



Historic Preservation Commission

Regular Meeting

335 South Broadway
De Pere, WI 54115
<http://www.de-pere.org>

Final Minutes

Monday, August 15, 2016

6:00 PM

De Pere City Hall Council Chambers

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM by Chairperson Mike Fleck

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Scott Crevier	Aldersperson	Present	
Mike Fleck	Chairperson	Present	
Gene Hackbarth	Commissioner	Present	
Brian Netzel	Vice Chairperson	Present	
Kate Sabel	Commissioner	Present	
Sue Sands	Commissioner	Present	
Adam Turriff	Commissioner	Excused	

Also present: City Planner Peter Schleinz.

2. Approval of the minutes of the June 20, 2016 Historic Preservation Commission meeting.

Gene Hackbarth motioned, seconded by Scott Crevier, to approve the minutes. Upon vote, motion carried unanimously.

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Gene Hackbarth, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Scott Crevier, Aldersperson
AYES:	Crevier, Fleck, Hackbarth, Netzel, Sabel, Sands
EXCUSED:	Adam Turriff

3. Discussion regarding the status of the Wisconsin Historical Society Grant for an Intensive Survey Update.

City Planner Peter Schleinz reported that on June 20, 2016, the City received a signed memorandum of agreement for a \$19,000 grant to conduct an intensive survey update. He outlined a timeline which provided a staff-created summary of the steps that need to be taken in order to complete the survey, which needs to be completed by September 30, 2017. The city is currently in the process of drafting a request for qualifications, an RFQ, in order to begin the process of finding a consultant who can perform the survey. He outlined the four sections of this project:

- 1.) Reconnaissance survey with survey maps
- 2.) Intensive survey
- 3.) Site-specific research
- 4.) Preparation of an intensive survey report

Peter explained that a quarterly report must be submitted to the state regarding the status of the project. Once a consultant is hired, they will submit the information to Peter and he will submit it to the state. At these times, reimbursements can be requested as well. Peter stated that it is most likely that reimbursements will be requested in 2017, either in one lump sum or in two halves. Mike Fleck asked if requests for proposals have been submitted. Peter stated that the requests are being prepared at the present time and his goal is that they will be completed by the end of August. Scott Crevier asked what the difference was between a reconnaissance survey and an intensive survey. Peter explained that a reconnaissance survey looks at the data that we already have readily available

including data from past surveys, while an intensive survey will provide new information to help identify specific projects. Scott then asked when the Historic Preservation Commission will need to take action on this project. Peter replied that the next time action will need to be taken is when it is time to hire a consultant, which will be in either September or October. This action will be in the form of a recommendation to the City Council. Gene Hackbarth remarked that there is nothing on the calendar regarding an actual presentation on the intensive survey results. Peter replied that a presentation can be included if the Commission desires. He asked if Gene is interested in a presentation among the HPC members or to the general public. Gene replied that because it is an intensive survey of properties within the community, he would like to see it as a presentation made available to the general public, with the possibility of making it available through the city's website and also as a hard copy. Mike Fleck added that there should be a lot of new areas opened up to districts since there will be many more homes over 50 years of age since the last survey was conducted in 2001. Scott Crevier questioned whether the survey results would be in depth or would they be more generic with just dates and numbers. Gene noted that the 2001 Intensive Survey was in-depth and provided a guideline for moving forward with potential historic districts or individual properties being listed.

RESULT:	NO ACTION
----------------	------------------

4. Review and Recommendation on the Historic Preservation Commission Proposed Budget for Year 2017.

City Planner Peter Schleinz reported on the proposed budget for 2017, which had an approximate 3% reduction from 2016. He pointed out that the total budget of \$29,110 includes a grant of \$19,000 which will be spent in 2017. In comparison to previous years, seminars/conferences were reduced to reflect the approximate amount that was spent in previous years. A small amount was removed from travel expense and office supplies to get to the 3% reduction. Gene Hackbarth asked whether the grant to the De Pere Historical Society will remain the same at \$5050. Peter confirmed that this amount has not changed at all. Gene Hackbarth motioned, seconded by Scott Crevier, to approve the budget for 2017. Upon vote, motion carried unanimously.

