

## **OFFICIAL NOTICE AND AGENDA**

The City of Stoughton will hold a **Regular** meeting of the **Landmarks Commission** on **Thursday, December 13, 2018 at 6:30 pm** in the **Hall of Fame Room, Lower Level, City Hall, 381 E. Main Street**, Stoughton, Wisconsin, 53589.

### **AGENDA:**

1. Call to order.
2. Consider approval of the November 8, 2018 meeting minutes.
3. Discuss status of 1892 High School.
4. Status update for the Power Plant building.
5. Review and make recommendations for amending zoning code section 78-518.
6. Discuss Linderud photo collection.
7. Discuss community outreach.
8. Discuss 2018 Preservation Award.
9. Status of 2017 & 2018 grants.
10. 2019 Budget Update.
11. Discuss funding options available for the downtown area.
12. Commission Reports/Calendar.
13. Future agenda items.
14. Adjournment.

12/4/18mps

### **COMMISSIONERS:**

Peggy Veregin, Chair  
Alan Hedstrom, Vice-Chair  
Kristi Panthofer

Tom Majewski (Council Rep)  
Greg Pigarelli, Secretary

Kimberly Cook  
Todd Hubing

### **EMAIL NOTICES:**

Art Wendt  
Council Members  
Receptionists  
Roger Springman

Desi Weum  
Matt Dregne, City Attorney  
smonette@stolib.org

Stoughton Hub  
Leadership Team  
Joe DeRose

**For security reasons, the front door of City Hall will be locked after 4:30 P.M. (including the elevator door). Please use the east employee entrance.**

**IF YOU ARE DISABLED AND NEED ASSISTANCE, PLEASE CALL 873-6677 PRIOR TO THE MEETING.**

**NOTE: AN EXPANDED MEETING MAY CONSTITUTE A QUORUM OF THE COUNCIL.**

## **Landmarks Commission Meeting Minutes**

**Thursday November 8, 2018 – 6:30 pm**

**City Hall, Hall of Fame Room, Lower Level, 381 E. Main Street, Stoughton, WI.**

**Members Present:** Alan Hedstrom, Vice-Chair; Greg Pigarelli, Secretary; Tom Majewski; Kimberly Cook; and Todd Hubing, Kristy Panthofer

**Absent:** Peggy Veregin, Chair

**Staff:** None

**Guests:** None

1. **Call to order.** Hedstrom called the meeting to order at 6:34 pm.
2. **Consider approval of the Landmarks Commission meeting minutes of October 11, 2018.**  
Motion by **Hubing** to approve the minutes as presented, 2<sup>nd</sup> by **Cook**. Motion carried 6 – 0.
3. **Status update for the Power Plant building.**  
Discussed dam and raceway removal.
4. **Status update for Highway Trailer / Moline Plow building redevelopment.**  
The October 10, 2018 RDA minutes are provided in the packet.

Thirty feet of north side of blacksmith building wall blew in during high winds last week. Council talked of lifting demolition moratorium. The project might be beyond saving.

5. **Discuss Linderud photo collection.**  
Hubing - historicstoughton.org. Hubing provided an example of screen print with watermark. Commission discussed watermark to satisfy the Stoughton Historical Society requirements for website use. Example photo was 800 pixel wide and low resolution. Dave Kalland will be speaking about the collection at the next Our Old House meeting on November 15 at Learn EMC.
6. **Discuss Community Outreach.**  
Hedstrom - farmers market outreach table discussion.  
Panthofer - logo, banner design & content marketing with social media on hold for personal reasons.
7. **Discuss 2018 Preservation Award.**  
Veregin plans to write a letter for the preservation award. A presentation is anticipated at the December 11<sup>th</sup> Council meeting.  
  
2018 award to Badger Theater. Future award possibly dragon house upon completion.
8. **Status of 2017 and 2018 local landmark grants.**  
A spreadsheet summarizing the grants is provided in the packet.  
Next Tuesday the city budget will be approved with landmarks funding intact. TIF funding will have excess monies to distribute.
9. **Discuss 2019 Budget.**  
The 2019 budget will be known by November 13th.

**10. Discuss Historic Preservation Conference - Elkhart Lake.**

Hedstrom gave an overview of the historical preservation conference including a presentation by the City of Superior & “Buffalove” which were highlights of the conference. Both presentations dealt with the importance of small scale development and how it can take advantage of vacant buildings and prevent needless demolition. Notes from the Superior presentation are attached.

