that. And so there won't be any unpainted around finished wood.

- Okay, thank you.
- Beautiful.
- I'm excited about it.
- Oh, okay. So then once again, Alder, so then your motion would be to approve or go ahead, make your recommendation again based on the changes that were made to satisfy Jason, and the Landmarks commission?
- Yeah, I mean I think the motion is really just to approve as recommended by staff. And that captures the essence of everything we've talked about.
- Okay. And then who's the second?
- Susan. I second.
- All those in favor say aye.
- [Group] Aye.
- Anyone opposed, any nos? Is anyone opposed? I'll ask one more time is anyone opposed? With no opposition to this project the motion carries as stated. As put forward so, thank you.
- Thank you very much.
- The ayes have it.
- Thank you.
- Is it okay if I drop from the call at this point or would it'd be better if I stay on?
- You may leave.
- All right, thank you. No, thank you so much I really appreciate you all. Have a wonderful time. Take care.
- Thank you.
- Okay. Great.
- Thanks.
- Item number two under regular business, certificate of appropriateness number 23 dash 02. Consideration with possible action on a design review for a new porch step railings located at 809 South Jackson Street. Jason?
- Stephanie you don't remember how we found out about this?
- Inspection.
- Inspection pointed out that work had been done.
- Yes.

- So here we have a house on Jackson, South Jackson. I have a nice 2019 photo on the left. If you can zoom in with your eyes only on the porch step railing, please note the railing there. And then a much more recent photograph on the right of the newly installed stair railing. I guess we can cut straight to the recommendation slide right? So, this isn't a recommendation, this is an observation. We typically require that all wood exterior material be painted. And I note that this work that was done without a COA, the balusters should not have been face mounted to the upper and lower rails, but should be attached at the ends to the top and bottom rail. So my observation is that the completed work appears to be incompatible with our prior direction to other property owners. I got the slide just to, just to reflect on that. So, so we have work done without a COA and here it is, we either need to issue a COA or provide direction, I suppose. Thank you.

- Well I have noticed as I went by the property too that it, it's up for rent right now. Did you say, you say that the, the recommendation was made to the prior owners? Was the place sold and now somebody else's renting it out or? what did you mean by that Jason? I didn't quite catch that last sentence of yours.

- So in other COAs having nothing to do with this one, we typically require that the balusters be end nailed or screwed into the ends of the balusters at the top and bottom rail instead of through the face mount into the rails. And we typically require that all that sort of railing be painted. Here neither of those two have happened. And, I don't know that there's been a change in ownership since 2020, but, my understanding is the current owner has done this work.

- Got a question for staff. Did you reach out to the owner? And if so, have you heard back?

- Somebody submitted a COA application. I think it was the owner.

- Mhm. That's right.

- And then that's, they claimed that there had been no railing which was false. And that this matched whatever would've been there, which is also false. So.

- So the COA you received was after they were put on notice, or did they do that on their own initiative?

- That I'm not sure. I know we sent a letter, but they could have submitted the application prior to that. It was submitted while I was out on medical leave. So I'm not sure of the timeline.

- When was this property purchased?

- It was on realtor.com, I think it was 2020.

- Out of curiosity, and I think for the benefit of everyone here, when somebody buys one of these properties, like is part of that, you know title search? I mean is there, is there anything, any kind of legal notification that's given to them to say hey, if you're gonna do any work on this, you're an historic district, you have to do something.

- Unfortunately not, we can't do any titles.

- No. But, when somebody does list a property, let's say it's not a for sale by owner and they list it with a company per Wisconsin state law they have to fill out a real estate condition report. And one of the, and that goes through different things, house like problems with the roof, plumbing, electrical. And one of the items on there is they ask if this is in a historic district and the seller would have to check off to the best of their knowledge, yes or no. If you check off yes or anything, then you have to give an explanation. But if this was a for sale by owner and there wasn't an agent involved on the selling or listing side, then the seller doesn't have to fill out a condition report.

- We do send out annual letters to all historic property owners every April-ish, March maybe. Just like a hey, here's a reminder here, are your funding resources available? Here's the COA application. So every year they get a letter reminding them of it though. So if it was purchased in 2020, in theory they've received at least two of them.

- That's interesting.

- I mean, I think it would be the building purchasers responsibility. The building owner.

- Yeah.

- The building purchaser responsibility to understand what it is they're purchasing.

- But, but we don't know that this was sold. What, do we?

- Right.

- No, that was in response to Brian's question. I'll just--

- Okay. Yeah okay.

- Yeah.

- I can check and see if there's anything in Paragon MLS for that.

