

Agenda
City of Monona Landmarks Commission
Monona City Hall – Conference Room
5211 Schluter Road, Monona, WI
Wednesday June 15, 2016
4:30 p.m.

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes of April 20, 2016
4. Appearances
5. Unfinished Business
 - A. Commissioner Updates on Additions to the Wisconsin Historical Society Architectural Survey Database.
 - B. Commissioner Updates on WVMO Radio Recordings.
 - C. Discussion of Pagoda Restoration - Draft Historic Preservation Plan.
 - D. Discussion of Potential Archaeological History Projects.
6. New Business
 - A. Discussion of Forms and Process for Landmark Site/Building Nomination.
 - B. Discussion of Items for Future Agenda.
7. Upcoming meetings – July 20, 2016 and August 17, 2016
8. Adjournment

NOTE: Upon reasonable notice, the City of Monona will accommodate the needs of disabled individuals through auxiliary aids or services. For additional information or to request this service, contact Joan Andrusz at (608) 222-2525 (not a TDD telephone number), FAX: (608) 222-9225, or through the City Police Department TDD telephone number 441-0399. The public is notified that any final action taken at a previous meeting may be reconsidered pursuant to the City of Monona ordinances. A suspension of the rules may allow for final action to be taken on an item of New Business. It is possible that members of and a possible quorum of members of other governmental bodies of the municipality may be in attendance at the above stated meeting to gather information or speak about a subject, over which they have decision-making responsibility. Any governmental body at the above stated meeting will take no action other than the governmental body specifically referred to above in this notice.

Agenda Posted 6/7/2016 on the City Hall, Library, and Community Center bulletin boards and on the City of Monona's website, mymonona.com.

**Minutes
Landmarks Commission Meeting
April 20, 2016
4:30 pm**

Chair O'Connor called the meeting to order at 4:40pm.

Present: Chair Aldm. Mary O'Connor, Ms. Rebecca Holmquist, Ms. Branda Weix, Mr. Matt Aro, Mr. Rick Bernstein

Also present: City Planner and Economic Development Director Sonja Reichertz

Approval of Minutes: A motion was made by Ms. Weix, seconded by Ms. Holmquist, to approve the minutes of February 17, 2016. The motion carried with no changes.

Appearances: There were no appearances.

Unfinished Business

A. Discussion of Online Architectural Survey Database, Wisconsin Historical Society

The Commission continues to work on updating individual records. Staff noted that this is not an urgent project, but will provide useful information for future Commission projects, such as identifying and designating new landmarks in the community.

B. Discussion of Pagoda Restoration.

Staff summarized research completed to date, including quotes and information from Casey Concrete & Construction, concrete preservation specialist Charles Quagliana, A&M Masonry (Mark Elmer) and Henry Frerk and Sons, and retired State Preservation Architect Jim Sewell. A&M Masonry previously provided a recommendation for a crack sealing product.

Mr. Bernstein reported on his correspondence with Jim Sewell. Mr. Sewell suggested that this will not be worth the expense because it will not last long or prevent long term damage. He believes that it is deteriorated to a point where complete replacement will be necessary, and that matching the new roof to the existing concrete of the base will be the difficult part.

Ms. Holmquist talked with Simon Leverett of Henry Frerk and Sons who does not recommend the crack injection option. He also recommended that any restoration option be completed after the park improvements are completed so any disturbance does not affect the restored pagoda. Ms. Holmquist said it is important to analyze the existing concrete and use a product that matches. This is important because modern Portland cement is too hard and may have chemical or structural issues when placed on top of the columns.

Chair O'Connor agreed that a restoration should be timed carefully with the park improvements to minimize disturbance and to maximize efficiency of cost. She said fundraising and budgeting could also be aligned, and that fundraising could be done through the Friends of the Parks 501(c)(3) organization. She said the Parks Director also received a donation for improvements to this park and that it may be available for Pagoda work.

The Commission discussed timing for the capital budget if a larger allocation of funds is needed.

The Commission noted that all of the companies so far have noted that the pillars are sturdy, including Mark, Charlie, and Simon.

