

MINUTES  
City of Monona  
Landmarks Commission  
Wednesday September 8, 2021

Chair Goforth called the meeting of the Monona Landmarks Commission to order at 4:33 PM.

Present: Chair Kristie Goforth, Mr. John Chapman, Ms. Anne Wellman, Ms. Peggy Michaelis, Ms. Branda Weix, Mr. Rick Bernstein and Ms. Rebecca Holmquist

Absent: None

Also Present: Douglas Plowman, City Planner

**Approval of Minutes**

A motion by Mr. Bernstein, seconded by Ms. Holmquist, for the approval of the minutes of August 11, 2021 carried with no corrections.

**Appearances**

None.

**Unfinished Business**

None.

**New Business**

**A. Public Hearing on Certificate of Appropriateness for a Demolition Permit for a Monona Landmarked Structure at 4227 Winnequah Road – Springhaven Pagoda. (Case No. Z-020-2021)**

Ms. Ann Waidelich, President of the Historic Blooming Grove Historical Society appeared to share her concern with the demolition request. She is discouraged by the need to take the Pagoda down, and hopes it can be saved or preserved. She recommended that other opinions be gathered from other contractors to address some of the structural issues on the existing structures. Concrete restoration contractors were shared with the Commission, including Terry Marsh who has done work in the City of Madison, and it was recommended that others be consulted prior to a determination being made. There were no other appearances and the public hearing was closed.

**B. Consideration of Action on Certificate of Appropriateness for a Demolition Permit for a Monona Landmarked Structure at 4227 Winnequah Road – Springhaven Pagoda. (Case No. Z-020-2021)**

Chair Goforth introduced the application and referenced the relevant section of the City Ordinance. Mr. Bernstein shared that if there is time it would make sense to get a second opinion. The roof may not be the priority (given it has already been discussed extensively), but the columns and foundation instead. Other contractors were discussed by the Commission including Wes Masonry, and CMR out of Milwaukee. Ms. Holmquist added that other opinions would be great for reconstruction, but as far as she is concerned the structural integrity due diligence has been completed. There has been a structural report completed, as well as opinions from multiple engineers.

The Commission discussed the differences between the 2016 Historic Preservation Report and the existing conditions as present today, as well as the speed of deterioration. Ms. Holmquist responded that in 2016 the base was not as exposed as it is now, meaning a full structural review was not conducted. Instead, just the front edge was excavated for further review. It was

not the same structural review of the Pagoda, and the scope focused on if the columns were in the same deteriorated condition as the roof (as this was already agreed to be in poor shape). Concerns were raised by Mr. Chapman about the safety of the site given the park is opening imminently, and what would be needed to protect park users.

There was discussion of the time sensitivity to make a decision given the existing machinery on site and efficiencies with the park project. Commission members discussed the possibility of waiting to make a determination until after another opinion has been gathered and how a later decision may impact any future installation.

There was discussion of the deteriorated condition of the foundations. City Planner Plowman responded that his understanding was that it was more a matter of timing. The excavation that took place around the Pagoda allowed for the ground level to be lowered closer to the base, and for the full condition to be viewed unlike during the 2016 Preservation Plan. In discussion with the engineers there is a sense that the construction technique itself was flawed and caused the deterioration in the foundation.

The Commission discussed getting a second opinion on the structural integrity of the Pagoda. Ms. Weix added that cost savings should not expedite the decision process, and that if the delay is caused in order to get another opinion, it is the correct decision for the Commission to make. Mr. Bernstein added that the Pagoda should be protected in the interim, especially during the winter. Ms. Holmquist added that she felt the Commission has done their due-diligence given who has shared their opinion already. Mr. Chapman's main concern is the safety of park visitors, but added that it should be limited to just a second opinion. He added somebody could likely restore the Pagoda, but it may take a lot of time and money. That would be another point the Commission would need to discuss and be prepared for. Ms. Holmquist added that multiple experts have inspected the Pagoda in the last 5 years, and RFP's have been issued for restoration with limited interest. She added that the safety and integrity of the structure is of concern.

There was discussion between the Commission as to the firm that should review the structure, and what deliverable would be desired to inform the ongoing discussion. The preference from the Commission was for CMR, with Wes Masonry second.

A motion was made by Mr. Bernstein and seconded by Ms. Michaelis to table the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a Demolition Permit for a Monona Landmark Structure - Springhaven Pagoda.

The motion carried 5-2 (Ms. Holmquist and Mr. Chapman voted nay).

Fencing around the Pagoda was discussed, and City Planner Plowman will work with the Parks Director to have something temporary installed shortly. Ms. Wellman asked about the boulder placement in the park, and Planner Plowman will check with the Parks Director for specifics. Ms. Weix asked if the Parks Board were aware of the current Pagoda situation. Planner Plowman responded that Alder Wood shared the Landmarks meeting materials with the Board via email so they were aware.

A motion was made by Mr. Bernstein and seconded by Mr. Chapman to pursue a second opinion from either CMR or Wes Masonry for a consult on the structural integrity of the Pagoda as well as the possibility of preservation or restoration of the existing structure.

The motion carried 6-1 (Ms. Holmquist voted nay).

**C. Staff Updates**

**i. National Register Nomination Update**

City Planner Plowman shared that the National Register CLG grant extension is currently with the City Attorney for review. This will add a one-year extension to the grant funding and run through mid-September 2022. Mr. Aro has a few questions about the nomination process, and Planner Plowman is working to set up a meeting to continue the discussion. Ms. Weix shared that she has not been able to meet with Mr. Schwenn regarding his property nomination but has stopped by there a number of times.

**ii. Updates/Discussion on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Efforts**

Mr. Bernstein shared that the City of Madison conducted a survey to find significant properties for diverse communities and asked if this could be a possibility in the City. He also shared that the Harry Whitehorse shop is still present and it could be the site of a possible historical marker.

**D. Landmarks Commission Requests for City Staff**

Chair Goforth asked if a tour of the Frank Allis house could be set up. A number of new Commission members have not had the chance to tour it. City Planner Plowman will coordinate schedules and facilitate a tour.

**Upcoming meetings**

Upcoming meetings are scheduled for October 13, 2021 and November 10, 2021

**Adjournment**

A motion by Ms. Michaelis, seconded by Ms. Holmquist, to adjourn carried. (5:49 PM)

Submitted by,

Douglas Plowman, City Planner