**11. Commission Reports/Calendar.**

Nothing discussed

**12. Future agenda items.**

Preservation awards; TIF - funding available for main Street projects; Outreach; Grants program out to a broader market

**13. Adjournment.** Motion by Majewski to adjourn at 7:38 pm, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Cook. Motion carried 6 - 0.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Gregory Pigarelli*

## **Historic Preservation & Vacant Housing in Superior: From Liabilities to Assets**

by Jim Paine, Mayor of Superior

Brian Finstad, Planning Commission member, City of Superior

Jeff Skrenes, Housing Coordinator, City of Superior

Jim Paine said he became Mayor of Superior, WI, by talking about housing. For several years, historic district houses had been falling into disrepair. And people had been talking about demolishing them. People used a line, “We have the oldest housing stock in Wisconsin” to criticize that. But he also knew that people had pride in place. He started talking about making it better, and trying to change talk about the “the oldest housing stock” to “the most beautiful housing stock”. But he knew he couldn’t do that by himself, and that he needed friends. At this point, he introduced his “fixers”: Plan Commissioner Brian Finstad and Housing Coordinator Jeff Skrenes. \*

Brian and Jeff took turns talking about their experiences working with distressed housing in Minneapolis, and the process they came up with to save blighted buildings instead of just demolishing them, which had been the modus operandi.

During the foreclosure crisis in 2008, almost every other house in some neighborhoods of Minneapolis was boarded up. But the rehab \$ estimate was too high to interest anyone in doing that. At the same time, they figured that the numbers used for demolition estimates were upside down, and that private guys could do rehab for half that price. But the bureaucracy of city government was such that demolition was the preferred solution. They figured they had to tell the City that their numbers were wrong. This is how they figured the cost of demolition:

\$10K - \$25K : cost to tear down

\$1K per year to mow

\$1.5K per year, lost prop tax revenue

\$30K - \$70K subsidy for new construction

**In other words, each demolished house cost taxpayers an average of ~ \$100K**

**This is also the money saved by not doing a demolition.**

So, they were able to turn things around gradually, and get some houses renovated. But progress was slow, as they were having to fight the bureaucracy to save each vacant or blighted house for someone to renovate. They figured there had to be a better way than fighting the city bureaucracy to save every blighted house from demolition, as this takes a lot of time and energy that could be better spent actually renovating the houses.

What they decided they needed was a system, and a quasi-government entity, to acquire and save the houses until they could be put up for sale, sold and then renovated.

They came up with the **Vacant House Process**. The following steps of that process list how they get from Before to After, without fighting the bureaucracy to save and eventually renovate every house.

- I. Acquisition
  - a. Donated from private party
  - b. Sale

- c. Tax forfeiture & Transfer from County (needs clear, marketable title)
- II. Public Notice of Sale (how to get word out that homes are for sale)
  - a. Statutory requirement (e.g. City website)
  - b. MLS
  - c. Demandstar or similar
  - d. Targeted to underserved groups (e.g., Spanish radio stations or print media)
  - e. Direct Outreach
- III. Standards (for RFPs of potential buyers)
  - a. End use description (e.g. homeowners)
  - b. Feasibility in proposal
  - c. Track record of applicant (e.g., slumlord? )
  - d. Design
- IV. Review (of applicant proposals)
  - a. By task force or neighborhood group
  - b. City staff
  - c. City Council
  - d. Timeline should be as close to market process as possible

It's an example of what can happen when you let market come in.

Arguments against this new approach (and counter-arguments) include:

- Have never done it before (doesn't mean it will fail)
- Did it before and didn't work (may have been administered poorly)
- Abused by slumlords (this is why you have standards)
- Nobody wants these houses (maybe they didn't know were available)
- Costs too much to repair (let small scale developer decide)

Gave example that used new process – “blue tarp house”

- Bought for \$1
- Small scale developer put \$120K into rehab
- Was listed for \$176K
- Sold for (same?)

What creates value?

- Demand
- Utility
- Scarcity
- Transferability

In other words, let the market decide, instead of letting someone say it needs demolition.

Making available for \$1, instead of paying \$20K to demolish. Almost everyone who buys a vacant house for \$1 will find a way to rehab it.

Have to keep in mind utility (usefulness). Need a change in mindset – old houses are assets, not a liability. Because when the utility of a house has expired, that's an opportunity. Then it's at a point

where it can be offered for \$1 (or modest amount), and it's also at that point where a small scale developer is willing to take it on.

