

OFFICIAL NOTICE AND AGENDA

The City of Stoughton will hold a **Regular** meeting of the **Landmarks Commission** on **Thursday, May 12, 2016, at 7:00 pm** in the **Hall of Fame Room, Lower Level, City Hall, 381 E. Main Street, Stoughton, WI.**

AGENDA:

1. Call to order.
2. Consider approval of the Landmarks Commission meeting minutes of April 14, 2016.
3. Elect Chair
4. Elect Vice-Chair
5. Elect Secretary
6. Workshop to discuss the role of the Landmarks Commission.
7. Status Update for 1892 High School.
8. Status update on the Linderud exhibit and collectables from Art Wendt.
9. Commission Reports/Calendar.
10. Future agenda items.
11. Adjournment.

5/2/16mps

COMMISSIONERS:

Peggy Veregin, Chair
Alan Hedstrom, Vice-Chair
Josh Mabie

Kathleen Tass Johnson (Council Rep)
Greg Pigarelli, Secretary

Kimberly Cook
Stephen Mar-Pohl

EMAIL NOTICES:

Art Wendt
Council Members
DErickson@madison.com
Steve Kittelson

Kelli Krcma
Matt Dregne, City Attorney
Receptionists

Stoughton Hub
Leadership Team
smonette@stolib.org

Note: 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

Monday, April 14, 2016 – 7:00 p.m.

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

Members Present: Peggy Veregin, Chair; Alan Hedstrom, Vice-Chair; Kimberly Cook; Greg Pigarelli; Michael Engelberger; Stephen Mar-Pohl and Josh Mabie

Absent: None

Staff: Zoning Administrator, Michael Stacey

Guests: Todd Hubing and Jamae Ramsden

1. **Call to order.** Peggy called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.
2. **Consider approval of the Landmarks Commission meeting minutes of March 10, 2016.**
Motion by **Kimberly** to approve the minutes as presented, 2nd by **Greg**. Motion carried 6 – 0.

Michael Engelberger arrived at 7:02pm

3. **Jamae Ramsden requests a certificate of appropriateness to have new seamless gutter and downspouts installed by AAA Gutters at Tobacco Junction/The Lageret, 515 E. Main Street.**

Peggy introduced the request.

Jamae Ramsden explained the intent of the request is to protect guests entering the building from rainwater and eliminate water in the basement.

The Commission had a lengthy discussion about the type of gutter and downspout to use for a replacement which is summarized as follows:

- Stephen and Michael E would like to see a gutter and downspout more period specific such as the existing half round gutter.
- Peggy, Alan and Josh believe it is reasonable to just take care of the water issues than require a more expensive replacement such as the half round gutter. The belief is the proposed gutter will not be visibly intrusive.
- Jamae Ramsden believes there are 4 downspouts in the rear and 3 in the front and the plan is to add one more to the front to handle all the stormwater.
- There is a lack of information for this request such as building elevation drawings showing the location of existing downspouts and the proposed location(s) of new downspouts, and details of how the proposed gutter would be attached to the building.
- Josh questioned regulation vs judgment for requiring half round gutter. Stephen and Michael assert it is a design standard and is part of the integrity of the building. It is part of owning a historic structure.
- Jamae stated the inability of locating a contractor that would work at that height is an issue.
- Stephen stated there should be a detail for where the additional downspout would go in front and a detail for how the gutter would be attached to the building since the attachment is different for a K style gutter than the existing half round.
- The group decided to walk down the street to inspect the property and found the following:

- There are 2 downspouts in the front and 4 in the back.
- Adding more downspouts in the front won't work well for drainage or for the historic integrity of the building. It was discovered that the primary (street facing) façade never had (and currently doesn't have) downspouts on that wall and in fact the two downspouts at each end actually are placed against the side walls of the building.
- It could not be determined where some of the downspouts in the rear drain to.
- A gap was visible in the front gutter where guests enter the building.
- The downspouts appear to be in good shape and are of substantial size and high quality. The potential for re-using these existing downspouts should be considered especially given the potential for cost savings.

The group came back to City Hall for further discussion.

Stephen believes an engineer should look at the water issue on a larger scale and recommends staying with 2 downspouts in front for the historic integrity of the building.

Motion by **Stephen** to deny the request based on the proposed 4 downspouts in the front of the building, 2nd by **Michael**.

The group discussed whether they could approve the back portion of the request. Peggy stated they could.

Stephen stated a detail for how the K style gutter is attached to the building is necessary.

Peggy gave reasons to Table the request to allow time for more information.

Motion by **Michael** to Table the request to allow for more information to be provided, 2nd by **Stephen**.

- Provide a detail for how the K style gutter would be attached to the building.
- The existing downspouts appear to be in good shape and could remain.
- The front may need to be engineered to evaluate how the water from the roof is handled.
- Provide building elevation drawings showing the locations of existing and proposed gutter and downspouts.
- Investigate possible repair of the gutter. Stephen offered to help find someone that could investigate the repair.
- The project could be phased: first repairing the gutters at the rear of the building and addressing the most pressing concerns for the applicant; then appropriate time could be spend investigating an appropriate solution for the primary (street facing) facade of the building.

Motion carried 6 – 1 (Josh voted no)

Stephen rescinded his original motion to deny.

Michael S will email Jamae with information. Jamae will contact Stephen next week to gain information about the repair of the gutter.

4. Discuss WAHPC Conference April 22-23, 2016, Green Bay and De Pere.

Peggy stated registration is still open. The Commission has historically reimbursed Commissioners for registration and accommodations. Alan stated he may go and Peggy plans to go.

Motion by Michael E to approve paying for registration and lodging for 2 Commission members with Commission funds, 2nd by Stephen. Motion carried 7 -0.

5. Status Update for 1892 High School.

Peggy stated that a coalition of four local organizations has come together with the goal of repairing and finding a use for the building. The Landmarks Commission is represented in the Coalition.

A presentation has been made at the Chamber of Commerce. More community outreach is being planned.

There is an event at 3pm Saturday April 30th at Wendigo for volunteers.

6. Discuss New Landmark Preservation Law (former AB 568).

Peggy provided a copy of Wis Act 176. There are no law changes that affect the Stoughton Landmark Ordinance.

7. Discuss Linderud Collection.

Alan brought pictures provided by Art Wendt who is moving to Minneapolis. Peggy suggested a sub-committee to figure out how to handle the Linderud Collection.

Josh suggested collaborating with the Library to allow the public access to the collection.

The collection will remain in the safe until a decision is made.

8. Commission Reports/Calendar.

May is Preservation month.

The group discussed the annual preservation award and timing of the presentation.

Peggy suggested a proclamation at Council. Michael S will send Peggy a boilerplate proclamation.

9. Future agenda items. None discussed.

10. Adjournment. Motion by Alan to adjourn at 9:25 pm, 2nd by Stephen. Motion carried 7 – 0.

Respectfully Submitted, *Michael Stacey*