

Revised 7/19/2016

**Agenda
City of Monona Landmarks Commission
Monona Public Library – Municipal Room
1000 Nichols Road, Monona, WI
Wednesday July 20, 2016
4:30 p.m.**

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes of June 15, 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. Consideration of Action to Hire Preservation Architect Regarding Springhaven Pagoda Condition Assessment and Identification of Treatment Alternatives.
 - 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 – August 17, 2016 and September 21, 2016
 - a. Request to cancel or postpone September 21, 2016 meeting – City Staff conflict.
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 7/19/2016 on the City Hall, Library, and Community Center bulletin boards and on the City of Monona's website, mymonona.com.

**Minutes
Landmarks Commission Meeting
June 15, 2016
4:30 pm**

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

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

Excused: Ms. Rebecca Holmquist, Mr. Matt Aro

Also present: City Planner and Economic Development Director Sonja Reichertz

Approval of Minutes: A motion was made by Ms. Weix, seconded by Mr. Bernstein, to approve the minutes of April 20, 2016. The motion carried with no changes.

Appearances: There were no appearances.

Unfinished Business

A. Commissioner Updates on Additions to the Wisconsin Historical Society Architectural Survey Database.

Staff reminded the Commission to complete updates to the spreadsheet. The Commission noted a couple address changes on the spreadsheet.

B. Commissioner Updates on WVMO Radio Recordings.

Staff reminded the Commission to work with Media Director Will Nimmow to schedule readings about Monona Landmarks.

C. Discussion of Pagoda Restoration – Draft Historic Preservation Plan.

Staff presented a draft historic preservation plan that outlines 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 document is to serve as a decision making guide for the Landmarks Commission and other Monona elected and appointed decision makers to evaluate future preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction efforts.

The Landmarks Commission discussed the draft plan and information provided therein. The Commission discussed timing – first in terms of how much longer the Pagoda can sit idle without any repair or restoration before it is beyond repair, and second in terms of when other park improvements will occur at Stone Bridge Park.

Regarding the timing of Stone Bridge Park improvements, Staff reported that she talked with Parks Director Jake Anderson who estimated that the Capital Budget request for Stone Bridge Park will likely be a 2018 request for design and engineering and a 2019 request for construction.

Mr. Bernstein said he is not sure if we can afford to wait until a 2019 park construction project in order to address the pagoda. However, there is cause for concern that if we restore the pagoda before the park work is done, the park work could cause damage to the pagoda structure. Mr. Bernstein noted that if the pagoda scope of work is only replacing the roof, it may not be as big of an

issue to coordinate with park work. The only reason to wait would be to avoid damaging the park work, but if the Landmarks Commission cannot wait, then a safe guard would have to be put around the pagoda during park construction and equipment would just have to stay away from it. However, the problem then becomes finding a structural engineer willing to evaluate the pagoda's ability to hold a new roof. He said if the roof deteriorates further, it makes the rest of the structure that much more susceptible to damage.

Staff reported that she contacted Josh Straka from Strand Associates for information on whether a structural analysis of the pagoda could be completed. In brief, the structural engineers at Strand are 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. Strand cannot determine this information without having access to historic building prints, which do not exist. The information could be further investigated by excavating around the base to learn more about the structure's footings, however, this caused concern for destabilizing something that appears to be stable and disrupting compacted soil. Mr. Straka said all of this information would be required before Strand can analyze the load bearing capacity of the columns for a new roof, and even then, there is too much liability and risk, such as the roof being unstable, falling, and hurting someone, that they are not interested in making a recommendation.

Ms. Weix noted that even if the roof is replaced, we still do not know what the base structure's estimated life span is.

Mr. Bernstein said it appears the Commission is at a crossroad as far as needing more information to determine whether a capital budget request will be made. He said he believes more architectural history expertise is needed and he offered to contact Charles Quagliana for assistance. If Mr. Quagliana is not able to assist, Mr. Bernstein will ask him for recommendations of other structural engineers that may be able to help.

