Reconnaissance and Intensive Survey of Historical and Architectural Sites In La Crosse County, Wisconsin Towns of Campbell, Medary, Hamilton and Bangor 1950 to 1985



Elmer and Evelyn Schultz House, 3525 Lakeshore Dr., Town of Campbell

Barbara M. Kooiman, M.A. Architectural Historian/Historian Kevin Hundt – Historian 2018

Achnowledgements

The La Crosse County Reconnaissance and Intensive Survey Report was funded through a Certified Local Government (CLG) grant awarded to the La Crosse County Historic Sites Preservation Commission from the National Park Service and the Wisconsin Historical Society, Historic Preservation Division in Madison, Wisconsin.

Survey Staff

Barbara M. Kooiman, M.A., Architectural Historian/Historian, Principal Investigator Kevin Hundt, Historian, Research Assistant

Barbara Kooiman would like to thank the following people for their support and assistance:

La Crosse County Board

Tara Johnson, Chair Alice Sorenson, Administrative Assistant to Tara Johnson

La Crosse County Historic Sites Preservation Commission

Vicki Twinde-Javner, Chair King Holley Roger Plesha Harriet Schuppel Kent Sween Anita Doering

Wisconsin Historical Society, Historic Preservation Division

Joe De Rose, CLG and Survey Coordinator Daina Penkiunas, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer



The La Crosse County Reconnaissance and Intensive Survey was prepared through a Certified Local Government (CLG) grant from the Wisconsin Historical Society as granted to the La Crosse County Historic Sites Preservation Commission. The project was conducted from November 2017 to September 2018 by Barbara Kooiman, historian/architectural historian, with the assistance of Kevin Hundt, historian. Ms. Kooiman looked at four unincorporated townships in the county; Campbell, Medary, Hamilton and Bangor. In her field work she re-surveyed previously surveyed properties that were recorded in the Wisconsin Historical Society's Architecture History Inventory (AHI) database. She also added new properties which were constructed between 1950 and 1985 to the survey and database. Between the four townships, Ms. Kooiman added 70 new properties to the AHI database, finding a total of seven (7) properties which potentially meet the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 – Methodology1
Chapter 2 – Historic Overview5
Chapter 3 – Township Histories (1950 to 1985)9
Campbell
Medary
Hamilton
Bangor
Chapter 4 – Architecture23
Chapter 5 – Survey Results29
Chapter 6 – Recommendations
Bibliography43
Appendix

La Crosse County Historic Preservation Ordinance

Chapter 1 Methodology

The La Crosse County Reconnaissance and Intensive Survey consultant selection of Barbara Kooiman, architectural historian, was made by the La Crosse County Historic Sites Preservation Commission in October 2017. Shortly thereafter, Barbara Kooiman began preliminary research and preparations for field survey. Kooiman printed out all previously surveyed properties which were found in the Wisconsin Historical Society's Architecture and History Inventory (AHI) database. She prepared blank field survey forms and photo log sheets to take into the field to conduct the updated survey, focusing on properties within the four target townships of Campbell, Medary, Hamilton and Bangor built between 1950 (the end period of the previous 1990s surveys) and 1985.



Map courtesy of La Crosse Public Library Archives

Barbara Kooiman contacted La Crosse County GIS specialist Ron Roth to acquire large scale maps for field work. Each map, representing each of the four townships, had parcel lines and addresses for each parcel indicated on the maps.

Preliminary research included going to the La Crosse Public Library archives to retrieve print information in the form of published histories, newspaper articles and plat maps concerning the four townships. There was surprisingly little information which was general to the development of the rural areas of these four townships for the study period of 1950 to 1985 in the archives, with the exception of the Town of Campbell, which saw some rapid growth and newsworthy articles concerning annexation attempts of and incorporation attempts by the township.

When fall foliage was gone, Barbara Kooiman began field survey. She drove all public streets and roads of each of the four townships, photographing buildings which met survey criteria to add to the inventory. Survey criteria included any properties which were built between 1950 and 1985 and had sufficient historic material and integrity to be included into the database. The vast majority of properties added to the database were houses built during this time period. Criteria for houses included having original siding material, original windows, original front door and usually original garage doors. By this study period the "ranch style" house is ubiquitous, and front-facing garages are common, making up a large part of the façade. Therefore, original garage doors were an important component in determining if a house should be added to the AHI inventory. Barbara Kooiman also, while conducting field work, rechecked previously surveyed properties, identified if they were still extant, and took new photographs of previously surveyed properties, as well as updating the AHI database with any changes to the properties since previously surveyed.

By April 2018 Ms. Kooiman had completed the field inventory and had identified a handful of properties which she felt could be potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places

2

(NRHP). She also had begun entering the newly inventoried properties into the AHI database. Kooiman coordinated with Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer Daina Penkiunas of the Wisconsin Historical Society to look at the properties which were potentially eligible. Ms. Penkiunas looked at all of the properties which Ms. Kooiman had identified as potentially eligible, and a more concise list of potentially eligible properties was created.

Barbara Kooiman collaborated with historian Kevin Hundt to do intensive research on the properties which were identified as potentially eligible for the NRHP. Kevin conducted more detailed research on the properties, identifying previous owners, construction dates, historic uses and in some cases design details of the properties. Kevin Hundt's research material made up the bulk of the Intensive Survey portion of this project.

In August 2018 Joe De Rose, CLG and Survey Coordinator from the Wisconsin Historical Society, came to La Crosse for a scheduled public meeting about the findings of the survey. All property owners of properties identified as potentially eligible for the NRHP were invited to the public meeting, and a public notice was made in the *La Crosse Tribune*. One of the property's owners attended the meeting.

By September 2018 the project had concluded, with the survey, data entry and final report completed and submitted to the La Crosse County Historic Sites Preservation Commission and the Historic Preservation Division of the Wisconsin Historical Society, thus fulfilling the elements of the contract for this project.

Chapter **2** Historic Dverview

The area that became La Crosse County was first inhabited by Native American people about 12,000 years ago, but the first Euro-Americans did not settle in this part of Wisconsin until the 1840s and early 1850s. The name "La Crosse" was adapted from the French fur traders who when first arriving to the Mississippi River Valley in the late 1700s witnessed Native Americans playing a type of ball game on the prairie which used long sticks with a small basket on the end to scoop up a ball that was kept in play. The rough and tumble game was given the name "la crosse" by the French speakers who thought the racquet looked like a "crosier" or the staff that a Catholic bishop would carry.

The first attempt at permanent Euro-American settlement in what is today La Crosse County occurred in 1841 when fur trader Nathan Myrick moved his trade goods up the Mississippi River from Prairie du Chien to a location about 60 miles north on the banks of the Mississippi where two rivers, now known as the La Crosse and the Black rivers, flowed into the Mississippi. Myrick built his trade cabin, and within a few years other Euro-American settlers came to the area and settled the fertile alluvial soils in the river valley.¹

Wisconsin became a state in 1847, and in 1851 Crawford County was divided, resulting in the formation of the area which was to become La Crosse County. The village of La Crosse was selected as the county seat. Though the boundaries of the county changed several times, the present boundaries were finally established by 1918.²

¹ History of La Crosse County, 329, 339.