The Commission discussed whether repair with the crack injection product would be beneficial. Chair O'Connor, Mr. Bernstein, and Mr. Aro felt that it seems like only a short term solution and that the Commission does not have money for both. Ms. Weix noted that it may still be needed, though, based on the timing of the park improvements and cost of restoration. If restoration is not feasible until five years from now, for example, then she suggested we might need to repair the crack.

Mr. Aro suggested contracting with a structural engineer for a couple hours of time to analyze the structure. Spending money on an engineer will answer the question for us on whether or not we want to spend the \$1,500 on the crack injection due to delay of the park. It gives us an idea of how much time we have. Mr. Aro said he will share a list of other preservation architects as well.

Staff will talk to the Parks Director about timing of park improvements and the Public Works Director about engineering services. Staff will also prepare a preservation plan as described by Mr. Qualiana in order to summarize information and guide our future decision making and to use as a communication tool for Council and other bodies.

C. Discussion of Potential Archaeological History Projects

Staff shared information from Archaeologist Amy Rosebrough. She said a blanket eligibility statement for the Late Woodland mounds in the region was completed by Archaeologist Bob Birmingham and she provided this eligibility statement.

The Commission asked for information on how other Commissions have typically approached a landmark designation on the National Register of Historic Places for private property. For instance, would a Commission nominate a site themselves, or work more in partnership with the owner, or does the owner typically nominate the site. Ms. Rosebrough replied that it will vary from community to community. She said you will need a majority of the landowners for any given nominated property to consent, so working with them would be a must. For archaeological nominations, hiring a regular NRHP consultant will not work. She recommended contacting George Christiansen at UW-Baraboo who prepared the State's latest Late Woodland mound nomination. He is familiar with the NRHP procedure and is familiar with the archaeology.

The Commission discussed use of consultants and if one is needed. Mr. Bernstein said that consultants are probably used 95% of the time.

Ms. Weix asked how aware the property owners of this particular property were of the existence of the mound. Are they familiar with the cost of pursuing a nomination, do they know about the tax benefits, and the process?

Mr. Aro asked what the benefit is to the city of achieving a nomination on city property. He said this should be communicated. He asked how we can gain access to the land since the city property is landlocked by private parcels.

Chair O'Connor suggested that we check with George Christiansen about the cost of consulting services.

Mr. Aro noted that the Ho-Chunk nation may have an outreach program.

Staff will reach out to George Christensen about his services.

A. Discussion of Ideas for Preservation Month (May)

Ms. Holmquist noted that May is preservation month. Members agreed to schedule their radio readings and insert a message about preservation month. Staff will post webinar information on the City Website from the State Historical Society. Mr. Bernstein noted there are a couple webinars that may be useful to Commission members such as the Certified Local Government Training, Walking Tours, and Ordinance training.

B. Discussion of Items for Future Agenda

Staff will work on the preservation plan and pagoda follow-up and archaeological questions for the next meeting.

The Commission also requested that discussion be scheduled to talk about the nomination process and forms for nominating future landmarks. Mr. Bernstein shared a standard form and Mr. Aro shared examples from the City of Madison.

Adjournment

A motion by Mr. Aro and seconded by Ms. Holmquist to adjourn was carried. (5:30 pm)

