

**MINUTES**  
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**Monday, September 14, 2015**  
**City Hall, Room 210**  
**4:00 p.m.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairperson Ald. Mark Steuer, Roger Retzlaff, Dave Boyce, Susan Ley, Jeanine Mead, Dennis Doucette

**ALSO PRESENT:** Cheryl Renier-Wigg, Ald. Guy Zima, Jim Sanderson, Rod Golonka, Sharon Roitstein, Karen Blazejewski, Andy Klarkowski, Joe De Rose, Jim O'Rourke, William Peters, Nick Backhaus, James Hayward, Jason Flatt and others

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND AGENDA**

- a. Approve August 10, 2015 Minutes.

A motion was made by S. Ley and seconded by R. Retzlaff to approve August 10, 2015 Minutes. 5 in favor 1 abstention. Motion carried.

- b. Modify and adopt agenda

A motion was made by Ald. Steuer and seconded by R. Retzlaff to move 4a.under Design Reviews. All in favor. Motion carried.

A motion was made by R. Retzlaff and seconded by D. Boyce to approve modified agenda. All in favor. Motion carried.

**2. DESIGN REVIEWS:**

- a. Review and discuss driveway expansion permit for 701 S. Jackson St.

No representative was present at this time.

A motion was made by R. Retzlaff and seconded by S. Ley to table discussion until the next meeting. All in favor. Motion carried.

- b. Review and discuss sign permit for 155 N. Broadway.

No representative was present at this time.

A motion was made by R. Retzlaff and seconded by S. Ley to table the discussion until the next meeting. All in favor. Motion carried.

- c. Review and discuss driveway expansion permit for 423 Dousman.

No representative was present at this time.

A motion was made by Ald. Steuer and seconded by R. Retzlaff to postpone the discussion. All in favor. Motion carried.

- d. Review and discuss building permit for 1102 S. Monroe Ave.

A motion was made by Ald. Steuer and seconded by S. Ley to open the floor. All in favor. Motion carried.

Rod Golonka a representative from Deleers Construction and Sharon Roitstein the property owner were present.

R. Golonka was looking to do a 2-story addition to expand the living space. The blueprint will remain the same. They also would like to repair the existing flat roof garage. The home will keep the same look; there will just be an extension on the home.

A motion was made by J. Mead and seconded by S. Ley to approve the building permit. All in favor. Motion carried.

- e. Review and discuss roofing permit for 812 Cass St.

A motion was made by Ald. Steuer and seconded by J. Mead to open the floor. All in favor. Motion carried.

Karen Blazejewski, property owner was present. K. Blazejewski wants to re-roof the entire home but not the garage. The home was re-roofed 20 years ago. The shingles on the driveway side are wearing from the trees rubbing against them. The look of the roof will not change.

A motion was made by D. Boyce and seconded by S. Ley to approve the building permit. All in favor. Motion carried.

- f. Review and discuss fence permit application for 617 S. Quincy St.

Andy Klarkowski, property owner was present. The fence will be placed south of the lot line to just the back of the house and across the driveway. There is an existing fence on the north lot line and the east side. The design of the new fence will be identical. The fence is a 6 foot cedar straight line fence. All of the boards are on one side of the exterior, side-by-side boards. A. Klarkowski will be tapering down the last 3 feet of the fence to 4 feet versus 6 feet at the driveway to make the fence more visually appealing.

A motion was made by R. Retzlaff and seconded by S. Ley to approve with the condition that the fence is a 6 foot cedar fence. All in favor. Motion carried.

- 4a. Discussion on Jim Sanderson's request for consideration in purchasing the only remaining Fort Howard building at 412-414 N. Maple Ave and moving it back near to its original site on City-owned property at 331-349 Donald Driver Way.

Jim Sanderson was present. J. Sanderson feels with the upcoming 200<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the installation of the Fort Howard ensemble on the Fox River in 2016 and the 200<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Brown County in 2018 this would be an appropriate commemoration of those anniversaries.

The area between Dousman and Mather is one of the most historical pieces of land in the State of Wisconsin. Just within the last few years the location where this building originated from became available, before that the railroad had it and Larson Canning had it afterwards. Now, the Donald Driver Way right-of-way has allowed the building to be moved near its original footprints, inside of Donald Driver Way behind Tiletown Brewery. There is green space between Donald Driver Way and the Tiletown Taproom parking lot that used to be used as a grassy parking area, but vehicles are no longer allowed to go in that area. This property is owned by the City according to Brown County Land Records.

J. Sanderson met with Wisconsin Coastal Management and they would be interested in contributing to the funding of the move. The condition is that the municipality the building is located would have to have possession of the building. The City would need to purchase the building and then apply for reimbursement through Wisconsin Coastal Management. The City needs to act on this while the land is still available. The owner is willing to sell the building. J. Sanderson does not believe the relocation of the building will be too costly and recommended that it be done in stages.