² *History of La Crosse County*, 328; La Crosse County Agriculture. 2.



La Crosse County, 1878

The four townships which are part of this report are Campbell, Medary, Hamilton and Bangor. They more or less are located in the center of the county, and three of the four, Medary, Hamilton and Bangor, have the La Crosse River Valley corridor running through them. The fourth, Town of Campbell, is technically an island between the Black and Mississippi rivers. The early development of Medary, Hamilton and Bangor townships was first influenced by the La Crosse River, which early in Euro-American settlement in the region influenced the earliest railroad lines terminating at the Mississippi River in La Crosse. The first railroad to reach La Crosse was the La Crosse and Milwaukee Railroad in 1858. By 1893 three major railroad lines were running through the valley. Along with helping establish the villages of Rockland (Bangor), Bangor (Bangor) and West Salem (Hamilton), the railroad opened the door for transportation of

raw materials, manufactured goods and people from the La Crosse River Valley to commerce centers in Milwaukee, Chicago and St. Paul. ³

La Crosse County's early history is, of course, heavily invested in agriculture. While early wheat cultivation was short-lived, due to the soil nutrient-stripping nature of wheat, by the late 19th century La Crosse County farmers turned their attention to dairy production. The soil was well suited to the cultivation of crops such as corn and hay which were needed to feed the dairy herds. The hilly, driftless area coulees also made large field agriculture challenging, however, cattle could maneuver through the hills and valleys searching for fresh grass. Milk production lead to the creation of local cooperatives that specialized in butter and cheese production. Farm sizes between 1890 and 1950 remained fairly stable, averaging 154.4 acres in 1890, and 168.0 acres in 1950. By 1978 there were a total of 898 farms in La Crosse County, averaging 234 acres per farm. ⁴ This appears to indicate a shift in consolidating smaller farms into larger acreage, especially with the increased widespread use of agricultural equipment such as tractors and combines.

This survey, however, tended to focus on non-agricultural properties, primarily single family residences in rural developments. This was particularly true for the Town of Campbell, which is laid out and developed in a more urban style, and the Town of Medary, where parts of the township are heavily developed with neighborhoods of houses. The rural parts of both Hamilton and even more-so Bangor townships has a more distinctly open, rural feel to them. As populations in La Crosse County increase, people who work in La Crosse and Onalaska are increasingly moving to the rural parts of the county to avoid higher property taxes and congestion, while working in the cities.

³ Gregory, 375; Nesbit 1985, 117.

⁴ La Crosse County Agriculture, 18; Wisconsin Agricultural Census, 1978.

La Crosse County Population Statistics

Census year	Population	% +/-	
1950	67,587	13.3% +	
1960	72,465	7.2% +	
1970	80,468	11% +	
1980	91,056	13.2% +	

• Note – Est. 2017 county population is 118,274

Chapter 3 - Township Histories

Town of Campbell



Town of Campbell & French Island

Map courtesy of La Crosse Public Library Archives

The Town of Campbell, when organized in 1851, was named after Erasmus D. Campbell, a former Lieutenant Governor of Wisconsin. It is located north and west of the City of La Crosse on an island between the Black and Mississippi rivers known traditionally as "French Island". French Island is named after Joseph French, an early resident of the town who was originally from Leicestershire, England. Regardless of French's ancestry, several French Canadians from the Province of Quebec also settled on French Island, giving it some more authentic French heritage.⁵

⁵ *La Crosse Tribune*, 25 November 2007.

The Town of Campbell was created at the same time that La Crosse County organized in 1851. For nearly a century, the Town of Campbell remained primarily the same size, other than the loss of land due to the inundation of Lake Onalaska when the locks and dams on the Mississippi River were built in the 1930s. The original Campbell size included all of what is today known as French Island, as well as what today is known as the Town of Medary. With the continued growth of the city of Onalaska to the north, and Postwar development of City of La Crosse to the south, in 1954 the Town of Campbell was split in a north/south division. This left what remained of Town of Campbell to the west of Oak Street, and primarily on French Island. The eastern section of what had been part of Town of Campbell prior to the 1954 split became the newly formed and named Town of Medary.



Elmer & Evelyn Schultz House, 3525 Lakeshore Dr., Town of Campbell

Prior to the 1954 split the properties on French Island were small cottages, a few taverns and a few small storefronts. With the creation of the new, smaller Town of Campbell, more people began to expand their small cottages, or build larger, more substantial houses. One example of that would be the Elmer and Evelyn Schultz House at 3525 Lakeshore Drive (AHI #237312). The

Schultz's bought their original "cottage" toward the north end of Lakeshore Drive in 1942, implying the cottage was already there. It burned down in 1959, and so in 1961 the Schultz's built a larger, contemporary two-story house on the same lot.⁶ This type of "upgrading" appears to have been a common occurrence in the Town of Campbell.



La Crosse Airport, circa 1947

The primary portion of French Island that is not township property is the La Crosse Regional Airport, which is owned by the City of La Crosse. The City had an earlier, smaller airfield dating back to 1919 along Losey Boulevard known as Salzer Field. The city first leased, then by 1928 purchased Salzer Field. However, by 1931 Salzer Field was found to have some serious safety issues. As a temporary solution, the City leased a small private airfield from the Pfaffin brothers on French Island. By 1935 Pfaffin Field became known as the La Crosse County Airport. As local businesses did not want their airmail services interrupted, the City of La Crosse made the

⁶ *La Crosse Tribune*, 31 December 1961.

decision to purchase the La Crosse County Airport and develop it to a regional airport hub. By 1942 all aeronautic studies showed that the French Island site was the best location for an airport within a 100 mile radius. Land condemnation proceedings went forward, and the City of La Crosse contracted to have the 1,100 acre site developed into the new airport, with 450 acres for the airfield itself. When dedicated in March 1947 the La Crosse Airport on French Island, fully owned by the City of La Crosse, was recognized as a Class IV airport with three runways of 150 feet by 5,300 feet. They began their history with a contract with Northwest Airlines for passenger service.⁷

Concerns by Town of Campbell residents that the City of La Crosse would start annexing other parts of French Island, the township began looking into incorporating into a village, to fend off the growing city. In July 1966 the Town of Campbell announced its intentions of incorporating. The township's attorneys had secured a legal finding that Campbell met the statutory requirements to be a village, and that it would benefit the town residents without harming other nearby communities. Once the town residents voted via referendum on incorporation, if all went favorably, they intended to call their new village "Campbell."⁸

The referendum for incorporation apparently passed, however further action was postponed when the City of La Crosse objected. The next mention of it in the local media was in December 1972, when the City of La Crosse was trying to block the "Village of French Island" incorporation. However, once again, the circuit court upheld that the proposed village met state requirements as far as size, population numbers and population density to move forward. Attorneys for the City of La Crosse filed with the court a resolution by the La Crosse Common Council offering to annex the entire Town of Campbell to the city.⁹

⁷ "La Crosse Airport Dedication" brochure. March 1, 1947.

⁸ La Crosse Tribune. 25 July 1966.

⁹ La Crosse Tribune. 12 December 1972.