- Yeah, that might really not be, you know, Jermaine to the discussion topic so much as, as for me to understand how these things slip through the cracks. Because I recall, you know, more recently, one that was on Oakland Avenue where they replaced the second story deck. You know, didn't get the COA and quite frankly his body, and then ultimately counsel ordered them to remove it. So, you know, those are obviously, that can be an expensive burden on a property owner and, for me it's just trying to understand you know, how those things happen so that we can prevent them from happening and then everybody's happier. This one I think is a little bit less costly than that particular example, you know, but if this, if this commission were to look at things consistently, you know, I would think that that would be the direction to go. Now unless staff was saying hey, if at least you painted it. Still not ideal, but still satisfactory. I don't, I guess maybe I'm just struggling a little bit to understand is that a direction that staff would recommend or would staff say, hey for this to be in compliance, we've gotta remove it and redo it?

- Well to answer that, what we currently see is not compliance. I don't know if the faces could be hidden by another rail. I don't understand why the balusters extend beyond the bottom rail to the steps. Perhaps this could be reworked with existing material but, I'm not really in the--

- Could you show the picture again please?

- Yeah. Could you, if we could see the picture, and Jason if you could highlight what you just described verbally.

- What's the property address again?

- 809 South Jackson.

- Thank you.

- So typically these vertical balusters or spindles should attach at the top and bottom ends to the railing, which is what we had here. Now in the later 20th century, what became common was you would install the rails top and bottom and then attach those balusters through the face of the material into the rail. So this is what would be appropriate for say, a back deck in a 20th century suburban neighborhood. So again, ideally these balusters should attach to the bottom side of the top rail and to the top side of the bottom rail. Here they attach to the outside of the top rail, the outside of the bottom rail, and in an odd choice extend beyond the bottom rail all the way down to the stair tread. And then we really haven't said anything about the Newell posts at the bottom.

- Right.

- We can take in what's here.

- Jason, is it fair enough to say that the image on the left from 2019, it's historically accurate in its construction, but the materials are not historic? Would that be accurate?

- So I have to start out by saying this is largely speculative on my part, but I will say that these rails on the stairs are a good match for the rails on the porch. Rails on the porch are historically appropriate. You see the rail height is the same as the bottom sill height of the windows. Very nice. What strikes me here is that perhaps the handrail height in 2019 maybe wasn't tall enough to be up to code. So if you look where the rail meets the upper new post, it's down here below the rail of porch railing, and now of course it's much higher. I don't take issue with that. When I look at these bottom newel posts, I don't know if these are day zero, day one, historically correct or not, they look like a later subjective thing to kind of match what was up here on the porch. But you know, it's keeping with the style of the house much more than a, you know, a pressure treated four by four with a cap on the top. If it even has that, maybe it doesn't, I guess these are just four by four posts with nothing on the top.

- Right.

- So, on the one hand I'm applauding raising the rail height. I think that's a safety issue. But there's been clearly a, a design choice that that is not appropriate for historic district with the face nailing of these balusters extending them below the bottom rail. And I've kind of reserved comment on the dual posts.

- That clarifies it, thank you.

- Susan did you find any info on when the house was last sold?

- No, and I looked under a single family. It's been on the market a number of times, but all the listings expired. I didn't find any sale. I know when you look at the Brown County site, you can bring up past owners, but they're not in chronological order. There aren't any dates at all. I looked under two family also, it's never been listed under two family.

- So Zillow claims it sold on October 20th of 2020.

- Zillow isn't always really reliable unless it was private party, private you know, a real estate brokerage firm wasn't involved at all then, they could possibly have that information from the Brown County records.

- Hmm. I know that when they were emptying out this house, they were putting things on the curb and people were driving by and loading up trucks with furniture, and desks, and chairs, and all kinds of stuff for a couple of months. I mean, it must have been packed full of things. I do believe those--

- Could be weren't just throwing it out that people were using that.

- And I think those original rails may have been partially broken up when they were moving things in and out as I recall. But that's got nothing to do with what we're looking at. I think, I think the question here is do we allow it to stand or do we say at least modify it like, you know, to from top to bottom like Jason said, or you know without, would you call it side facing rails? You know, to have a capped on top and capped on the bottom. I mean that's, they certainly have enough material there to do it properly. And you know, the question is, do we say that our certificate of appropriateness should say that those have to be corrected? And I think that's where we're at. Am I correct on that Jason, or?

- Yes, yes, you're correct. I have not recommended approval. But, but I--

- How can we enforce that if we say you have to correct this?

- I have to take it, take it apart and put it back.

- Yeah.