Moral of the story: "There were many who thought that they had a blighted houses problem. What they didn't realize was what they actually had was a 'bureaucracy dealing with a blighted houses' problem. They just needed a more creative approach."

"You have no better ally than the market."

For more info on this topic, you can google "Vacant House Recycling Program in Minneapolis". Here are also pertinent links:

<https://nextdoor.com/agency-post/mn/minneapolis/city-of-minneapolis/learn-about-the-citys-vacant-housing-recycling-program-tour-2207-16th-avenue-south-on-friday-feb-19-21637155/>

<http://www.minneapolismn.gov/cped/housing/MinneapolisHomes>

\* Brian Finstad is from the Superior area originally, but had moved to Minneapolis about a decade ago, where he earned much of his housing experience before moving back to Superior. Jim said he appointed Brian to the Plan Commission immediately after his election. As a member of the mayor's housing task force, Brian recommended that a position be created in their planning department dedicated to housing issues. He also highly recommended hiring Jeff Skrenes, whom he had gotten to know in Minneapolis. Jeff worked there as a mortgage originator and what Jim said can only be described as a "housing activist." After Jeff was hired, he moved to Superior and bought a distressed house in a distressed neighborhood.

CITY OF STOUGHTON, 381 E. Main Street, Stoughton, WI 53589

ORDINANCE OF THE COMMON COUNCIL	
Amending Zoning Code Section 78-518 of the Stoughton Municipal Code	
Committee Action: Planning Commission recommends approval - 0	
Fiscal Impact: None	
File Number: O - - 2019	Date Introduced:

The Common Council of the City of Stoughton do ordain as follows:

Sec. 78-518. - Residential historic design overlay zoning district.

- 1) *Purpose.* This district is intended to implement the ~~urban design~~ cultural resource recommendations of the comprehensive plan, by preserving and enhancing the historical quality of Stoughton's historic neighborhoods. As emphasized by said Plan, this district is designed to forward aesthetic objectives of the city by controlling the appearance of development within the district in a manner which is consistent with ~~historic neighborhood~~ residential design guidelines principles as outlined in the "Caring for Historic Houses in Stoughton" guide dated 1998. The application of these standards will ensure long-term progress and broad participation toward these principles.
- 2) *Boundaries.* The Northwest Side Historic District, Southwest Side Historic District, East Side Historic District, and the East Park Historic District as established by the Stoughton Landmarks Commission and as depicted on the ~~official~~ overlay districts zoning map.
- 3) *Residential design theme.* The residential design theme is generally characterized by a variety of architectural styles popular at the time, including Queen Anne, Italianate, ~~Classical~~ Colonial Revival, ~~Arts and Crafts~~ Bungalow, Greek Revival and American Foursquare. These homes have generous street-yard, side-yard and rear-yard setbacks, and are well-landscaped with a mixture of canopy and understory yard trees, and foundation shrubs and/or flower beds. ~~For illustrative purposes, examples of architectural styles which tend to have elements incompatible with Downtown historic styles include (with no attempt to be inclusive) Spanish Mission, Scandinavian Modern, Bavarian, and California Contemporary.~~
- 4) ~~Designated historic structures~~ Locally recognized structures, and local districts, and the role of the landmarks commission. The landmarks commission is charged with recommending historic designations ~~on~~ for locally recognized landmarks, landmark sites, and locally recognized historic districts within the city to the city council, as fully described in chapter 38 ~~article II~~ of the Municipal Code.

The landmarks commission shall have regulatory power for locally-recognized landmarks and locally recognized districts; such landmarks are required to obtain a certificate of appropriateness to make exterior changes to the property.

At the request of the property owner, ~~city staff, or the plan commission,~~ the landmarks commission shall advise on design components of properties which are not locally-recognized landmarks.

- 5) *Residential design guidelines.* The residential design guidelines adapted from Caring for Historic Homes in Stoughton, a booklet produced by Landscape Research, Ltd. for the Commission in 1998, shall only apply as a guide to homes in this district ~~that are, locally-recognized landmarks. However, these guidelines can serve as suggestions to other properties in this district.~~

This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its date of publication.