Submitted by:
Sonja Reichertz
City Planner

	Historic Name	Other Name	Address	Year Built	Survey Date	Historic Use	Architectural Style	Property Type	Wall Material	Architect	Demolished?	Photo	Monona Landmark
1	Kohl's Supermarket	Rubin's Furniture	4207 Monona Drive	1968		2006 Grocery	Contemporary	Building	Brick		No	no	
2	Monona Professional Building		4201 Monona Drive	1964		2006 Small office building	Contemporary	Building	Stone Veneer		No	no	
3			6300 Metropolitan Lane	1949		1979	Art Moderne		Concrete		No	y	
4	Pooley, Robert House		6003 Winnequah Road	1935		1979 house	International Style	Building	Brick	Beatty and Strang	No	y	
5	Frank Allis House	San Damiano Friary	4123 Monona Drive	1893		2006 House	Dutch Colonial Revival	Building	Stone - Unspecified		No	y	
6	Fred Schluter House	Mark Lederer and Lynn Levin House	5310 Schluter Road	1901		1993 House	Front Gabled	Building	Stucco		No	no	
7	Tower of Memories	Roselawn Memorial Park Cemetery	Roselawn Ave at US 12/18	1936		1979 Cemetery Building	Neogothic Revival	Buildng	Stone-Unspecified	Sheldon, H.K.	No	y	
8			4306 Winnequah Road			1980 House	Craftsman	Building	Clapboard		No	y	
9			4103 Monona Drive	1913		1979 House	Bungalow	Building	Wood	Cora Tuttle	Yes	y	
10	Willard Tompkins House	Matthew and Melissa Aro House	110 Henuah Circle	1937		1979 House	International Style	Building	Wood	Beatty and Strang	No	y	
11			6103 Winnequah Road			1989 House	International Style	Building	Clapboard		No	y	
12			4108 Buckeye Road		1989 and 2015	House	Tudor Revival	Building	Clapboard	Sears and Roebuck	No	no	
13		Asclepius (Greek God of Healing)	5001 Monona Drive	1964		2001 Statue/Sculpture	Not a building			Harry Whitehorse	No	y	
14	Edward A and Irene Thomas House	Doug and Anne Kearney House	809 Owen Road	1936		1980 house	International Style	Building	Brick	Beatty and Strang	No	y	
15		Tyler Engelman House	6003 Midwood	1935		1979 House	One Story Cube	Building	Stucco		No	y	
16		Max and Mollie Lamers House	4314 Shore Acres Road	1940		1979 House	International Style	Building	Stucco		No	y	
17	Thorp Finance Corporation	Capital Travel	4929 Monona Drive	1958		2006 Small office building	Contemporary	Building	Stone Veneer		No	no	
18			807 Delwood Ct	1979		House	Contemporary	Building	Brick		No	y	
19			1001 Femrite Drive			1979 house	Colonial Revival	Building	Clapboard		No	y	
20	Charles Fix House	Nancy and Robert Barth House	4659 Tonywatha Trail	1926		1980 House	Dutch Colonial Revival	Building	Fieldstone		No	y	
21		Immaculate Heart of Mary Church (Catholic)	5101 Schofield Street	1961		1979 Church	Contemporary	Building	Concrete Block		No	y	
22	Gary and Mora Lincoln House	Mora Lincoln House	6015 Winnequah Road			1989 House	International Style	Building	Clapboard		No	y	
23	Nichols School	Monona School District Office	5301 Monona Drive	1937		1979 Elementary, Middle, Jr. High	Collegiate Gothic		Brick	Edward F. Starck and Hubert Schneider - 1937, Stark Sheldon and Schneider	No	y	
24	Schroeder, Otto and Louise House	Victoria and Dennis Hull House	4811 Tonyawatha Trail	1932		1980 House	Tudor Revival	Building	Stone - Unspecified	Frank Riley, Herbert Fritz (studio)	No	y	
25	Paul Harris House		411 W Dean Ave	1935		1980 House	International Style	Building	Brick	John J. Flad	No	y	
26	Marsha Heath House	Draeger House	6106 Winnequah Road	1936		1979 House	International Style	Building	Concrete	Beatty and Strang	No	y	
27	Fulcher, Paul House		6008 Winnequah Road	1935		1979 House	International Style	Building	Brick	Beatty and Strang	No	y	
28	Bump, Marvin House	Zerkxes Taylor House	6103 Winnequah Road	1935		1979 House	International Style	Building	Brick	Beatty and Strang	No	y	
29	Mahoney House		3837 Monona Drive			1979 House	Other Vernacular	Building	Stucco		Yes	y	
30	Cronin-Meyer House		5800 Winnequah Road	1938		1989 House	International Style	Building	Aluminum/Vinyl Siding	Beatty and Strang (Filipowicz Thesis)	No	y	
31			500 Interlake Drive	1956		2013 House	Rustic Style	Building	Log		No	no	
32			4406 Winnequah Road			House	Tudor Revival	Building	Clapboard	Sears and Roebuck	No	y	
33	Ed Rothman House		5215 Tonyawatha Trail	1938		1980 House	International Style	Building	Stucco	Beatty and Strang	No	y	
34	C Wright Thomas House	Edna Thomas House	5903 Winnequah Road	1931		1989 House	International Style	Building	Stucco	Hamilton Beatty	No	y	
35	Hamilton and Gwen Beatty House		5907 Winnequah Road	1931		1989 House	International Style	Building	Aluminum/Vinyl Siding	Hamilton Beatty	No	y	