- [Ian] That's consistent with the deck railings.

- And what if they know we're not going to do it.

- What's that?

- What if, what if the property owner says no, we're not going to rebuild the railings, we're not gonna do it. Then what's--

- Then they don't get the COA. And then they can get fined, right?

- Yep.

- Okay, okay.

- I mean, in my mind it should be corrected and done accurately. I mean it's like a death by a thousand cuts.

- I agree.

- If my district did this, we wouldn't have a district.

- Exactly.

- So is that a motion, Ian?

- It wasn't a motion no, but.

- She could make it one.

- Would you like to make it a said motion?

- I guess I'm just entertaining some discussion around it.

- Yeah, no, no, no. I totally agree with you. Like, that's why I brought up the fact that there's certainly enough material there to fix it correctly because--

- Right.

- Yeah, and that's why I said to what I said because, in my opinion I think that, like you say, we wouldn't have historical district, if we just let this stuff go on all the time.
- Got a question for staff, their COA application, is it asking to allow what is there to remain?
- Yes.
- Well, I'm fully prepared to make a motion then Ron.
- Who just said that, I'm sorry?
- David.
- Oh, no, no.
- I looked at, I looked at the Zillow piece and the photograph in the Zillow from back in 2020 if that's when it was sold, has those railings just like they are today in that photograph.
- No, the Zillow shows them as the railing. Oh wait yep there it is, sorry.
- No?
- Correct.
- I got confused I thought I, well, so some of my--
- At least the photograph that they used.
- They're more recent listing photos because it's for rent. And I don't know, I don't know enough about the photos in Zillow to say when those were taken. If they were taken to list it for rent and overwrote the for sale listing. I confused myself earlier. All I know is a 2019, we weren't looking at that.
- Maybe we need to do some research and find out when this property owner purchased the property and then if we can figure out if the railings were like that at that time at the time of purchase or you know, previous owner who did that.
- Frankly, I think it's irrelevant when it was done. If we're discovering something that's compromised the historic nature of this, and this is pretty minor, I'd say we address it without regard if it was done by a previous owner or the current. And Ron again, I'm prepared to make a motion.
- So I have one more point that I'd like to make. When was the Landmarks Commission law established?
- Late 2018.
- Okay. So I'm just presuming then it was done after 2018.
- Yes.
- Excuse me, can you guys hear me? This is Randy.
- [Group] Yeah.

- Hi guys. So I'm actually the property owner right next to this building.
- Okay.
- Ah.
- At a 8015. So I can maybe clear up a little bit of it for you.
- Motion to open the floor.
- Thank you.
- Second.
- Okay. All in favor of opening up the floor, say aye. Aye.
- [Group] Aye.
- Any nays? Okay the floor is open. Randy, go right ahead.
- Okay so we've been at 815 South Jackson for about four years now. And those, those stairs were added within the last two years.
- Okay.
- The old staircase that was there was, was in pretty rough shape as is the deck of that house. And, right before the owners had that house for sale, they put that deck on, but they didn't have railings. So I think what happened was, is when the new owner of the house bought it and they wanted to start renting it for code, they probably thought they had to add the railings. So, within the last two years, those stairs have been added. But the house in general is in quite disrepair. And, I'm kind of afraid that the new owners of the house don't really want to do a whole lot with it. The roof is falling apart. I wouldn't be surprised if it's leaking. You know, the porch is in really rough shape. So I don't know what this committee can do to kind of force the, at least the exterior upkeep of the house, but it's in pretty rough shape.
- Thanks for that insight, Randy. That's--
- Yeah, thank you Randy.
- Much appreciated.
- And I don't, I don't know if you have any other questions for us, but like I said, we've been in the house next door for about four years now. So, but I think as a rental, I mean obviously maybe everybody that lives in the neighborhood doesn't like the idea of rentals coming in either. Which is something we don't really like because people are coming and going pretty often. So I don't know if the Astor park committee can even prevent that kind of thing from happening. But, I guess that's all I had to add for now.
- Motion to close the floor.
- It's all moved.
- Okay, we have a motion to close the floor. Second, all in favor? Aye.
- [Group] Aye.

- Okay anyone nay? Okay, the floor is closed. Well with that in mind I mean, David, do you wanna stick with your motion?

- Yeah, I'll make one. I'll make a motion that we reject this COA and have staff contact the applicant to work with them to get an appropriate, historically appropriate set of railings put in.

- Paul, what were you gonna say? I'm sorry.