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Gene Hackbarth, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Scott Crevier, Alderperson
AYES:	Crevier, Fleck, Hackbarth, Netzel, Sabel, Sands
EXCUSED:	Adam Turriff

5. Discussion regarding the Wisconsin Historical Society's Historic Places Photo Contest.

City Planner Peter Schleinz notified the Commission on the Historic Places Photo Contest, which is sponsored by the Wisconsin Historical Society. The photo contest will feature fifty photographs and the submission deadline is October 7, 2016. Peter encouraged the members to submit their own photos, as well as tell their friends about the contest in order to highlight some of the historical sites of De Pere.

RESULT:	NO ACTION
----------------	------------------

6. Discussion regarding status of Broadway Historic Plaques.

City Planner Peter Schleinz reported on the Broadway historic plaque project, which was suspended after staff changes occurred earlier in 2016. Approximately 15 homeowners

were originally interested in the program and the plan is to contact them to see if they are still interested in receiving a plaque. The City will mail letters to the owners after establishing the costs for the plaques. The plan is to collect the fees this fall and install the plaques next spring, or possibly in winter if it is mild enough. Originally 54 individuals were surveyed. Gene Hackbarth mentioned that a few properties have changed ownership since the original survey went out and suggested that they should be contacted to see if the new owners would like to receive a plaque since they were not included in the original survey. Peter replied that he would verify any ownership changes and contact any new property owners to see if they would be interested in getting a plaque.

RESULT: NO ACTION

7. Review and Recommendation of funding for the Historic Preservation Commission members to attend the 2016 Tenth Annual Local History and Historic Preservation Conference.

City Planner Peter Schleinz stated that if registration occurs by August 26, the cost per attendee to attend the conference for two days is \$100 and one day is \$58. Gene Hackbarth mentioned that he would like to attend the conference and Mike Fleck polled the remaining members to see if anyone else would be interested in attending. No one else was interested in attending. Gene suggested contacting Adam Turriff to inquire if he'd like to attend, since he was absent from the meeting. Peter said that he would contact Adam to see if he'd like to attend.

RESULT: NO ACTION

8. Review of Revisions to the Historic Preservation Commission Ordinance to allow the Historic Preservation Commission to designate historic buildings with the acceptance of property owners.

City Planner Peter Schleinz explained that in order to retain the ability to apply for grants, such as the recent \$19,000 grant that was received, as well as to retain CLG status, changes need to be made to the Historic Preservation ordinance. There are three parts of the ordinance change that need to be reviewed. The first change identifies the city as having the ability to designate a historic landmark or establish a historic district and the process for public notification that is related to that. The second change is the property owner having the ability to appeal a decision and the Common Council having the ability to overturn a recommendation for such a designation. The third change creates the appeal process in the case that the property owner disagrees with the Commission's designation. Peter explained that at this time, the intent is to look over the text and discuss any changes the Commission feels are important. Then next month, they can take formal action to recommend approval to the Common Council. Scott Crevier asked how the approval of the property owner is obtained. Peter replied that a notification to the property owner is required prior to Commission action on the designation. He stated that the City shall, by first class mail, notify the property owner of the designation and also the time and place of the public hearing. Scott Crevier questioned the language of the third section, which states that an owner of a property that is affected by a decision of a city landmarks commission may appeal the decision to the common council. He questioned whether that statement means that a neighbor or another person other than the property owner could appeal the decision. Peter stated that he would look into it further to clarify that statement before next month's meeting.

RESULT: NO ACTION

Adjournment

Scott Crevier moved, seconded by Sue Sands, to adjourn the meeting at 6:39 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Kelly Barker