LANDMARKS RADIO READINGS

1. Ernie's Trading Post (218 words)

possin

Monona's existence as a separate village originated in a little commercial building on Winnequah Road, known today as Monona Motors. It was in the back room of a grocery store once located there – Ernie's Trading Post – where talks began to incorporate Monona and secede from the Blooming Grove Township. The building was originally intended as a garage in 1925, but its first use, even though a warranty deed disallowed it, was as a "speakeasy" of the prohibition era. It was later purchased in 1932 for \$2,300 by Ernie Ferchland who established a neighborhood store there. Notices of meetings and maps showing the proposed new village were posted in the store for concerned citizens to study before voting on the secession in 1938. "Some of the meetings were hilarious," recalled Ernie Ferchland. At one of the meetings, one of the organizers, Professor Ray Owen said, "what are we going to name the Village?" Owen came up with Tonyawatha, and somebody said Winnequah. The opinion seemed to be they wanted an Indian Name. Ernie said jokingly to Owen, "spell Tonyawatha." After difficulty and a few laughs, Ernie said, "Well, I'd make it simple. My choice would be Monona." "And the five of us took a vote on it, and we agreed to call it Monona, which made me feel good."

2. Frank Allis Home / San Damiano (293 words)

many

The Frank Allis estate, a prominent early home in Monona is located at 4123 Monona Drive. Frank Allis was the son of the founder of the Allis-Chalmers farm machinery company in Milwaukee. His father was "among the greatest of manufacturers this state has produced." Frank Allis came to Madison in 1893 and gradually acquired land until he had assembled a beautiful tract of some 600 acres with extensive lake frontage on which he established a farm. The Allis' were recognized by their neighbors as of the aristocratic type. The Frank Allis home was a center of much hospitality with a sizable ballroom, 14 rooms for family and guests, and 7 fireplaces. Frank Custer of the Capital Times newspaper collected descriptions of Frank Allis, including that, "he was a pretty rotund, round-faced guy, who was not particularly a prosperous farmer. He had a problem, drink. The family figured a farm would keep him away from it." Frank Allis died at age 50 in 1915. In 1916, Mrs. Allis donated 2 acres of land to the new School District Number 10, to build the Frank Allis School as a memorial to her late husband.

~~The Frank Allis home was a center of much hospitality with a sizable ballroom, 14 rooms for family and guests, and 7 fireplaces.~~ In 1924, the Mahoney sisters purchased the property, and later transferred it to the Norbertines for "\$1.00 and other good and valuable considerations." The home was operated as a novitiate until 1959 for young men who desired to join the Order of St. Norbert either as priests or brothers, who spent one year at the novitiate without leaving the grounds. Starting in 1975, the Norbertines rented the premises to six Capuchin friars of the Franciscan Order as a House of Prayer. The property then became known as San Damiano, which comes from the Church in Assisi, Italy where St. Francis received his call to become a priest.

3. Springhaven Pagoda (151 words)

Rick

A graceful pagoda on the southeast shore of Lake Monona was built to protect the clear water that flowed from a natural spring. It stands today as a reminder of the peaceful pastoral setting that was once part of a farm owned by the prominent Attorney General, Postmaster, and Judge E.W. Keyes. The spring was so treasured by Keyes that he not only built this concrete structure housing for it, but also named his farm Springhaven. In the early 1900s the farm was eventually divided into tracts for summer homes, but the Stonebridge Park ravine in which the pagoda is located was kept as public property. Through the years many have enjoyed the serenity of the setting, the wild flowers there, and the water from the spring. In earlier years the children from Nichols School held their end-of-the-year picnics at the site and used the cool clear spring water to make their lemonade.

4. Effigy Mounds (292 words)

Matt

Wisconsin is considered to be the center of what is referred to as "effigy mound culture" because of the especially dense concentration of Native American burial mounds and ceremonial sites. The Wisconsin Historical Society documents that at least 234 mounds once existed at twenty-seven locations on the shores of Lake Monona or surrounding area. Today, Aabout ten mounds remain in Monona.