- Well I'll, I'll second David's motion and then I'd like to discuss it or comment on it. I appreciate the discussion that the commission has taken towards this thing. We certainly wanna not make rush decisions, but quite honestly, I don't understand why this would even be something we should even be concerned with. They did the work without a certificate of appropriateness and they didn't do the work and make any attempt to match the historical integrity of this existing house. And quite honestly, as somebody said before, if this was acceptable throughout, the Astor Historic District would lose all its character if we continue to allow this to go ahead. So I can't even in my wildest dreams understand why we even consider approving something like this. And I don't really care when the house was bought, sold or whatnot, because ignorance of the law is no excuse. And so I'm tired of hearing this lame thing that property owners buy a piece of property and then, oh by the way, I didn't know that it was a historic property or that it was in a historic district. That's not in my mind justification for bad behavior. So I, that's my 2 cents worth on it and just wanted to get that in there.

- I support you're commentary on that a hundred percent Paul.

- I'd also like to thank you for your comment. I appreciate that 100 percent as well. Well said.

- Exactly, yeah.

- So we have a motion to ask the owners to change that railing to take what they have and make it historically correct. We have a second.

- Ron.

- Yes?

- Yeah, I just wanted to add an additional comment to that.

- Yeah sure.

- I appreciate Paul, like the irrelevance of the date. I just at least wanted to confirm for the edification of anyone who wants to know that warranty deed was transferred in October 12th of 2020. And that's per the county assessor records. The, I do support the motion. I think a lot of times maybe you might get landlords that see these properties and may not know that they're historic districts, I agree. Doesn't necessarily excuse it, but I think this is a low cost way to communicate that hey, you gotta make these improvements and oh by the way, you need to be kind of on the lookout for any additional improvements that you might need to make looking into the future. Because as our neighbor there had mentioned, there's the possibility for a lot of additional work that might need to be done to this property and this is good for us to get a head of this. And then really just more for Randy's purpose there too, he had inquired about the rental unit. State law prohibits us from dictating whether a property can be used as a rental unit or not. So we don't have any jurisdiction over that. It's a state law. So just at least wanted to respond since you kind of inquired about that.

- Well, thank you for that. Thank you very much. So we do have the motion, and we have a second. All rules in favor say aye.

- [Group] Aye.

- Is anyone opposed to this? Once again, Is anyone opposed to this? Are there any nays? Okay seeing that the motion has no nays, the motion carries to require them, just well, as stated by David. Thank you. Item number F, informational staff level COAs.

- We had two staff level COAs. One of them is a new roof. It's asphalt shingles replacing asphalt shingles at 736 South Madison. Lovely home, I'm sure they'll do a great job. We approved it. Other one, kind of fun to see this one again. It's restoring the banner pole foundations for a restaurant here. You may recall a signed COA not too long ago that we took issue with, but that restaurant is now gone and I guess a different one is coming back.

- Yes.

- So, they're gonna put a pole there to support another banner. Which is a reactivation of a previous sign of identical dimensions, which falls under staff level authority.

- That's it.

- Yay.

- Okay.

- Well thank you for that. Any staff updates?

- Uh.

- A few, I think.

- Yeah, we could talk about stuff.

- We just wrapped up the phase 5, 6, and partial 7 for the intensive survey. We got the report from Legacy Architecture today, yesterday. And they're gonna be coming to our next meeting to do the wrap up public meeting in which we'll invite the property owners that are listed as potentially eligible. So, hopefully we'll have some good discussion with those property owners about that. And then everything will be posted online and published and ready to go and we'll be applying for our next CLG grant soon-ish. Right?

- We've already applied.

- We already applied.

- So it will be the next phase or phases in discussion with SHPO. I'm getting the distinct impression that SHPO doesn't really want to do the final phases that would be the far east and far west sides of the city on the grounds that they don't feel those portions of the city are old enough or likely enough to yield enough eligible properties. With that in mind, for the next thing to apply for, we would apply for it towards the end of this year. I think. I'm proposing that we apply for CLG funds to create district design guidelines that we would label as district plans to use, to have one more piece of the puzzle to substantiate all of our, all of our determinations for COAs. So that would be district guidelines for the downtown districts as well as the residential districts. That is an eligible CLG sub grant project. And I think it would help us a lot on a internal side of things. Later, maybe next month we're going to start discussing writing a national register nomination for, what do we call it? Baby Astor, Astor Park.

- Little Astor.

- Little Astor. It has a hundred and like 70 some odd houses I guess. Mostly right around Astor Park. Extending South down to I forget, is it Alleyway?

- Alleyway.

- Thank you.

- Yep.

- Not Oshawa but--

- Not Oshawa then.