The Town of Campbell continued with their campaign to become incorporated as a village. However, in 1977, they were stalled once again. The Wisconsin Department of Local Affairs and Development (DLAD) had denied a 1975 petition to incorporate in December 1977. At this point, DLAD decided that the town failed to meet any of the five standards necessary to become an incorporated village. Town of Campbell attorneys were frustrated at what they felt were interpretations of the annexation laws that gave cities more power, making it "hopeless" for a community to petition for incorporation if it is close to an annexing body. ¹⁰

The City of La Crosse has continued its efforts to annex the Town of Campbell. A court decision in 2002 led to the City of La Crosse gaining some newer homes (mostly built post 1980s) on Hiawatha Island, a small island on the Black River east of French Island, however the court ruling was that the annexation of French Island itself was invalid. 2002 was marked the most recent bid by the residents of Town of Campbell to incorporate into a village. As of now, 2018, the incorporation has not been successful.

Today, the Town of Campbell is comprised of a total area of 12.57 square miles. Of this, 3.84 square miles is land, and 8.73 square miles is water.

Census year	Population	%
1960	2,296	N/a
1970	3,327	+44.9
1980	4,118	+21.2%
1990	4,478	+8.4%

Campbell Population

¹⁰ La Crosse Tribune. 29 December 1977.

Town of Medary



Map Courtesy of La Crosse Public Library Archives

The Town of Medary was created in 1954 when it was split from the east side of the Town of Campbell. It has a total area of 11.7 square miles (9,170 acres), with almost all of it being land (only 0.04% is water). The township is bordered on the north by the City of Onalaska and the Towns of Onalaska and Hamilton, on the south by the Town of Shelby, on the east by the towns of Barre and Hamilton and on the west by the cities of La Crosse and Onalaska. Though the majority of the township is located south of Interstate Highway 90, small, disarticulated sections of Town of Medary exist north of the interstate, as well, along State Highway 16. The town hall is located in the National Register-listed Smith Valley School, a small, rural brick school built in 1887.



Smith Valley Road, now in Town of Medary, ca. 1910

Though there are parts of the Town of Medary which are very rural, along County Road B and adjacent to the City of Onalaska, the properties are laid out in a more urban, subdivision form. Most of these houses date from the post 1954 creation of the township, which is simultaneous with the rapid development of the City of Onalaska in the last quarter of the 20th century. Therefore, the majority of farmsteads which are found in the Town of Medary date back to the late 19th century, with most of the modern development in the more dense, urban patterns. In April 1953, a referendum was overwhelmingly approved by town of Campbell residents to divide the township into two sections, thus creating a new and separate Town of Medary in 1954. One of the primary reasons for the split was that the residents on French Island, the western part of Town of Campbell, were seeking more public services that the more rural, eastern side of the township was not interested in pursuing. ¹¹

¹¹ Mississippi River Regional Planning Commission, 2009, 1-1.

The new township was named after John S. Medary, a former, prominent businessman who owned a farm, slaughterhouse and the J.S. Medary Saddlery Company. The borders of the newly formed township remained stable until 1969, when the land that now makes up the La Crosse Interstate Industrial Park was annexed to the City of La Crosse. As the corridor along State Highway 16 and Interstate Highway 90 became more commercialized, the need for sewer services forced Medary's government to allow further annexation by the City of Onalaska and the City of La Crosse into the 1980s and 1990s. ¹²

The Town of Medary 2009 Comprehensive Plan noted that the majority of the Town of Medary's houses were built between 1970 and 1979 (31.9%, or 191 houses). Only 49 houses (8.2%) were built prior to 1939. So, it is apparent that the majority of houses were built in the period between 1940 and 1980 (362 houses out of a total 598 in the entire township). This is despite a significant drop in population between 1970 and 1980. Most of that drop came due to the annexations of that same period.

Census year	Population	%	
1960	1,563	N/a	
1970	2,333	+49.3	
1980	1,794	-23.1	
1990	1,539	-14.2	

Medary Population

¹² Mississippi River Regional Planning Commission, 2009, 1-1.

Town of Hamilton



Map Courtesy of La Crosse Public Library Archives

The Town of Hamilton is located centrally in La Crosse County, with an area of approximately 33,000 acres. The incorporated village of West Salem is within the Town of Hamilton boundaries. The Town is bordered on the north by Town of Farmington, on the south by Town of Barre, on the east by towns of Burns and Bangor, and on the west by the towns of Medary and Onalaska. When La Crosse County was formed in 1851, there were originally five towns. The Town of Pierce, the largest of the five, covered the area of the present-day towns of Hamilton, Barre, Bangor and Washington. In 1853 the Town of Neshonoc was created, covering most of the present-day area of the Town of Hamilton. The Town of Neshonoc and Barre merged, creating the Town of Hamilton, which was further reduced in size 1874 when 21

sections were realigned to form Town of Barre a second time. The realignment resulted in the present-day borders (and 54.25 sections) of Town of Hamilton as it is known today. ¹³

In 1858 the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railroad was built through the township, south of the infant village of Neshonoc, next to the La Crosse River. Because of the railroads decision to build about a mile south of the village of Neshonoc, many of the buildings in Neshonoc were moved closer to the railroad tracks, and Neshonoc was abandoned, making way for the new village of West Salem. By 1873, the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad was built along the same line, further helping the growth of the Village of West Salem, and giving the farmers of the Town of Hamilton much-needed transportation for their crops and goods. ¹⁴



Neshonoc Electric Light Plant, circa 1920

In 1895 McMillan Mill constructed a water-powered electrical generating plant where the earlier Neshonoc Feed Mill on the La Crosse River was located, at the intersection of State

¹³ Mississippi River Planning Commission, Town of Hamilton, 2009: i.

¹⁴ Mississippi River Planning Commission, Town of Hamilton, 2009:ii.

Highway 108 and the La Crosse River today. By 1940, the dam was improved with a 14 foot high concrete dam, creating Lake Neshonoc. About a mile downstream and west from the power plant was property used by a Civilian Conservation Corps camp, and they deeded the property to the La Crosse County Highway Department in 1943, where the county built its main shop. ¹⁵

In the 1950s the La Crosse Interstate Fair, which had originally been located where the Wisconsin State University (now UW-La Crosse) football field is today, was relocated to the Town of Hamilton on the west edge of West Salem, creating a new, 143 acre dedicated fairgrounds. The township further benefitted from Interstate 90 being built through the Town, with an interchange constructed at County Highway C. ¹⁶

In 1970 the Town of Hamilton (not including West Salem) had 372 housing units, increasing to 586 units by 1990. Though the township is still primarily agricultural, with 15,920 acres (48.6% of total land available) zoned for agriculture, 1,330 acres is strictly residential, and 9,315 acres are in forest and agricultural forest use. Nonetheless, there are current residential pressures being put on the agricultural lands as Hamilton is one of the more populated of the townships in La Crosse County. Only the towns of Campbell and Onalaska have a higher density of population per square mile than the Town of Hamilton has. Since much of Campbell and Onalaska townships are already more urban in their density and layout, Hamilton has throughout the last half of the 20th century with increasing development, been threatened with loss the rural landscapes and farms that were ubiquitous throughout the late 19th and early 20th centuries. ¹⁷

¹⁵ Mississippi River Planning Commission, Town of Hamilton, 2009: ii.