Since 1944, the Outlet Mound has held a prominent position overlooking both Lake Monona and the Yahara River, near today's Midwood and Ridgewood Avenues. The outlet mound group was

the earliest dated mound group in the four lakes area, having been established as a ceremonial and burial place by the Woodland people around two thousand years ago. It was discovered during planning and surveying for roads and residential development in south Monona. The outlet mound group was undoubtedly both a burial and ceremonial site. The conical mound is recognized as a significant prehistoric site because it contains human remains.

The Tompkins-Brindler Mounds are located on the northwest slope of a high glacial drumlin in Woodland Park. This mound group was originally part of a larger group that included the Nichols Mounds. Together, these groups contained as least fourteen linear mounds and one conical mound. Some mounds had already been destroyed by 1913 due to the construction of what is now Monona Drive. The Nichols Group was lost entirely to subdivision development after that time. New water tower construction in the late twentieth center disturbed two graves, probably from former mounds. The mounds were named for the Tompkins and Bridler families, early farmers of the land.

The Outlet Mounds and the Tompkins-Brindler Mounds are listed on both the State and National Register of Historic Places, and are recognized as City of Monona Landmarks.

Branda

5. **Nichols School (173 words)**

Monona's Nichols School stands on the same corner where the area's children have attended classes since 1869. Situated on farm land previously owned by George M. Nichols, for whom the school is named, it has undergone several building replacements and many additions. For the early settlers of the area, the establishment of a school district was of prime importance. In 1851 the first meeting of the School District was held, followed by the building of a modest wooden structure in 1852 at a cost of \$100. In 1869 a new one-room school was built at a cost of \$750 on the present site. It served the area through the rest of the century and into the 1900s. By 1922 there were 48 children enrolled. During 1935, the first part of the current brick building was constructed. Numerous other additions occurred from 1946 to 1957. Today, the Nichols School is one of six schools in the Monona Grove school district. It houses the High School Charter Program and the Monona Grove School District Offices.

Springhaven Pagoda

Historic Preservation Plan

City of Monona Landmarks Commission

6/15/2016



This document is to serve as a decision making guide for the City of Monona Landmarks Commission, and other City of Monona elected and appointed decision makers to evaluate future preservation options for the Springhaven Pagoda, a City of Monona Landmark.

Table of Contents

1. Purpose of Preservation Plan
2. Brief History of Springhaven Pagoda
3. Current Conditions
4. Evaluation of Treatment Approach
5. Recommended Treatment Approach
6. Future Areas of Research
7. Sources
8. Attachments

Acknowledgements

Landmarks Commission

Mary O'Connor, Alder - Chair
Rebecca Holmquist
Branda Weix
Matthew Aro
Richard Bernstein
Sonja Reichertz, City Planner &
Economic Development Director

Professional Input

Simon Levertt, Henry Frerk & Sons
Mark Elmer, A&M Masonry
Charles Quagliana
Jim Sewell
Casey Concrete
Strand Associates

Purpose

The need for a Historic Preservation Plan is based on the understanding that each historic property represents a unique and irreplaceable resource. Even well intended restoration efforts can obscure the historic character of these unique resources. Preservation plans provide a framework with which to address potential changes to a historic resource during the planning process, explore alternative plans of action, and minimize loss, damage, or irreversible adverse effects on the resource. The Preservation Plan briefly outlines historical background and existing conditions. This background is not intended to be all-inclusive, but rather is limited to provide enough information to guide future treatment decisions. Ultimately, the Preservation Plan is a tool to guide decision making on the fate of the historic resource.

Various treatment options are available and should be considered. These options can include preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction. Definitions are provided below.¹

Preservation is defined as the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of a historic property, generally focuses upon the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials and features rather than extensive replacement and new construction.

Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, and architectural values.

Restoration is defined as the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and characteristics of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period.

Reconstruction is defined as the act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features, and detailing of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location.

¹ Definitions provided by: Historic Structure Reports and Preservation Plans: A Preparation Guide by the New Jersey Office of Historic Preservation. <http://www.nj.gov/dep/hpo/4sustain/preparehsr.pdf>

Brief History of Springhaven Pagoda

This section describes the history of the Pagoda's construction, alterations, owners, and significant events at the property based on physical and documentary evidence.