Dates

Council Adopted: \_\_\_\_\_

Mayor Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Published: \_\_\_\_\_

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tim Swadley, Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Holly Licht, City Clerk



**2017 GRANT FUNDING**

APPLICANT	PROPERTY	PROJECT SUMMARY	GRANT AMOUNT	COA APPROVAL	PROJECT APPROVAL	FUNDS PAID	NOTES
TONY HILL	BADGER THEATER, 255 E. MAIN STREET	FIX CRUMBLING CONCRETE FAÇADE	\$2,500.00	4/12/2018	8/9/2018	8/10/2018	Completed
MICHAEL ENGELBERGER	SOUTH SCHOOL, 1009 SUMMIT AVENUE	FOUNDATION REPAIR	\$875.00	2/8/2018	7/5/2018	7/9/2018	Completed
ERIC FRANCKSEN	327 E. WASHINGTON STREET	FOUNDATION REPAIR	\$625.00	9/20/2018			1 YR EXTENSION APPROVED 5/10/18
		<b>TOTAL 2017 FUNDING:</b>	<b>\$4,000.00</b>				

**2018 GRANT FUNDING**

APPLICANT	PROPERTY		GRANT AMOUNT	COA APPROVAL	PROJECT APPROVAL	FUNDS PAID	NOTES
STOUGHTON SCHOOLS	1892 HIGH SCHOOL, 320 NORTH STREET	TUCKPOINTING	\$1,000.00	3/8/2018	7/12/2018	7/25/2018	Completed
BILL WEBER	RR DEPOT, 529 E. MAIN STREET	TUCKPOINTING	\$1,500.00	8/9/2018			Permit issued
JOSEPH CABIBBO	404 S. FIFTH STREET	FRONT PORCH REPAIRS	\$2,500.00	9/20/2018			
		<b>TOTAL 2018 FUNDING:</b>	<b>\$5,000.00</b>				

**2019 GRANT FUNDING**

APPLICANT	PROPERTY		GRANT AMOUNT	COA APPROVAL	PROJECT APPROVAL	FUNDS PAID	NOTES
		<b>TOTAL 2019 FUNDING:</b>	<b>\$5,000.00</b>				

## **Landmarks Commission 2019 Budget Request.**

The Stoughton Landmarks Commission is requesting funding to continue the Local Landmark Mini Grant Program that began in 2017. The program provides façade improvement and repair matching grants to help facilitate reinvestment in our community. Only owners of locally landmarked buildings are eligible for the grants. These mini-grants will be for exterior repair projects although interior projects may be considered if those projects involve structural issues or mechanical improvements. Since many local landmarks are on Main Street, these grants will facilitate reinvestment in downtown buildings while grants to other local landmarks will help maintain the character of our historic neighborhoods.

Building owners must apply to the Landmarks Commission for the matching grants with a thoroughly developed scope of work that complies with Stoughton's historic preservation design guidelines and meets the National Park Service's Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The Landmarks Commission will reach out to owners of Stoughton local landmark buildings to inform them of this matching grant program. These matching grants are an excellent way for the City to demonstrate its commitment to local reinvestment in our historic Main Street and neighborhoods while supporting residents who own historic buildings in our community.

Our grant budget for 2018 was \$5,000.00 and we received grant applications totaling more than \$30,000.00. The funding we have received to date has been awarded, the money is now encumbered and waiting for disbursement.

While we have had positive public response, and requests for funding that far outpace our program budget, we are not asking for an increase in the grant budget this year. We prefer to be able to demonstrate a track record of success (completed projects) before asking for another increase. Our request for funding is the same as what we requested for 2018.

### **2019 Mini Grant Budget request: \$5,000.00**

The Landmarks Commission is responsible for installing small bronze plaques on the exterior of buildings when they are designated as local landmarks. In 2018, we designated two new local landmarks, and the two landmarks most recently designated, prior to 2018, also have not received plaques. We request funding to purchase these plaques.

### **Landmark Budget request for Plaques, Website hosting and administration: \$1000.00**

The Plan Commission, Landmarks Commission, City Staff and others have been discussing the need to create a Local Downtown Historic District which would create a level playing field for all properties within the Historic Downtown and protect the investment of owners and residents of the community. The Local Downtown Historic District would replace the existing Downtown Design Overlay Zoning District. There are many positives to creating a Local Downtown Historic District such as encouraging better consistent quality design and enhancing business recruitment potential. With this increased desire to create a Local Downtown Historic District, the Landmarks Commission has begun planning and outreach in 2018 with the intent to formally start the process in 2019.

**Budget request to begin the process to create a Local Downtown Historic District which includes seeking a request for proposal to draft the nomination for the district and mapping of the district area: \$8,000.00**

**Total Budget request: \$14,000.00**

**APPROVED**