¹⁶ Mississippi River Planning Commission, Town of Hamilton, 2009: ii.

¹⁷ Mississippi River Planning Commission, Town of Hamilton, 2009: 2-3.

Hamilton Population

Census year	Population	%
1960	1,439	N/a
1970	1,229	-14.6
1980	1,472	+19.8
1990	1,633	+10.9

Town of Bangor



Map Courtesy of La Crosse Public Library Archives

The Town of Bangor encompasses a total area of 35 square miles. The villages of Bangor and Rockland takes up a portion of that area. The township was organized in 1856, occupying

Township 16, Range 5 West in La Crosse County. It is bordered on the north by the Town of Burns, on the east by the Town of Leon in Monroe County, south by the Town of Washington, and west by the Towns of Hamilton and Barre. The Town of Sparta, Monroe County is at the northeast border, and the La Crosse River flows southwest on the Town's northern boundary. The earliest Euro-American settlement in the Town of Bangor was 1851 when a group of Swiss immigrants coming from Sauk County, Wisconsin, settled the township, organizing a Freethinker's association.

The village plat of Bangor was laid out in the spring of 1854, with its settlement hastened by the construction of the La Crosse & Milwaukee Railroad along the La Crosse River Valley in 1858. Early industries in the Town of Bangor were a flour mill which was operating by 1855, and a woolen mill built near the Village of Bangor in 1864. In the township's earliest census, 1860, there were 30 farms cultivating 2,204 acres. By the 1870 census, there were 115 farms cultivating 16,852 acres, raising mostly wheat. By the turn of the 20th century, agricultural production in the Town of Bangor shifted from wheat production to dairy. By 1895 there were 1,001 milk cows, one cheese factory and one creamery in the township. By 1905 the number of milk cows had risen to 1,614. ¹⁸

The Town of Bangor is one of the more rural townships in La Crosse County. Today it has less than 10 homes per square mile. Despite this, the number of housing units in the township rose from 146 in 1970 to 199 in 1990. Today, Bangor continues to be very much an agricultural township, with 20,520 acres zoned for agriculture out of a total 21,929 acres available. ¹⁹

¹⁸ Mississippi Valley Regional Planning Commission, *Town of Bangor*, December 2008: I - ii.

¹⁹ Mississippi Valley Regional Planning Commission, *Town of Bangor*, December 2008: 2-2.

Bangor Population

Census year	Population	%
1960	603	N/a
1970	569	-5.6%
1980	572	+0.5%
1990	598	+4.5%

Chapter 4 – Architecture

Following the end of World War II and lessening of wartime restrictions on building materials, along with the expansion of freeway systems, and population growth resulted in what has been referred to as the largest building boom in the nation's history.²⁰ Along with a growth in suburbs, there was an increase in experimentation of new building materials and forms such as prefabrication.

In La Crosse County, the national trends were also reflected in Postwar growth, yet a boom in population was relatively minimal due to geographic constraints; suburbanization nonetheless occurred. Though the City of La Crosse's population increased most dramatically from 1940 to 1950; in 1940 the population was 42,707; in 1950 it was 47,258, county population statistical increases were not as dramatic. The bulk of the newer, post World War II housing was being built in the towns of Campbell and Medary.²¹

The following discussion gives a synopsis of the types of Postwar housing styles typically found in La Crosse County.

Architectural Styles, Postwar Housing

Post-World War II residential styles included in the 2002 National Register *Historic Residential Suburbs* Bulletin were limited to the "Suburban Ranch House," its variation of the "Split-level" and the "Contemporary House."²² Many existing state and local preservation databases are also limited to these styles, in some cases with accommodation for regional or local variations. As survey and documentation continues throughout the country it is expected that these stylistic

 ²⁰ David L. Ames and Linda Flint McClelland, "Historic Residential Suburbs: Guidelines for Evaluation and Documentation for the National Register of Historic Places," Washington, D.C. National Park Service, Sept. 2002, p. 65.

²¹ Howard Ohm, Hazel Kuehn, Eds. *The Wisconsin Blue Book* 1946, 1955. 1960, 1970. <u>www.digicoll.library.wisc.edu</u>. Accessed Nov. 20, 2017.

²² Op Cit. Historic Residential Suburbs," pp. 66-69.

terms will be expanded and refined for more encompassing definitions to be applied to local and state surveys and National Register nominations.

The following is a discussion of the prevalent terms, general characteristics and potential subtypes based on current scholarship.



Suburban Ranch House

Suburban Ranch style house - 223 Olivet St., Town of Campbell

The term "Suburban Ranch House" may be misleading since the style was also built in rural areas as free-standing houses and in urban areas on existing city lots. Nonetheless, the style is typically associated with suburban Postwar development. The style is also referred to as "rambler" and is broadly applied to Postwar housing. The Ranch style represents an evolution from the Minimalist Traditional and earlier, the Prairie School architectural styles and is generally characterized by an emphasis on horizontal lines. Typically Ranch style houses are one story, rectangular in form with low pitched, hipped roofs, wide overhanging eaves with attached one or two stall, or tuck under garages. Other terms commonly used include the raised ranch (a two story house), and the "walk-out" ranch. Variations identified and analyzed

by scholars Herbert Gottfried and Jan Jennings in 2009 include L shaped, U shaped, H shaped, and open gable styles.²³

Emphasis on horizontality can include the ubiquitous "picture" window on the main façade along with smaller ribbon or rectangular shaped windows that sometimes wrap around the corners. Siding material can include wood, clapboard, aluminum, brick or stone facing, or combinations of those materials. Ranch houses often feature integral planters on the main façade, typically near the main entrance, constructed of brick or stone. Other exterior features can include a prominent brick or stone pylon exterior chimney; located asymmetrically along the roof, or flush to a side elevation. Ranch style houses are also characterized by the lack of a traditional front porch; some examples, however, feature wide, recessed arcaded porches beneath the roof overhang. Walk out ranches maintain the appearance of a one-story house but include a lower level area which leads to the back yard. The walk out form is often undetectable from the street/main facade particularly given the absence of alleyways in most Postwar subdivisions.

²³ Herbert Gottfried and Jan Jennings, American Vernacular Buildings and Interiors 1870-1960, New York, W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 2009, pp. 209-217. Thomas C. Hubka, Houses Without Names: Architectural Nomenclature and the Classification of America's Common Houses. Knoxville, The University of Tennessee Press, 2013, pp.85-86.

Split Level



Split Level Ranch style - 1909 Sharon St., Town of Campbell

As noted above, the *Historic Residential Suburbs* National Register Bulletin included the split level as a variation on the Ranch style house. Split level houses, similar to the Ranch style described previously is a term used to broadly define a style which includes variations such as the bi or tri-level and the raised ranch. Split level houses are characterized by a split foyer leading from a main entrance to upper and lower living zones. Similar to the Ranch style, exterior materials can include wood, steel, aluminum, prominent brick chimneys and tuckunder garages. Exterior finishes can include "colonial" or "swiss" details such as columns and "fachwork.²⁴

²⁴ Op cit. Ames and McClelland, 2002, pp. 66-67; Gottfried and Jennings, 2009, pp. 219-220.