A graceful pagoda on the southeast shore of Lake Monona was built to protect the clear water that flowed from a natural spring. It stands today as a reminder of the peaceful pastoral setting that was once part of a farm owned by Judge E.W. Keyes. The spring was so treasured by Keyes that he not only built this housing for it, but also named his farm Springhaven, or Keyes Springs.

The Keyes' farm was adjacent to the southern end of the Frank Allis property. In the early 1900s the farm was eventually divided into tracts for summer homes but the Stonebridge Park ravine in which the pagoda is located was kept as public property.

Through the years many have enjoyed the serenity of the setting, the wild flowers there, and the water from the spring. In earlier years the children from Nichols School held their end-of-the-year picnics there and used the cool clear spring water to make their lemonade.

Springhaven Pagoda has managed to survive all these years and the natural spring water occasionally flows. Although the Pagoda shows the wear of both time and vandalism, it is hoped that this landmark can be restored to its original graceful charm.

From the 2011 City of Monona Landmarks Commission Publication



1899 plat map of the west side of the Town of Blooming Grove.



Photos taken 1951

Current Conditions

Current conditions; Remaining significant and character defining features.



Evaluation of Treatment Approaches

The Landmarks Commission has been reviewing options for restoration of the Springhaven Pagoda in order to identify the most cost-effective method that will either preserve the historic resource in its current form or restore it to its original form.

Most of the opinions solicited to date are specifically regarding work needed on the Pagoda's deteriorating roof. Some conversations have involved more of the Pagoda's structure (columns and base). We have solicited information and quotes from various contractors and specialists including the following:

- Casey Concrete & Construction (John Wedekind)
- Concrete preservation specialist Charles Quagliana
- A&M Masonry (Mark Elmer) and Henry Frerk and Sons (Simon Leverett)
- Retired State Preservation Architect Jim Sewell
- Strand Associates (Josh Straka)

Masonry Crack Injection

Commission Chair Mary O'Connor and City Planner Sonja Reichertz met on site with Mark Elmer of A&M Masonry and Simon Leverett of Henry Frerk Sons. This visit and inspection revealed that there has been significant deterioration in the roof. **Attached** is a summary of this site visit. Following the visit, Mr. Elmer supplied the Commission with an estimate for services (dated February 16, 2016) for crack injections to prevent further damage to the pagoda roof in the amount of \$1,500. The proposed product for filling the roof cracks was Jahn M30 Micro Injection Grout. The estimate from A&M Masonry and the product specifications are **attached**. The material would be applied through a syringe-like instrument to fill the crack. It will not strengthen the crack, but will prevent additional water from getting in and cracking it even more.

Effectiveness of Masonry Crack Injection Questioned

Retired State Preservation Architect Jim Sewell provided input on the crack injection method on February 29, 2016 in an email to Commissioner Rick Bernstein. Mr. Sewell wrote:

"I just inspected the pagoda and I am skeptical that the injection process that is being proposed will do much good... It seems clear to me that, given the loss of much of the overhang, as well as the porosity and delamination at the edges, the roof will continue to deteriorate to the point where the overhangs will eventually fail, at which time the underlying perimeter beam will begin to deteriorate...The big problem is that, in its existing condition, with no discernible drip edge or water control, water will continue to seep into the concrete where it will freeze and thaw and

eventually destroy the pagoda's overhangs. This pains me to have to say but, if the pagoda is important as part of the park's cultural landscape, the best and most durable solution may be to replace the roof with an identical new roof. By identical, I mean both in a design sense and with concrete that matches that of the original, including its original aggregate. Contemporary concrete would not be appropriate. If there wasn't one originally, there should be a drip edge – a kerf on the underside of the overhangs case into the concrete."

Mr. Sewell continued:

"There is one alternative to replacement, but it is tricky and would require the owners to find a contractor willing and able to carry it out. That alternative would be to re-cast the missing parts. As I said it would not be impossible, but it would be tricky. This would likely involve drilling holes near the missing areas, inserting stainless steel pins, and then re-casting the overhanging portions of the pagoda roof. Unless there is something that I'm missing, injection of consolidates is not going to solve the problem."