The Commission discussed timing for a capital budget request either this year (for the 2017 budget) to restore the pagoda or waiting one more year for a 2018 restoration. Chair O'Connor said if we want to request a capital budget item for construction in 2017, we need a ballpark estimate by the end of next month (July). The Commission discussed that in order to get this estimate, we need to have an expert do some analysis and study in a short period of time, and that would require funding out of the Landmarks Commission budget.

The Commission reaffirmed that pursuing protection of the Pagoda is the responsibility of the Landmarks Commission and that it was a priority to spend Commission funds on an expert's analysis. Chair O'Connor mentioned previous discussion of moving the pagoda up closer to the road. The consensus of the Commission is that the Pagoda should be restored in its current location.

Ms. Weix said if we wait for the park improvements, there simply may not be a pagoda left to protect. Mr. Bernstein added he is concerned about the pagoda surviving another winter. Ms. Weix added that perhaps the study would provide recommendations on protecting the pagoda through another winter until restoration can occur.

Staff read previous information provided by Charles Quagliana stating that he estimates about \$3,200 to cover a preservation plan and preservation implementation study.

A motion was made by Ms. Weix, seconded by Mr. Bernstein, authorizing staff to execute a contract of up to \$3,000 from the Landmarks Commission budget with a preservation architect for a structural and concrete analysis of the pagoda, which should also include an

estimate of the cost of restoration of the pagoda, before the July 20th Landmarks Commission meeting.

Discussion continued. Mr. Bernstein said we are trying to get a rough plan from Charles Quagliana done before the July Landmarks Commission meeting so we can see how much restoration might cost so that we can put a capital budget request in by the end of July. A full detailed plan will be needed after the July meeting, but right now our goal is just getting the ballpark number which means he will have to do at least some engineering analysis in the short term.

The motion carried.

D. Discussion of Potential Archaeological History Projects.

Mr. Bernstein reported that he called potential consultant George Christianson, who is terribly busy and cannot commit to a project right now. Mr. Christianson said he would share an educational piece however about pursuing protection of archaeological sites. Mr. Bernstein also talked to Amy Rosebrough at the Wisconsin Historical Society (WHS) who said that it would not make sense to nominate just one mound; this would be analogous to nominating just one gravestone in a cemetery. To nominate all of the mounds, one would need a majority of all the property owners. Mr. Bernstein also talked to John Broihahn of WHS who added that nomination for the register may not even be necessary. Mr. Broihahn suggested the best way to protect a mound is to seek a preservation covenant which allows the property owner to receive tax exemptions. Mr. Bernstein explained that a preservation covenant is permanent protection on the deed that would run with the property, and gives a certain amount of review to the WHS. This essentially is the property owner giving up one property right regarding the historic resource in exchange for tax exemptions.

Ms. Weix asked if the property owners were already unable to disturb the mounds.

Mr. Bernstein said there is a law that exists; however, as shown by recently proposed legislation, that law is tenuous and may not be around forever. He added there is not a lot of policing or oversight. Often mounds are disturbed but the WHS does not hear about it until after. The protection covenant is one level of protection that is easy to manage but also provides monetary incentive to the property owners.

The Commission discussed that the property owners may not be fully aware of the mounds' existence on their property, or their significance and that would be part of the Commission's role to make that information available.

The Commission discussed future steps for any mound on City owned property, wondering if the City would be willing to place a protection covenant on their property as a model. The Commission suggested entering into this covenant first to learn more about the process, and then share the information as education to other property owners with mounds on their property. The Commission would invite the City Council, homeowners, and someone from WHS to talk about importance of the mounds and the benefits of the tax exemption. The Commission said it would need guidance from the City Attorney on the covenant as well, and that perhaps he could provide a memo to the City Council.

Ms. Weix noted we should also talk about the impact the city if the other mounds become tax exempt.

Landmarks Commission Meeting

June 15, 2016

Draft Minutes Subject to Approval

The Commission will discuss the process further and plans to make a recommendation to Council regarding being a model for other privately owned burial mounds. Mr. Bernstein will provide a model covenant and perhaps some literature on tax exemptions.