Contemporary



Contemporary style house – N4515 Marcou Rd., Town of Medary

The third house style identified in the Historic Residential Suburbs bulletin was categorized as Contemporary. According to Ames and McClelland, the contemporary house grew out of and was influenced by work of architects such as Frank Lloyd Wright, Walter Gropius, Mies Van der Rohe and other "modernists." Characteristics of the style include modern materials such as glass steel, concrete, cantilevered forms, and the integration of interior and exterior living spaces.²⁵

²⁵ Ibid, pp. 67-68.

Chapter 5 – Survey Results

There were seven (7) properties within the four township survey which met National Register of Historic Places criteria. These seven properties were researched in depth to provide sufficient history to justify their eligibility. In order to list any individual property on the National Register, it must meet at least one of four criteria: Criterion A for its historical significance; Criterion B for its association with a significant person; Criterion C for its architectural, engineering or artistic significance; or Criterion D for its ability to yield more significant information in the future (Criterion D is typically used for archaeological sites, whereas A, B and C are more often used for standing structures). Typically a property must be at least 50 years old, and it needs to have enough physical integrity of materials and workmanship to convey its history.

One (1) of the properties is in the Town of Campbell, three (3) are in Town of Medary and three (3) are in Town of Hamilton. There were no National Register eligible properties found in the Town of Bangor. Additionally, there were no potential historic districts found in the survey.

Townships	Total Surveyed 1990s	Total potential NRHP eligible (2018)	Total surveyed (2018)
Campbell	11	1	45
Medary	3	3	14
Hamilton	53	3	7
Bangor	9	0	4
TOTAL	76	7	70

Summary of 2018 Survey

3525 Lakeshore Dr., Town of Campbell - Elmer & Evelyn Schultz House AHI #237310



The Elmer and Evelyn Schultz House, located at 3525 Lakeshore Drive was built in 1961 in a contemporary, two story style.

The original house on the lot (construction date unknown) burned to the ground in 1959. The original house, which the Schultz's purchased in 1942, was described as a "cottage" which the Schultz's remodeled in the 1950s. After the fire, they decided to build a larger house on the same lot. The Schultz's were apparently collectors of reclaimed parts of other local buildings which had been demolished. This house incorporates features from other La Crosse properties, including doors and lights from the old St. Joseph Cathedral, a metal grille from the Cargill House (located at 235 West Ave. S., La Crosse, razed 1975) and urns from the former YWCA (the former Elsie Gile Scott House, named "Pasadena", which was at West Avenue and Main Street in La Crosse). The exterior fence grille was the only thing that survived the 1959 fire. Elmer Schultz had obtained the iron grille with a "C" on it for Cargill in 1959, when the Cargill house
lost some of its exterior fence for the expansion of the First Presbyterian Church. Schultz turned the "C" into an "S", and it is still visible on the house's exterior gate today. ²⁶

The house boasted being of the Schultz's own design. It has a Winona Stone grand fireplace in the family room (which is the same stone on the exterior) as well as wood paneling on the walls of several of the rooms, using woods such as hemlock, butternut and walnut. The kitchen was built with a skylight, the bathrooms all had ornately tiled floors, the upstairs hallways were parqueted floors, and the bedrooms all had their own balconies. The stairway has decorative iron banister and the decorative iron continues along the mezzanine hallway in the upper level. The Schultz's moved to the La Crosse area in 1931 from North Dakota, though Elmer Schultz was originally from Dodge, Wisconsin. They had one daughter. They owned Schultz Distributing, which delivered beer and chickens, and was located in the former office of the Listman Mill on Front Street in La Crosse.²⁷ Elmer was active in various community and charity organizations, and Evelyn Schultz was recognized by the La Crosse Tribune in 1971 and State Senate in 1972 for her civic involvement (the latter posthumously).²⁸ Elmer died in 1984.²⁹

This property is potentially eligible for the National Register under Criterion C, for architecture. The property is a good example of an unusual, mid-century contemporary house which is highly intact today.

²⁶ 12-31-1961 *La Crosse Tribune* article.

²⁷ 7-4-1976 *La Crosse Tribune* advertisement.

²⁸ 4-11-1965 and 8-1-1971 *La Crosse Tribune* articles and 7-13-1972 *Journal of the Senate.*

²⁹ 9-21-1984 and 9-22-1984 *La Crosse Tribune* obituaries.

N3216 Smith Valley Rd., Town of Medary - Weimer/Ederer/Leibl

Farmstead, AHI #120406



The Weimer-Ederer-Leibl Farmstead includes a one and one-half story red brick gabled ell farmhouse, a barn, and several agricultural outbuildings. It sits in the valley in a picturesque setting. The house and outbuildings had been restored by John and Wendy Severson in the 1990s and early 2000s.

The Weimer/Ederer/Leibl Farmstead is located in Smith Valley. This farmstead area was initially settled sometime around 1865. The first owners of record were Valentine and Jacob Weimer, who were probably brothers. They owned the property from the mid 1860s to the early 1910s. Jacob had a daughter who married Peter Ederer. The Ederers became the next owners of the property, from the 1910s to the 1940s. The Ederer's had a daughter, Louisa, who married Mr. Leibl. ³⁰ The Leibl's owned the property until the 1980s. ³¹ Therefore, the property had stayed

³⁰ Tax rolls; geni.com; 5-22-1977 *La Crosse Tribune* article.

³¹ La Crosse County (WI) Tax rolls.

in the same family for over 100 years. Wendy Severson bought the property in late 1996, which had already had much of its agricultural land sold and partitioned off. ³²

This property is eligible for the National Register under Criterion A for history. It is a good example of a late 19th century farmstead, with intact house, barn and outbuildings from that late 19th century period. Further research would be needed to establish the types of crops and livestock that was raised on this property.

W3645 Pleasant Valley Rd., Town of Hamilton - Myers/Albers



Farmstead, AHI #237332

³² 7-10-1997 Severson property research, WHS site file, Division of Historic Preservation; 1-11-2015 *La Crosse Tribune* obituary.

The Myers-Albers Farmstead may have been built circa 1870. It is a one and one-half story red brick gabled ell house. There are outbuildings on the property including a wood frame barn and other smaller agricultural buildings. George Leach (also spelled Leuck) apparently owned the property from about 1870 to the 1880s, when Herman Myers bought it in the 1880s. Fred Albers Sr. owned the property from about the 1910s until the 1960s, at which time Fred Albers Jr. took ownership of the property. The property has stayed in the same family throughout this history, as Fred Albers, Sr. married Herman Myer's daughter Minnie in 1914. ³³ Fred and Minnie had a daughter Barbara who married George Spaniak. ³⁴ Today the property is in the ownership of the Michael and George Jr. Spaniak Trust. Michael and George Jr. are Barbara and George's sons. ³⁵

This property is eligible for the National Register under Criterion A for history. It is a good example of a late 19th century farmstead, with intact house, barn and outbuildings from that late 19th century period. Further research would be needed to establish the types of crops and livestock that was raised on this property.

³³ 9-11-1976 *La Crosse Tribune* obituary.

³⁴ 4-24-2003 *La Crosse Tribune* obituary.