The front of the building has original characteristics; the back had to be rebuilt. According to the assessment records the building was built in 1813 which would make it the oldest building in this area. The building is currently a 4-plex rental until. The assessed value is \$117,700. The owner wants fair market value. The building has no floor support deterioration.

Ald. Zima believes this would draw people to the area. He would like to see this project start soon. The City needs to take advantage of the history of this building. He suggested putting a fence around the building and open it up for tours. It could be a good attraction for the West Side of Green Bay and help develop the area.

R. Retzlaff stated that one of the purposes of the HPC is to try to keep historic buildings in public use; to keep them in their original location and in a way that people have access to them.

J. Sanderson commented that the building will be near its original footprints and would be the only other fort building in the Midwest outside of Fort Mackinaw that would have that designation.

The idea has not been publicized. J. Sanderson's next step will be to go to Fort Howard School and see how they feel about the move.

James Hayward, a local historian, said that the building has never been identified as a Fort Howard building; there is no supporting documentation. He has tried to gain access to the building to identify characteristics of an 1830's home, but the owner has not allowed. J. Hayward would like the Committee's help in gaining access.

J. Hayward stated that there are numerous military buildings throughout the Midwest that are being preserved on original sites, such as the surgeons' quarters at Fort Winnebago. He wondered if the

structure will be on the National Register once it is removed from its designated area. If not, it will not be eligible to receive any tax credits.

It would need to be identified whether or not this building is in fact a military building and what its function was. This structure could have been either the surgeons' quarters or the officers' quarters.

Nick Backhaus, from Heritage Hill, said that it's believed the building was moved from the fort in 1866. Heritage Hill holds records pertaining to the original fort and has blue prints as well as over 2 dozen pictures.

Will Peters, Fort Howard Neighborhood Association President, says he and other neighbors are in support of the move and will assist with outreach efforts.

Jim O'Rourke, local historian, would like to see all of the public documents pertaining to Fort Howard consolidated and available to the public. Anyone wanting to do research on the fort can do so and can go to one source.

A motion was made by Ald. Steuer to return to regular order. All in favor. Motion carried.

Ald. Steuer believes this is a good opportunity. Green Bay is the oldest city in the state. Some of the City's structures have been razed or removed or are out of commission. Ald. Steuer will be willing to speak with City offices for input. He believes this needs to be pursued at least to get the truth behind the fort. 2016 commemorates the 200<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Fort Howard, which was the beginning of this state.

A motion was made by Ald. Steuer and seconded by D. Doucette to continue research on this structure including the City, private parties, and other like-minded historical organizations to get their inputs and move forward with a resolution, whether it be to move the building or keep it as is. All in favor. Motion carried.

An amendment to the motion was made by R. Retzlaff and seconded by S. Ley to continue the discussion at the next meeting and invite members from the City staff to participate in this discussion and develop a plan to consider how to acquire and develop.

Ald. Zima expressed concern over the time frame. He wants to see things expedited. The City should get positive identification of the building and set aside the land where the building is moving to. He would like to see a proposal for a rough budget for the acquisition, relocation, and restoration of the building. Ald. Zima would like to see the project begin within the next 6-18 months.

R. Retzlaff suggested setting up a discussion to be held during an upcoming City Council Meeting.

Ald. Steuer asked for a vote on R. Retzlaff's amendment to his motion. All in favor. Motion carried.

A motion was made by Ald. Steuer and seconded by D. Boyce to move item 3b. before 3a. All in favor. Motion carried.

### **3. CONTINUING BUSINESS**

- b. PowerPoint Presentation on obtaining CLG status. Joe De Rose, Survey and Registration Historian for Wisconsin Historical Society's Historic Preservation and Public History Division, will be in attendance.

Joe De Rose, Survey and Registration Historian for the Wisconsin Historical Society, coordinates the Certified Local Government Programs, which is administered by the National Parks Service out of Washington D.C. National Parks Service funds preservation offices around the country, each state has their own preservation office. Preservation offices are required by law to pass 10% of federal funding to Certified Local Governments, which averages to be about \$100,000 a year given out through grants. To qualify, a community has to have established a preservation ordinance. There are over 300 communities in the State of Wisconsin that have preservation ordinances. What separates the CLG from these communities is that the ordinance has to establish a Preservation Commission and allow the Commission to designate properties as local landmarks and regulate work that is done on those properties. Currently, there are 68 CLG's in the State of Wisconsin, 2 of which are in Brown County.

J. De Rose, presented a PowerPoint on how the City of Stoughton uses the CLG Program and how it has been beneficial.

He explained that the process is to get the ordinance to read a certain way and then the mayor has to write a letter requesting to become a Certified Local Government. More information is on the State's website. In order to maintain CLG status the Commission needs to meet regularly and e-mail copies of the minutes and agendas to J. De Rose. Once a year, J. De Rose needs an update from the Committee on the members and their addresses and what the Committee has done over the course of the year.

- a. Discussion on 30-day raze ordinance.

Ald. Steuer asked for J. De Rose's input on a waiting period for demolitions/raze orders.