There was no further discussion.

New Business

A. Discussion of Forms and Process for Landmark Site/Building Nomination.

This information was not discussed and will be forwarded to a future agenda.

B. Discussion of Items for Future Agenda

Discussion of major projects including the pagoda and burial mounds will continue, as well as nomination forms. The Commission also discussed expanding the number of Landmarks Commission members by ordinance to seven, as part of the City's overall recodification process. Expand members.

Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Bernstein and seconded by Ms. Weix to adjourn was carried.
(6:00pm)

Respectfully submitted by:
Sonja Reichertz
City Planner

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>

From: [Mary O'Connor](#)
To: [Sonja Reichertz](#); [Bernstein, Rick A - WHS \(Rick.Bernstein@wisconsinhistory.org\)](#)
Subject: Fwd: Monona Pagoda
Date: Sunday, July 17, 2016 2:26:39 PM

Hi Sonja & Rick,

Below you'll find Charles Quagliana's response to our questions.

Mary

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Charles Quagliana** <cjquagliana@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2016 at 4:36 PM
Subject: Re: Monona Pagoda
To: Mary O'Connor <mkoconnor73@gmail.com>

7/13/2016

Mary O'Connor

Re: Springhaven Pagoda Preservation Plan

I briefly reviewed the draft Springhaven Preservation Plan and offer the following comments:

First, I commend the City for developing a Preservation Plan. It is a very important aspect to establish credibility of the proposed project and of course as a decision making tool.

I would suggest a few additions.

In the historical summary I would attempt to establish why the Pagoda is significant. Is it just about the relationship to Keyes, or is it a distinctive or unique work. As indicated in the text on page 4 of the draft, the significance probably relates to the landscape/site as well as the pagoda itself.

I think establishing how significant this is helps in determining if restoration or rehabilitation is the appropriate treatment.

Moving forward I would suggest a formal condition assessment by a qualified preservation person and structural engineer. This would include carefully excavating along one side of the basin to expose the stone walls/foundations. It may also include removing a small (quarter size) segment of the concrete roof edge for analysis. A written 5-6 age report would be provided with illustrative photos. This would be integrated into the Preservation Plan by the City staff.

Once you have the condition assessment information you can expand the Treatments section of the report.

Within the Evaluation of Treatments section, I would consider that there are 4 possibilities.

- A. Do nothing.
- B. Restoration in place.
- C. Rehabilitation in place.
- D. Rehabilitation in new location (perhaps just a few feet away from the present location).

I agree with Jim Sewell, I do not think any temporary measures, except a tarp cover for the winter, would provide much benefit.

In the restoration concept the pagoda would be repaired and the basin below the pagoda simply cleaned out. The stone walls surround the pagoda would be repaired but not altered. The landform and landscape around the spring would be returned to that illustrated in the 1951 images.

In the rehabilitation concept the pagoda would be raised approximately two feet, the basin partially disassembled and rebuilt, the existing roof removed and replaced with a replica. The stone walls would be moved back several feet from their current location and other vandal minimization changes made to the landscape.

In the rehabilitation in new location concept the pagoda, basin and stone walls could be moved/relocated toward the north.

For each alternative you would describe the impacts of each alternative and provide a range of costs and an implementation strategy. This would include a description of how to preserve the pagoda (specifics), estimate of probable costs, funding sources and a time line. Perhaps a pro/con list for each alternative too.

My structural engineer and I could do the condition assessment, if the City provides the excavation work, for something like \$1,500-1,800.

I could provide input to the treatment alternative as noted above for something like \$1,500-1,700, including some time for a contractor to provide some cost information.

All work would be provided to the City in MSWord electronic format. Integration into the Preservation Plan would be by City staff.

Let me know if you would like to discuss further.