³⁵ Tax rolls; 9-11-1976 *La Crosse Tribune* obituary.

W3951 County Road B, Town of Hamilton - Marking Farmstead

AHI #237333



The Marking Farmstead may have had older agricultural buildings and house on the property at one time, however, most of the buildings are gone, and have been replaced with buildings from the 1950s and '60s. This property would be eligible for its later, mid-20th century history. The property has a ca. 1960 one story ranch house, a circa 1950s gothic roof barn and several outbuildings, many of which may date to the mid-century period or possibly some earlier. Melvin B. Lee owned the property until 1949, when in 1950 it was purchased by Adolph Marking, who was the one who constructed the large, modern barn and the modern house. Tax rolls indicate large improvement values between 1956 and 1961 which would confirm this construction and development period. ³⁶ It is unclear where Adolph had lived prior to

³⁶ La Crosse County (WI) Tax rolls.

purchasing this farm, because his 1993 obituary states that he had been farming in the West Salem area since 1930, some twenty years before he purchased this farm.³⁷ He was well-respected in the area, and was a clerk at the Pleasant Valley School in the 1950s.

This property is eligible for the National Register under Criterion A for history. It is a good example of a mid-20th century farmstead, with intact house, barn and outbuildings from that mid- century period. Further research would be needed to establish the types of crops and livestock that was raised on this property.

N3031 County Rd. FA , Town of Medary – Robert and Betty Luxford House AHI #237334



The Luxford House was built sometime in the late 1950s or early 1960s. Though blueprints of the house exist, there is no architect name recorded on them, and thus the architect is unknown. Robert Luxford owned and operated Luxcor Engineering, which was a tool and die maker in La Crosse. He also owned Ridgeview Stables. Having moved to La Crosse in 1941, he moved away finally in 1972. The modern/contemporary style house features a lower level

³⁷ 4-10-1996 *La Crosse Tribune* obituary.

garage, upper level living space, large spans of windows, an upper level deck, and a panoramic view of the Mississippi River Valley. The house is highly intact on the exterior and interior, with only moderate, historically sympathetic renovations in the kitchen.³⁸

W3926 County Road M, Town of Hamilton - Hiram Lovejoy House

AHI #72336



The Hiram Lovejoy House, built as part of a larger farmstead circa 1870 west of West Salem in the Town of Hamilton, now only consists of the house, with all other outbuildings not-extant. The Lovejoy House is built with local red brick with stone lintels, sills and quoins. It was built in the Italianate style, which was popular in the later part of the 1800s. This impressive example of the Italianate style features two-over-two sash windows, a portico porch entrance,

³⁸ Interview with King Holley 8.2.18; Interview with Nancy Gerrard, current owner, 8.7.18; Robert Luxford obituary http://www.obitcentral.com/obitsearch/obits/wi/wi-lacrosse47.htm.

decorative paired brackets under eaves, a second story front-facing windows with small, Palladian-style windows above, and a hipped cupola. A one-story ell with hipped porch likely was built for the kitchen. This house is remarkably intact, and retains sufficient integrity to be considered eligible for the National Register under Criterion C, for architecture, as one of the best rural examples of Italianate style in La Crosse County. This house is somewhat vulnerable, as it is currently a rental property and is surrounded by annexations of the city of West Salem on all sides.



W5670 County Road F – John and Razy Wright House (Medary), AHI #237331

The John and Razy Wright House was built in 1924 for the couple as designed by local La Crosse architect Otto Merman. The large, two story, front gabled house featured curved rooflines, random ashlar stone siding, arched doorways, multiple windows, all which added up to a picturesque style house with Craftsman details. The house is potentially eligible for the National Register under Criterion C for architecture, as an unusual and unique picturesque style designed by local master architect Otto Merman.

Chapter 6 - Recommendations

Overview

La Crosse County had been comprehensively surveyed in three different survey years including 1995, 1998 and 2002. The four townships covered in this report, Campbell, Medary, Hamilton and Bangor, had last been surveyed in 1995. During this survey, 70 properties have been newly surveyed and seven (7) total properties were found to be National Register eligible.

National Register recommendations

There are seven (7) individual potentially eligible properties which identified during this survey, three of which were newly surveyed, and four (4) were previously surveyed properties which had been newly evaluated.

These seven individual properties could be nominated as local landmarks to give them the historic recognition that the county's historic preservation ordinance provides. This may also give these properties status to utilize county funds, if they are made available in the future, for renovations and rehabilitations. Additionally, with further research, all seven (7) properties have been pre-screened by Wisconsin Historical Society staff as meeting the National Register criteria.

By listing these properties on the National Register, they may qualify for state and federal historic tax credits for rehabilitation. More information on the National Register program and the historic tax credit program may be found at

https://www.wisconsinhistory.org/Records/Article/CS15309 .

Historic preservation recommendations

La Crosse County has been very progressive concerning historic preservation initiatives for the past 40 years. In the mid-1980s the first form of the La Crosse County Heritage Preservation

39

Commission was formed. Within a few years of formation, the La Crosse County Historic Sites Preservation Commission achieved Certified Local Government (CLG) status from the Wisconsin Historical Society. That designation recognized the county as having a historic preservation ordinance and an active historic preservation commission. La Crosse County was the first county in the state of Wisconsin to have achieved both having a historic preservation ordinance and receiving CLG status. At this time in 2018, La Crosse County is the ONLY county unit of government to have both a historic preservation ordinance and CLG status in the state of Wisconsin.

General recommendations for the La Crosse County Historic Sites Preservation Commission:

- List all of the properties identified as potentially eligible for the NRHP as local landmarks;
- List all of the properties identified as potentially eligible for the NRHP on the NRHP;
- Continue to work with the county corporate counsel's office to strengthen parts of the current Historic Preservation Ordinance;
- Establish "Certificate of Appropriateness" for proposed alterations to the exteriors of locally landmarked properties;
- Monetary penalties for non-compliance of Certificate of Appropriateness. Make these penalties severe enough to encourage people to comply;
- Making the Certificate of Appropriateness for individually designated landmarks mandatory, rather than recommendation only;
- Create disinsentives for allowing properties to deteriorate by neglect. Work with more town boards, to find issues before the building is so deteriorated that the building can no longer be saved. Be proactive.

Education efforts concerning local landmarks should also be continued with the La Crosse County community at-large. The Commission is encouraged to team up with others in the county interested in the county's built environment, including the West Salem Historical Society, the Bangor Area Historical Society, the Onalaska Historical Society, the Holmen Area Historical Society, Mississippi Valley Archaeology Center, Preservation Alliance of La Crosse and the La Crosse County Historical Society.

- Provide training and workshops for town board and county board members so they understand how the Historic Preservation Ordinance works.
- Provide continued training and education for the Commission members, through conferences, workshops and webinars.
- More community outreach. Topics for outreach could include:
 - Workshops for community members on basic renovation skills;
 - Conduct "building fairs" where the community can come to an event venue and speak with contractors, preservationists, historians and historic building property owners about historic preservation topics;
 - Provide programming and education with school children. Perhaps help local educators to provide education units on local historic preservation within the schools or on field trips. Consider having a local school teacher on the Commission as a liaison between the schools and the heritage preservation community.
- Prepare information on the economic benefits of historic preservation in La Crosse County. Collaborate with local tourism groups on numbers of heritage preservation tourism dollars our county sees because of past historic preservation efforts. Use these economic benefit numbers to convince the county board, town board members as well as local investors, bankers and developers of the benefits of renovating and restoring buildings which already exist.
- Take opportunities with the local news media to emphasize the good things that the Commission is doing in the community.
- Engage the citizens!