Request for Structural Analysis

At the April 20, 2016 Landmarks Commission meeting, the Commission requested that Staff contact a structural engineer to order a structural analysis of the Pagoda. The goal would be to determine how structurally sound the pagoda is in order to determine what method of preservation or restoration would be most worthwhile or even feasible. A structural analysis would reveal whether a new roof could be supported and if any additional restoration is needed on the structure's columns or base.

Staff requested this service from Strand Associates, and had a phone conversation with Josh Straka of Strand on May 17th, 2016. In brief, Strand Associates is not comfortable completing this analysis or providing a recommendation on the structural condition. Mr. Straka explained that it will be very difficult to determine the stability of the footings without knowing how deep they go down, how the columns were constructed, or what materials the columns are made off. First of all, Strand cannot determine the above information without having access to historic building prints. To our knowledge, this information does not exist. Alternatively, the above information could be determined by some further analysis, such as drilling into the structure and extracting samples, or digging around the base to learn more about the structure's footings and base.

Both of these methods of further research cause concern. First, drilling into the structure without understanding its composition could cause further damage. Second, excavating around the base could disrupt what has apparently been stable for over 100 years and could cause differential settling that may cause the columns to become unstable. Excavating and removing soil would also require replacing the soil with some sort of appropriately compacted material. It is difficult and risky to know the best soil composition to replace it with to avoid further damage.

Finally, Strand noted that all of this information would be required before their structural engineer could make a recommendation on how much load the columns could structurally support with regard to a new or restored roof. The opinion of Strand's structural engineers is that there is too much liability and multiple unknowns, and therefore they are unwilling to perform additional research and would not be willing to make a recommendation regarding stability or structural load potential. For example, if the analysis of load potential is not correct, a restored roof could fall and injure park users.

Consideration of Timing of Park Improvements

It is imperative to consider timing of potential improvements to Stone Bridge Park for a number of different reasons. These reasons include: (1) careful consideration of the sequence of restoration events to minimize damage to both a newly improved park and a newly restored Pagoda, (2) concerted efforts to maximize fundraising potential and minimize budget impact, and (3) to determine how much time will pass before the park improvements are made so that the Landmarks Commission can evaluate how quickly the Pagoda is deteriorating to understand whether a shorter-term preservation strategy is needed prior to a larger-scope restoration.

Regarding the sequence of restoration events, the goal is to coordinate any restoration work with the Stone Bridge Park project in a chronological order as follows.

1. Any restoration work on the Pagoda should not be started after initial grading is done at the park. The large equipment needed for grading would therefore not damage any new restoration on the Pagoda.
2. After this large equipment has left the park and the new grades are established, the Pagoda restoration work should be completed. This would allow additional equipment needed for the pagoda work (such as a vehicle capable of removing the pagoda's roof, if necessary) to access the park while it is still under construction.
3. Finally, the remaining park work such as final seeding and landscaping should be completed.

According to a May 17, 2016 conversation between the Parks Director and the Planning Director, the tentative schedule for Stone Bridge Park improvements is as follows.

1. 2018 Budget Request for Engineering and Design
2. 2019 Budget Request for Construction

The Landmarks Commission should continue analyzing information in this report to determine if a short-term fix is needed to slow deterioration on the Pagoda between now and 2019, or if the structure is stable enough to wait for a full restoration with temporary protection from the elements (such as covering the structure with a tarp).

Recommended Treatment Approach

Recommended overall treatment approach (preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction); recommended treatments for individual features or areas; Prioritization of recommendations and cost estimates. In the case of a recommended capital improvement project, a qualified consultant, such as a historic architect, is usually hired to prepare construction documents. Depending on the thoroughness of the document, additional testing or research may be needed prior to proceeding with the work.