Charles Quagliana, AIA

Preservation Architect

cquaglianaarchitect.com

From: **Mary O'Connor** <mkcoconnor73@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Jul 11, 2016 at 5:01 PM
Subject: Monona Pagoda
To: cquagliana@gmail.com
Cc: Sonja Reichertz <sreichertz@ci.monona.wi.us>, "Bernstein, Rick A - WHS
(Rick.Bernstein@wisconsinhistory.org)" <Rick.Bernstein@wisconsinhistory.org>

Hi Charlie,

Attached you'll find the draft historic preservation plan which our City Planner Sonja Reichertz developed as well as a map of the utilities at Stonebridge Park. I checked with our Park Director about the manhole cover. He says that there is a Madison Metropolitan Sewer District sanitary line running through the park and sent me the utilities map. I'm assuming that the thin white lines you can see on either side of the park are the sanitary sewer lines and the yellow line in the middle that extends partway into the park is probably the storm water outlet.

Thanks for meeting with us this morning. Please let me know if there's anything else you need in order to come up with an estimate.

Mary O'Connor

Landmark Nomination

1. Name

historic

and/or common

2. Location

street & number

city, town

congressional district

state

WISCONSIN

code

055

county

3. Classification

Category

district
 building(s)
 structure
 site
 object

Ownership

public
 private
 both

Public Acquisition

in process
 being considered

Status

occupied
 unoccupied
 work in progress

Accessible

yes: restricted
 yes: unrestricted
 no

Present Use

agriculture
 commercial
 educational
 entertainment
 government
 industrial
 military

museum
 park
 private residence
 religious
 scientific
 transportation
 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.)

SUBCHAPTER C: LANDMARKS (Madison, WI)

41.07 DESIGNATING LANDMARKS.

- (1) Designation. The Common Council, after considering the recommendation of the Landmarks Commission under sub. (5) below, may designate a landmark according to this section.
- (2) Standards. A site, improvement, or site with improvements may be designated as a landmark if the proposed landmark meets any of the following criteria:
 - (a) It is associated with broad patterns of cultural, political, economic or social history of the nation, state or community.
 - (b) It is associated with the lives of important persons or with important event(s) in national, state or local history.
 - (c) It has important archaeological or anthropological significance.
 - (d) It embodies the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type inherently valuable as representative of a period, style, or method of construction, or of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.
 - (e) It is representative of the work of a master builder, designer or architect.
- (3) Nomination. Any person may nominate a site, improvement, or site with improvements for designation as a landmark. The person shall submit the nomination to the City Planning Division, to the attention of the Preservation Planner, on a nomination form approved by the Landmarks Commission. The nomination shall clearly identify the proposed landmark, landmark site, and document why it qualifies under sub. (2). The Preservation Planner may ask the person to submit additional information and documentation as needed to complete or clarify the nomination. When the Preservation Planner determines that the nomination is complete, the Preservation Planner shall refer the nomination to the Landmarks Commission.
- (4) Landmarks Commission review and public hearing. Whenever the Landmarks Commission receives a complete, accurate nomination under sub. (3), the Commission shall review the nomination. As part of its review, the Commission shall publish a hearing notice according to sec. 41.06 and hold a public hearing on the nomination. The Commission may also conduct its own investigation of the facts, as it deems necessary.
- (5) Landmarks Commission action. After the Landmarks Commission holds a public hearing and completes its review under sub. (4), the Commission shall report to the Common Council a recommendation supporting or opposing the proposed landmark designation. The Commission may recommend landmark designation subject to terms and conditions that are consistent with this chapter. The Commission shall send a notice of the recommendation to each owner of record of each lot on which the proposed landmark is located at least 10 days before any meeting at which the Common Council may act on the Commission's recommendation.
- (6) Common Council action. After considering the Landmarks Commission's report recommendation under sub. (5), and based on the standards under sub. (2), the Common Council shall vote to designate or decline to designate the property as a landmark. The City Clerk shall promptly notify the Building Inspector and the City Assessor of each landmark designation. The City Clerk shall record the designation with the Dane County Register of Deeds at the City's expense.
- (7) Voluntary supplemental restrictions. The Common Council may at any time supplement the terms of a landmark designation, pursuant to an agreement between the landmark

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.