Bibliography

 Ames, David L. and Linda Flint McClelland. "Historic Residential Suburbs: Guidelines for Evaluation and Documentation for the National Register of Historic Places."
Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, September 2002.

Gottfried, Herbert and Jan Jennings. *American Vernacular Buildings and Interiors, 1870 – 1960*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., Inc. 2009.

Gregory, John G. West Central Wisconsin: A History. Indianapolis: S.J. Clarke Publishing Co., Inc., 1933.

History of La Crosse County, Wisconsin. Chicago: Western Historical Company, 1881.

Hubka, Thomas C. Houses Without Names: Architectural Nomenclature and the Classification of America's Common Houses. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 2013.

Journal of the Senate, July 13, 1972.

La Crosse Airport Dedication" brochure. March 1, 1947.

La Crosse County Tax Rolls, various years.

La Crosse Tribune.

December 31, 1961, Schultz house. April 11, 1965, Schultz house. July 25, 1966, "Way Cleared for Campbell to Vote on Incorporation."

December 12, 1972, "Campbell Wins Circuit Court Hearing: Incorporation Test Passes. September 11, 1976, Spaniak obituary.

December 29, 1977, "Campbell attorney vexed as incorporation fails."

September 21, 1984, Schultz obituary.

April 10, 1996, Adolph Marking obituary.

April 24, 2003, obituary.

November 25, 2007, "French Island residents pride themselves on their separateness from La Crosse, their lifestyle and their drinking water."

Luxford, Robert obituary. <u>http://www.obitcentral.com/obitsearch/obits/wi/wi-lacrosse47.htm</u>
Mississippi River Regional Planning Commission. *Town of Bangor Comprehensive Plan* 2009 – 2030, Section 1: Existing Conditions Report, Public Hearing Draft. December
2008.

Mississippi River Regional Planning Commission. *Town of Medary, La Crosse County, Wisconsin* 2008 – 2028 Comprehensive Plan. January 2009.

Mississippi River Regional Planning Commission. *Town of Hamilton Comprehensive Plan 2009 – 2030, Section 1: Existing Conditions Report*. August, 2009.

Nesbit, Robert C. *The History of Wisconsin, Vol. III*. Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1985.

Ohm, Howard and Hazel Kuehn, Eds. *The Wisconsin Blue Book* 1946, 1955. 1960, 1970. www.digicoll.library.wisc.edu. Accessed Nov. 20, 2017.

Wisconsin Agricultural Census, 1978.

Wyatt, Barbara (ed.). *Cultural Resources Management in Wisconsin – Volumes I – III, A Manual For Historic Properties.* Madison, WI: Historic Preservation Division, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1986.



La Crosse County Historie Preservation Ordinance

CHAPTER 22

HISTORIC SITES PRESERVATION COMMISSION

- 22.01 Purpose and Intent
- 22.02 Definitions
- 22.03 Membership
- 22.04 Historic Structures and Sites Designation Criteria
- 22.05 Duties and Powers
- 22.06 Voluntary Restrictive Covenants
- 22.07 Creation of Historic District
- 22.08 Recognition of Historic Structures and Sites
- 22.09 Annual Report
- 22.10 Severability

LA CROSSE COUNTY 5/15

22.01 PURPOSE AND INTENT.

(1) It is hereby declared a matter of public policy that the protection, enhancement, perpetuation and use of improvements of special character of special historical interest or value is a public necessity and is required in the interest of health, prosperity, safety and welfare of the people. The purpose of this section is to:

(a) Effect and accomplish the protection, enhancement and perpetuation of such improvements and of districts which represent or reflect elements of the County's cultural, social, economic, political, engineering, anthropological, archaeological and architectural history and prehistory.

(b) Safeguard the County's historic, prehistoric, and cultural heritage, as embodied and reflected in such historic structures, sites and districts.

(c) Stabilize and improve property values.

(d) Foster civic pride in the beauty and noble accomplishments of the

(e) Protect and enhance the County's attractions to residents, tourists and visitors, and serve as a support and stimulus to business and industry.

(f) Strengthen the economy of the County.

(g) Promote the use of historic and prehistoric structures, sites and districts for the education, pleasure and welfare of the people of the County.

(2) This ordinance shall apply to unincorporated areas in the County of La Crosse. This ordinance shall not apply retroactively.

22.02 DEFINITIONS.

past.

(1) In this section, unless the context clearly requires otherwise:

(a) Commission means the Historic Sites Preservation Commission created under this section.

(b) Commissioner means a member of the Historic Sites Preservation Commission.

(c) Improvement means any building, structure, place, work of art or other object constituting a physical betterment of real property, or any part of such betterment.

(d) Improvement parcel is the unit of property which includes a physical betterment constituting an improvement and the land embracing the site thereof, and is treated as a single entity for the purposes of levying real estate taxes. Provided, however, that the term "improvement parcel" shall also include any unimproved area of land which is treated as a single entity for such tax purposes.

HISTORIC SITES PRESERVATION COMMISSION 22.02(1)(e)

(e) Historic district is an area designated by the County Board on recommendation of the commission, composed of 2 or more improvement parcels that together compromise a district of special character or special historic interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the County, state or nation, and which has been designated as a historic district pursuant to the provisions of this chapter.

(f) Historic structure means any improvement which has a special character or special historic or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the County, state or nation and which has been designated as a historic structure pursuant to the provisions of this chapter.

(g) Historic site means any parcel of land whose historic significance is due to a substantial value in tracing the history or prehistory of Native American people, or upon which a historic event has occurred, and which has been designated as a historic site under this section, or an improvement parcel, or part thereof, on which is situated a historic structure and any abutting improvement parcel, or part thereof, used as and constituting part of the premises on which the historic structure is situated.

(h) History is also defined to include all prehistoric periods.

22.03 MEMBERSHIP.

(1) The Historic Sites Preservation Commission shall be composed of 7 members. The membership shall be composed of: 1 architect or architectural historian; 1 historian qualified in the field of historic preservation; 1 licensed real estate broker; 1 County Board Supervisor; 1 qualified archaeologist; or make a reasonable effort to find members with these qualifications; and 2 citizen members. Each member shall have, to the highest extent practicable, a known interest in historic preservation.

(2) The La Crosse County Board Chair shall appoint the commissioners subject to confirmation by the County Board. Of the initial members so appointed, 2 shall serve a term of 1 year, 2 shall serve a term of 2 years, and 3 shall serve a term of 3 years. Thereafter, the term for each member shall be 3 years. The Commission shall elect its chair and vice chair on an annual basis.

