

**TOWN OF PERRY, DANE COUNTY, WISCONSIN
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
APPROVED MEETING MINUTES for March 6, 2017**

1. Chair Doug Nelson called the meeting to order at 8:05 p.m.
2. Commissioners in attendance were: Don Mueller, Doug Nelson, and Renaye Leach. Gary Boley and Brad Grundahl attended by conference telephone call.
3. Other attendees were: Margaret Berg, Linda Bluschke, and Rick Fredrickson.
4. Motion made and seconded to approve the minutes of the January 26, 2017 meeting. Motion carried. Approved minutes will be sent to the Town Clerk.
5. The Commission then addressed the review of an Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness submitted by the Hauge Church Preservation Association via the Town Clerk and received on February 6, 2017. The Application seeks the Commission's approval of a boundary 2-rail & post fence on the Hauge Log Church Historic Site.

Brad moved to approve this application as it is written. Don seconded. Discussion followed. The question was called and the Application was approved unanimously.
6. Renaye then presented the following motion:

I think it important for clarity and future practice that the Commission fully disclose its perspectives and observations relating to the motion we just passed. Therefore I move that the Commission enter into its official record the following statement, which will be conveyed to the Town, the Association, and the appropriate offices of Wisconsin State Historical Society. The statement reads:

In deference to the presumptive right of individual or corporate property owners to demarcate their property boundaries and in deference to the concern that the possibility of increased traffic by park visitors to the church site might warrant the need for a security fence in the eyes of the applicant, and in light of the recent discovery of existing unmarked gravesites on the church site, the Commission voted to give its unqualified approval to the Association's application for a certificate of appropriateness for the newly constructed fence, as submitted.

However, we believe it useful to state for the record (and to avoid the establishment of inappropriate precedents for future actions by the Commission) all of the following observations relative to our decision in this matter:

First, the Commission's unqualified, ex post facto approval in the instance of the already constructed fence was significantly influenced by our strong desire to terminate an unproductive contentiousness and facilitate a renewed cooperation between the Town and the Association in fulfilling their respective roles relating to the Hauge Historic District.

Second, the Commission believes that any future proposed action, by any party, that requires a certificate of appropriateness should be applied for and receive Commission approval prior to the execution of the proposed action.

Third, while the Commission believes that the simple and rustic post and rail fence built by the Association does not detract significantly from the general historical character of the site, the Commission wants to make clear that we have no evidence that the newly constructed fence replaces or replicates (in design, extent or location) any fence that was clearly known to have existed at an earlier period. It is a new construction.

Fourth, the Town's Historic Preservation Ordinance and the Hauge Historic District Overlay Plan clearly instructs the Commission to promote visitation and the general public's enjoyment and use of its designated historic sites and districts. In light of that responsibility, the Commission respectfully encourages the Association to consider appropriate modifications to the newly constructed fence to allow freer pedestrian ingress and egress between the park and the site.

Brad seconded the motion. Discussion ensued, regarding concern about the definition of new construction vs. reconstruction. Doug offered a friendly amendment to change wording from:

...”the Commission wants to make clear that we have no evidence that the newly constructed fence replaces or replicates (in design, extent or location) any fence that was clearly known to have existed at an earlier period. It is a new construction”...

to:

“the Commission wants to make clear that we have no evidence that the newly constructed fence *either does or does not* replace or replicate (in design, extent or location) any fence that was clearly known to have existed at an earlier period. It is a new construction.”

Renaye and Brad accepted the change. After further discussion concerning definition, another friendly amendment was offered by Doug to strike: “*It is a new construction.*” Renaye did not agree to this change and then Doug offered to strike the sentence as a new amendment, seconded by Don. This amendment to strike the sentence carried 3 to 2. After more discussion the question was called and the original motion, as amended, carried 3 to 1, with 1 abstention.

The approved statement reads:

I think it important for clarity and future practice that the Commission fully disclose its perspectives and observations relating to the motion we just passed. Therefore I move that the Commission enter into its official record the following statement, which will be conveyed to the Town, the Association, and the appropriate offices of Wisconsin State Historical Society. The statement reads:

In deference to the presumptive right of individual or corporate property owners to demarcate their property boundaries and in deference to the concern that the possibility of increased traffic by park visitors to the church site might warrant the need for a security fence in the eyes of the applicant, and in light of the recent discovery of existing unmarked gravesites on the church site, the Commission voted to give its unqualified approval to the Association's application for a certificate of appropriateness for the newly constructed fence, as submitted.

However, we believe it useful to state for the record (and to avoid the establishment of inappropriate precedents for future actions by the Commission) all of the following observations relative to our decision in this matter:

First, the Commission's unqualified, ex post facto approval in the instance of the already constructed fence was significantly influenced by our strong desire to terminate an unproductive contentiousness and facilitate a renewed cooperation between the Town and the Association in fulfilling their respective roles relating to the Hauge Historic District.

Second, the Commission believes that any future proposed action, by any party, that requires a certificate of appropriateness should be applied for and receive Commission approval prior to the execution of the proposed action.

Third, while the Commission believes that the simple and rustic post and rail fence built by the Association does not detract significantly from the general historical character of the site, the Commission wants to make clear that we have no evidence that the newly constructed fence either does or does not replace or replicate (in design, extent or location) any fence that was clearly known to have existed at an earlier period.

Fourth, the Town's Historic Preservation Ordinance and the Hauge Historic District Overlay Plan clearly instructs the Commission to promote visitation and the general public's enjoyment and use of its designated historic sites and districts. In light of that responsibility, the Commission respectfully encourages the Association to consider appropriate modifications to the newly constructed fence to allow freer pedestrian ingress and egress between the park and the site.

7. Comments and questions were then heard and answered from town residents and other guests.

8. "Other business properly presented" included Brad stating that as in the Commission's motion he hoped that the Association would consider opening this fence to the park. Renaye then posed a question to Rick Fredrickson concerning the helpfulness of a new procedure in which a letter was sent from the Commission to the applicant acknowledging receipt of the application and notice of the Commission meeting date on which the application would be addressed. Rick stated that it was helpful.

9. The next meeting will be scheduled by email for some time in May unless pressing business is presented to the Commission before then.

10. Gary moved to adjourn the meeting. Don seconded. The meeting adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

Approved Minutes Respectfully submitted by Renaye Leach, Secretary Perry Historic Commission 09/11/2017

Respectfully drafted by Renaye Leach, Commission Secretary

Respectfully submitted by Doug Nelson, Chair, Perry Historic Commission