J. De Rose said that if it's a locally designated landmark, then the waiting period has to be part of the ordinance. If it is dealing with old buildings in general, then it does not. The CLG Program can provide a layout on how to use grants. Grants are awarded on criteria. Most important things to fund are surveys. After a survey is conducted, nominate properties to the National Register as historic places. It is preferable to nominate as districts versus individual properties, you can get more buildings listed that way and it is more cost effective. Thirdly, education tools such as brochures, design guidelines, and plats are eligible for funding.

Referring to "Protecting Potential Landmarks through Demolition Review" by the National Trust Preservation Law Publication, Ald. Steuer said that the intent of the waiting period is to have the ability to try to save properties from demolition by establishing an efficient process. The Commission needs to have resources in place that help permitting officials determine the age and significance of the buildings, determine a threshold date, keep the community informed by posting signs and notices, Facebook, and Twitter.

J. Flatt suggested having a Committee member be an HPC officer, so if there is a raze permit application it would go to that person first. If not a historic property, it will be given back to inspection for issuance. If historic, then the waiting period would apply before the permit could be issued.

R. Retzlaff proposed to not have an age limit for the properties being reviewed. To take into consideration any property with a historic significance, if significant it should be reviewed prior to issuing the raze permit. Things that need to be considered are whether or not to tear the building down. If not, what will be done with the building and who will pay the owner for the property.

C. Renier-Wigg commented that even after the waiting period and the property is reviewed, the City still does not own the property and will have to figure out a way to purchase it and rehabilitate it.

R. Retzlaff said that state law does govern the raze process to some extent. The City's only legal alternative is to tear the buildings down if the owner doesn't make corrections or turn it over to someone who will.

C. Renier-Wigg mentioned that the CLG status will allow for the City to use grant money for survey to designate larger areas.

R. Retzlaff wants at a minimum to develop a plan for public notification with respect to a waiting period. A waiting period should not impact an owner or developer. It is simply part of the design criteria. The idea and purpose is to look at properties in the city as public resources, which is why we are concerned with them being public nuisances when they fall into disrepair. The City needs to do due diligence and look at the importance of the building to the community and allowing the public to know what is going on with it.

J. Flatt agreed that the Committee should continue to pursue the waiting period but back it up with CLG status.

D. Doucette also agrees that obtaining CLG needs to be the first step; there is no credibility without it. He suggested using Fond du Lac's ordinance as an example.

J. Flatt recommended that the language for a proposed 30 day raze ordinance work in parallel with the CLG ordinance. CLG ordinance has an interim control provision, triggers an instant delay. With the separate delay through historic preservation, we have an identified/undesignated historic resource, and there should be some review process. There should also be a higher authority to review.

R. Retzlaff stated that the real issue is when someone goes in for a raze permit the only people that are aware is the Inspection Department. Planning and Economic Development are unaware. With a 45 or 90 day waiting period the raze permit would go before the Commission who will then determine the significance, and then it's at least addressed in a public forum, where other people can take action.

A motion was made by R. Retzlaff and seconded by D. Doucette to table and continue to discuss at future meetings and to accept D. Doucette's recommendation that the Commission obtain copies of Fond du Lac's ordinance. Also agree that CLG status is a high priority, and that it be obtained with equal pace to establishing a demolition waiting or review period. All in favor. Motion carried.

#### 4. **NEW BUSINESS**

##### b. Review June Building Activity Report.

A motion was made by R. Retzlaff and seconded by D. Boyce to review and place on file. All in favor. Motion carried.

##### c. Review City Raze/Repair Orders and Demolitions

Ald. Steuer would like J. Flatt to provide pictures of raze/repair properties to put on record. The City designated 1.5 million dollars to go after troubled properties. Ald. Steuer proposed that the

Committee looks at some of these properties and determine whether or not they are worth saving then use the money to do so.

## 5. **OTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS AND NEWS**

Ald. Steuer discussed the Historic Preservation Conference. The Commission has money in the budget to send a representative or two to the conference. Ald. Steuer would like to see a minimum of one representative. The dates of the conference are October 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>.

R. Retzlaff thinks it is important that a Committee member attends to go to the commission training. The conference is related more to the work of the commission and developing programs. It would be good for J. Flatt to attend if he were a permanent staff member. The main value of the conference is the commissioner training courses.

A motion was made by Ald. Steuer and seconded by R. Retzlaff to consider sending one or two Committee members to the conference. The registration and hotel will be covered by the HPC budget. All in favor. Motion carried.

R. Retzlaff received a letter from the Federal Communications Commission-Section 106 Filing for Cell Phone Tower at 338 S. Chestnut. They are seeking a response from the HPC on whether or not the cell tower will affect any historic designations in the area. R. Retzlaff gave the letter to J. Flatt for him to research and respond.

R. Retzlaff would like clerical support to print out and distribute a directory of Committee members and their contact information so everyone has an updated record.

A motion was made by Ald. Steuer and seconded by R. Retzlaff to adjourn. All in favor. Motion carried.