22.04 HISTORIC STRUCTURES AND SITES DESIGNATION CRITERIA.

(1) A historic structure or historic site designation may be placed on any site, natural or improved, including any building, improvement or structure located thereon, or any area of particular historic, archaeological, architectural or cultural significance to the County of La Crosse, such as historic structures of sites which:

(a) Exemplify or reflect the broad cultural, political, or economic or social history of the nation, state, regional or local community; or,

(b) Are identified with historic personages or with important events in national, state or local history; or,

(c) Embody the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or specimen, inherently valuable for a study of a period, style, method of construction, or of indigenous materials or craftsmanship; or,

(d) Are representative of the honorable work of a master builder, designer or architect whose individual genius influenced his/her age; or,

(e) Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important to prehistory or history.

22.05 DUTIES AND POWERS. The Commission shall have the following duties and powers:

(1) Adopt specific operating guidelines for landmark sites designation providing such are in conformance with the provisions of this paragraph.

(2) Publically advocate opinions and recommendations on issues involving historic preservation.

(3) Cooperate with the Historic Preservation Officer for the State of Wisconsin and the State Historic Preservation Review Board in attempting to include such properties hereunder designated as historic structures, sites, or districts in the National Register of Historic Places.

(4) Work for the continuing education of the citizens about the historic heritage of this County and the historic structures and sites designated under the provisions of this section.

(5) As it deems advisable, receive and solicit funds for the purpose of historic preservation in the County. Such funds shall be placed in a County account for such purpose.

(6) Designation. The Commission shall have the power, subject to the provisions and criteria of sections 22.04 and 22.07 of this Code, to designate historic structures, historic sites and historic districts within the unincorporated areas of the County. Once designated by the Commission, such historic structures, sites and districts shall be subject to all the provisions of this Code, and such designation shall be recorded, at County expense, at the La Crosse County Register of Deed's Office.

(a) Procedure.

1. Any person, including the owner of a structure or site, or any member of the Commission, may nominate a specific site, structure, or district for designation by the Commission. Any person who wishes to nominate a structure, site, or district for approval by the Commission, shall submit such a request in writing to the Commission.

2. Upon receipt of a nomination for a historic structure, site, or district, the Commission shall call a public hearing to be held on the nomination. Notice of the time and place of such hearing shall be given by publication in the County of a class 2 notice under ch. 985 of the Wisconsin Statutes. A copy of the notice shall also be mailed by certified or registered mail to the address of the owner or owners of the structure, site, or district to be considered, which notice shall include a statement of the effect of designation of the property under this Chapter, including the provisions of s. 22.05. At said public hearing, the public shall have an opportunity for written and oral comment regarding said nominations.

HISTORIC SITES PRESERVATION COMMISSION 22.05(6)(a)3.

3. As soon as possible after such public hearing, the Commission shall act on the nomination, either approving, modifying and approving, or disapproving of the same. If the nomination is approved, a resolution shall be prepared and presented to the Planning, Resource and Development Committee for approval and presentation to the County Board. If approved by the County Board, the resolution shall be recorded at the Register of Deeds, and a copy sent to the current landowner(s) within 10 days of recording by certified or registered mail, informing the landowner(s) of the resolution approved, the recording action, and that the property shall be subject to the provisions of this Chapter.

(7) Regulation of Construction, Demolition, Reconstruction and Exterior Alteration.

(a) The owner of a designated historic site or structure or of any property within a historic district who plans to construct, demolish, reconstruct or make exterior alterations to the structure, site or property, shall apply to the Commission for review of the work.

(b) The applicant shall submit a detailed description for the proposed construction, reconstruction, excavation or alteration together with any architectural drawings, if those services have been utilized by the application, and a sufficient description of the construction or alteration and use to enable the Commission to determine what the final appearance of the property will be, including measurements, building materials, furnish materials, and name brands of products when available. Upon filing of any application with the Historic Sites Preservation Commission, the Commission shall review the application and assess the effects of the application on the historic site, structure, district or archaeological site. The Commission shall make recommendations regarding the application within 21 days of receipt of the application. The Commission shall advise, cooperate, educate and work with the applicant in an attempt to preserve the historical significance of the site or structure.

(c) The owner, person, or entity in charge of a historic property or object shall refrain from reconstructing or altering all or any part of the exterior of such property or construct any improvement upon such designated property or properties or cause or permit any such work to be performed on such property or demolish such property while the application is being reviewed by the Commission.

(d) Upon filing of any application with the Commission, the Commission shall consider the following guidelines in reviewing the application:

1. Whether the property will be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment;

2. Whether the historic character of the property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic material or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historic development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall be discouraged;

HISTORIC SITES PRESERVATION COMMISSION 22.07(d)4.

4. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property should be preserved;

5. Deteriorated historic features should be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature should match the old in design, color, texture and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials.

6. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of historic structures shall be undertaken using the methods promulgated by the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitation Historic Buildings (36 CFR 67 and 68 as amended).

7. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction should not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new should be differentiated from the old and should be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

8. New additions and adjacent or related new construction should be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

(e) Ordinary maintenance and repairs shall be undertaken without an application to the Commission provided that the work involves repairs to existing features of a historic property site or the replacement of elements of a property or site with materials similar in appearance and provided that the work does not change the exterior appearance of the property or site and does not require the issuance of a building permit.

22.06 VOLUNTARY RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS. The owner of any historic structure or site may, at any time following such designation of its property, enter into a restrictive covenant on the subject property after negotiation with the commission. The Commission may assist the owner in preparing such covenant in the interest of preserving the historic property. The owner shall record such covenant in the County Register of Deed's Office, and shall notify the County Historical Society of such covenant and the incorporated conditions.

22.07 CREATION OF HISTORIC DISTRICT.

(1) For preservation purposes, the Historic Sites Preservation Commission shall select geographically defined areas within the unincorporated areas of the County of La Crosse to be designated as historic districts and shall, with the assistance of the County Zoning, Planning and Land Information Department, prepare a historic preservation plan for each area. A historic district may be designated for any geographic area of particular historic, architectural, archaeological or cultural significance to the County of La Crosse which:

(a) Exemplifies or reflects the broad cultural, political, economic, social history or prehistory of the nation, state or community; or,

(b) Is identified with historic personage or with important events in national, state or local history; or,

(c) Embodies the distinguishing characteristics or architectural type specimens inherently valuable for the study of a period or periods, styles, methods or construction, indigenous materials or craftsmanship; or,

(d) Is representative of the notable works of master builders, designers, or architects who influenced their age.

(2) Each historic preservation plan prepared for or by the Historic Sites Preservation Commission shall include a cultural and architectural analysis supporting the historic significance of the area, the specific guidelines for development and a statement of preservation objectives.

22.08 RECOGNITION OF HISTORIC STRUCTURES AND SITES. At such time as a historic structure or site has been properly designated, the Commission may cause to be prepared, at County expense, a suitable plaque declaring that such property is a historic structure or site.

22.09 ANNUAL REPORT. The Historic Sites Preservation Commission shall submit an annual report to the La Crosse County Board concerning its entire operation and activities. The Commission shall also submit a required annual report to the State of Wisconsin Historical Society, Division of Historic Preservation.

22.10 SEVERABILITY. If any provision of this Chapter or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of this Chapter and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

LA CROSSE COUNTY 5/15