Future Areas of Research

Identification of future areas of research or documentation

Resources

<http://www.nj.gov/dep/hpo/4sustain/preparehsr.pdf>

Landmark Nomination

1. Name

historic

and/or common

2. Location

street & number

city, town

congressional district

state WISCONSIN code 055 county

3. Classification

Category	Ownership	Status	Present Use	
<input type="checkbox"/> district	<input type="checkbox"/> public	<input type="checkbox"/> occupied	<input type="checkbox"/> agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/> museum
<input type="checkbox"/> building(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> private	<input type="checkbox"/> unoccupied	<input type="checkbox"/> commercial	<input type="checkbox"/> park
<input type="checkbox"/> structure	<input type="checkbox"/> both	<input type="checkbox"/> work in progress	<input type="checkbox"/> educational	<input type="checkbox"/> private residence
<input type="checkbox"/> site	Public Acquisition	Accessible	<input type="checkbox"/> entertainment	<input type="checkbox"/> religious
<input type="checkbox"/> object	<input type="checkbox"/> in process	<input type="checkbox"/> yes: restricted	<input type="checkbox"/> government	<input type="checkbox"/> scientific
	<input type="checkbox"/> being considered	<input type="checkbox"/> yes: unrestricted	<input type="checkbox"/> industrial	<input type="checkbox"/> transportation
		<input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> military	<input type="checkbox"/> other:

4. Owner of Property

name

street & number

city, town _____ vicinity of _____ state _____ ZIP _____

5. Location of Legal Description (In County Courthouse)

courthouse, registry of deeds, etc.

street & number

city, town _____ state Wisconsin

6. Representation in Existing Surveys

title

date _____ federal _____ state _____ county _____ local

depository for survey records

city, town _____ state _____

7. Description

Condition

excellent
 good
 fair

deteriorated
 ruins
 unexposed

Check one

unaltered
 altered

Check one

original site
 moved date _____

Describe the present and original (if known) physical appearance

8. Significance

(Continue on separate sheets if necessary)

Period	Areas of Significance—Check and justify below			
<input type="checkbox"/> prehistoric	<input type="checkbox"/> archeology-prehistoric	<input type="checkbox"/> community planning	<input type="checkbox"/> landscape architecture	<input type="checkbox"/> religion
<input type="checkbox"/> 1400–1499	<input type="checkbox"/> archeology-historic	<input type="checkbox"/> conservation	<input type="checkbox"/> law	<input type="checkbox"/> science
<input type="checkbox"/> 1500–1599	<input type="checkbox"/> agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/> economics	<input type="checkbox"/> literature	<input type="checkbox"/> sculpture
<input type="checkbox"/> 1600–1699	<input type="checkbox"/> architecture	<input type="checkbox"/> education	<input type="checkbox"/> military	<input type="checkbox"/> social/
<input type="checkbox"/> 1700–1799	<input type="checkbox"/> art	<input type="checkbox"/> engineering	<input type="checkbox"/> music	<input type="checkbox"/> humanitarian
<input type="checkbox"/> 1800–1899	<input type="checkbox"/> commerce	<input type="checkbox"/> exploration/settlement	<input type="checkbox"/> philosophy	<input type="checkbox"/> theater
<input type="checkbox"/> 1900–	<input type="checkbox"/> communications	<input type="checkbox"/> industry	<input type="checkbox"/> politics/government	<input type="checkbox"/> transportation
		<input type="checkbox"/> invention		<input type="checkbox"/> other (specify)

Specific dates

Builder/Architect

Statement of Significance (Give specific sources for all statements of fact.)

owner and the Landmarks Commission, to enhance the preservation and protection of the landmark.

- (8) Recognition of landmarks. Whenever the Common Council designates a landmark under sub. (6), the Landmarks Commission shall affix a plaque identifying the property as a landmark to the landmark or landmark site. The plaque shall be placed so that it is easily visible to passing pedestrians. In the case of a landmark structure, the plaque shall include the accepted name of the landmark, the date of its construction, and other information that the Landmarks Commission considers appropriate. In the case of a landmark that is not a structure, the plaque shall include the common name of the landmark and other information that the Commission considers appropriate. If the Commission determines that because the landmark is ecologically or culturally sensitive a plaque would be inappropriate, no plaque is required. No person may remove or modify a plaque without approval of the Preservation Planner.
- (9) Amending a Landmark Designation. Any person may petition the Landmarks Commission to amend a Landmark Designation. The process for amending a landmark shall be the same as for designating a landmark under subsections (1)-(7) above.