- Yep. And that is also something that we could apply for a CLG sub grant but, selfishly I really enjoy writing those. So, you know, if nobody objects, I would like to do that if it's acceptable to the owners of the houses there too. And that's exciting frankly. I know you maybe can't tell from my countenance at a distance, but this is me excited about that. I don't know if anybody on the Landmarks Commission has any input on any of that but, that's most of the staff updates, unless anybody wants to discuss any other recent events at council.

- Council returned the COA application for the main con garden windows. So they will be allowed to install a new storefront where those three small bar windows were once located well are currently located. They have to do the powder coded finish, which is which the rest of the COA application call for, for the windows. But council did overturn that at a vote of 11 to 1. One abstention was Alter Johnson. No.

- Gotcha.

- And one.

- Yes.

- And but going forward, they did agree to all those other items that were on the list, correct? That we had requested?

- Yep, everything else in the COA was already taken care of.

- Oh okay, good. That's good to know. Okay.

- If I could interject just a couple of personal things I guess. I'm not gonna hang myself but, I'd like to extend my personal thanks and commendation to the Landmarks Commission. I want to tell you all that you've done your job and you've done it well. I'd also like to say that perhaps the most important part of our job and the most important part of having this sort of ordinance is that it provides an opportunity for the public to have input on future changes to designated historic buildings. So in the absence of such an ordinance, a property owner could do as they please without any recourse for the public to voice opinions and concerns, You safeguard the public's right to voice concerns, changes in national register designated buildings. Now the fact here of course is that the public did not turn out to voice concerns in this particular instance. Regardless, we've done our job, we provided that opportunity, that legal opportunity. And for owners and historic properties, and Astor or the other residential districts, districts I'm saying plural because there may be others in the future. I think you'll find that the public has much more personal desire to have input in those properties than perhaps they will on a largely vacant storefront that they drive by every day but don't necessarily look at it. So, this is my way of saying thank you to you Landmarks Commission members. You did an excellent job. And frankly if you read quite literally between lines 5 and 6 in the conclusions of law, you'll see that you did an excellent job because there is no objection to what you've determined here. But, state statute is very clear that any property owner

can appeal any decision of a landmarks Commission or historic reservation commission directly to counsel. And that state statute was inserted specifically so that any determination of Landmarks Commission has a double check by counsel. And counsel has absolutely no obligation to take anything into consideration when making that decision. So, as much as I might be discouraged at this outcome, frankly I'm very encouraged in the fact that we've gone through this process, nobody suggested scuttling the ordinance. And we have exciting things to look forward to this year and next year and a clear path forward. We did our job. We did it well, so thank you.

- And Jason, I've expressed this to you before but, I thought you did an outstanding job of pulling all of the material together for this particular one. It was, on some levels it was complicated, on others it was very clear and simple. But I thought the documentation that represented the Landmarks Commission was as good as it could have been. And kudos to you.

- Thank you Jason.

- I agree.

- I Concur with that, Ian. That's very well said.

- Yeah.

- Anyone, anything else?

- Nothing else for staff update.

- I'm sorry?

- Nothing else for the staff update.

- Oh, okay. Well then we're at the date of our next meeting will be Wednesday March 15th, 2023. And do we have a motion to adjourn?

- Just, before we adjourn, I am pretty sure I cannot make that March meeting. So just throwing it out there right now so that we don't have issues with the quorum.

- Thank you.

- Oh. Yeah, I should mention I won't be there available either. I'll be just plane landing in Spokane Washington at that time.

- Too late Susan, Paul took it first.

- Yeah, and I'm gonna be in Las Vegas, so that's way more fun than Spokane.

- There you go.

- I'm flying for my granddaughter's birthday.

- What was, what was the date again?

- March 15th.

- 15th yeah.

- Well, so then, do we have a motion to adjourn?
- I question for David Siegel really quickly.
- Sure.
- Is the fire chief aware of the portico share thing?
- That was a tactical level thing. I've checked that career box so, I'm done.
- My wife was meeting with the fire chief at some point and I said, oh be sure to mention the portico share. And then I thought, well he perhaps, or she doesn't know anything about it.
- Would pretty much be completely clueless what you were talking about there, yeah. That was tactical crew operation, not something that would get up to the fire chief. He's probably wondering about me a little bit, so thank you.
- Can you elevate that in the manuals or something?
- I'll let, you've started the conversation. I don't wanna hijack it, please continue it.
- Okay, so where are we with the adjournment here? Motion to adjourn anyone?
- So moved.
- Second.
- Okay, all in favor?
- [Group] Aye.
- Are there any nays? Well, thank you everybody, It was a very productive--