HISTORIC DESIGNATION STUDY REPORT

SOUTH SECOND STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT

September 2016
Amended September 29, 2016
To reflect the addition of a bibliography, language regarding low to moderate housing, and clarify some historical information

I. NAME

Historic: S. Second Street, previously Reed Street
Common: S. Second Street

II. LOCATION

A. General Location

The district includes the buildings and properties on both sides of South Second Street between Pittsburgh and Oregon Streets. Some buildings/properties that historically faced East Pittsburgh or East Oregon are now included under one property ownership with buildings that front onto South Second Street, West Pittsburgh Street and W. Oregon Street included in one tax key.

B. Verbal Boundary Description

The boundaries of the South second Street Historic District are described as follows:
Beginning at the intersection of W. Oregon Street and South Second Street; then proceeding west along the south curb line adjacent to the property addressed at 235 South Second Street to the rear property line of said 235 South Second Street; then north along the rear property lines of all the properties that front onto South Second Street; then east along the north curb line adjacent to the property at 205 South Second Street; then crossing South Second Street to the north curb line of the property addressed at 133 East Pittsburgh (also known as 200 South Second Street); then east to the east property line of the tax key parcel 428-0269-110; then south along this east line to the north curb line of West Oregon Street; then west along the north curb line of West Oregon Street to the place of beginning.

III. CLASSIFICATION

District
NOTE: This district proposed for local historic designation is part of a larger National Register District known as the South First and Second Streets Historic District, listed November 30, 1987.
Under s. 320-21-9-c of the Milwaukee Code of Ordinances, this district was reviewed for its effect on low- and moderate-income housing within its boundaries. To the knowledge of staff there is only one residential unit within the district and it belongs to one of the building’s owners.

IV. OWNER OF PROPERTY  Multiple (see attached)

NOMINATOR  Ald. Jose Perez
ALDERMAN  Ald. Jose Perez  12th Aldermonic District

V. YEAR BUILT  1859 - 1946
ARCHITECT  See individual data sheets

VI. DESCRIPTION

A. General Character

The area under consideration for local historic designation is characterized by commercial and industrial masonry buildings that range from one to four stories in height, all with flat roofs and articulated cornices. Most of the buildings share party walls. The buildings occupy much of their lots and the fronts of the buildings are constructed to the street edge resulting in a compact and visually cohesive streetscape.

The buildings mostly date from the late 19th century. Two, 205 South Second (1947) and part of 113 East Pittsburgh (1950) were constructed after World War II but the East Pittsburgh building is a significant example of 20th century Moderne. The building at 205 South Second Street was a good example of the simple industrial Moderne Style but was remodeled in the last several years.

This district forms a special visual enclave. To the west are larger scale buildings and a former rail yard that is now being marketed to water-related businesses. A portion of East Oregon Street has been renamed Freshwater Way to reflect the city’s initiative at this location. To the north and south of the proposed district are blocks with similar groupings of masonry commercial buildings, but they tend to be larger in scale and reflect a slightly later period than the proposed historic district that is the subject of this nomination. To the east the nature of the businesses changed to machining and manufacturing.
The district consists of ten structures built as individual buildings in addition to two parcels that are vacant. One of these vacant parcels and three structures are now combined under one tax key and address.

DESCRIPTION OF THE INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS

1. 205 South 2ND Street (1946; Lloyd Ernst architect) originally Jordan Tool & Machine Company Building, now Purple Door Ice Cream

This one story building replaced two, 3-story masonry buildings (sometimes shown as 3-1/2 story) that had been addressed as 139-141 Reed and 143 Reed Street. The north building was associated with the Gruppe family and the south building was associated with J. Bauml. These buildings were demolished and replaced by the Jordan Tool & Machine Company Building that was constructed in 1946 per permit records. Additions were made in 1951 and 1956. An example of Moderne Style, the building featured a projecting metal cornice/canopy that wrapped around two sides of the building and had long horizontal window openings filled with glass block. In recent years the building has been totally remodeled into an ice cream shop called the Purple Door. It retains its flat roof and front entry but window openings have been enlarged along South 2nd Street and W. Pittsburgh. Another entrance is located along this thoroughfare above which is the name Float.

2. 209-211 South 2ND Street (c.1868) John Black Building

This building occupies the south 30 feet of its lot and showed modest improvements in the amount of $200 for many years under Joseph Guhl's ownership. John Black first appears in the tax rolls in 1867 and in 1868 the value of improvements increases to $1500, to $4,000 in 1871 and to $4500 in 1872. The assessment drops by 1887 when it was calculated at $4200 that year. Please note that earlier research was based on inaccurate information and the dating of the building is based on tax roll assessments.

This solid masonry building stands three stories and features round arched windows at the second and third stories. Windows are paired at the center bay and feature prominent stone keystones. Windows at either end of this three-bay façade are framed by pilasters. All sills are stone. The storefront has recently been returned to its historic appearance with masonry piers flanking the entry to the upper floors, and a storefront divided into a recessed center entrance framed with thin columns and large glass windows to either side. It appears that there had once been a projecting cornice, possibly of sheet metal, at the top of the façade but it has been removed. The north elevation is blank. It shows the outline of a building that has been demolished after the National Register listing took place.

3. 213-215 South 2ND Street (1860) Salentine Building
Brothers Stephen and Philip Salentine constructed this three-story solid masonry building in 1860 as an investment property. They also had other properties in the 5th Ward. Each half of the building was independently owned by the brothers, Stephen owning the north half into the early 20th century and Philip owning the south half into the 1870s. This building is in the Italianate Style and six bays wide. To quote from the National Register Nomination: "The façade is articulated by ornamental brickwork framing a series of arched windows on the second and third floors with compound arches and pilasters. Across the top is brick corbelling." The storefronts have been altered. Please note that the date of construction in this study report is based on tax roll information as well as an article indicating that the Salentine Brothers were about to construct a commercial block on Reed Street.

4. **221-225 South 2nd Street** (1865) C. F. Stamm Building

To quote from the National Register nomination: "The C. F. Stamm Building is an Italianate style commercial block. One of the largest Civil War era buildings in the district, it is four stories high and seven bays wide" and constructed of solid cream brick masonry. The ground floor retained its original storefronts but they have been recently restored. "The second and third floor windows have triple sash. The original stone lintels have been removed. The fourth floor has round arched openings with brick hood molds. Across the top is the same type of brick corbelling and brickwork decoration found on many of the other buildings in the district." The upper floor served as a meeting hall in which numerous fraternal organizations met.

5. **231-233 South 2nd Street** (1887) Richard Seidel Building

To quote the National Register nomination: "The Seidel Building, an example of the Queen Anne style, represented a departure from the traditional Italianate designs that had dominated the district's architecture. It is three stories high, clad with cream brick and trimmed with stone. The façade is divided into three bays by brick piers. The original storefront has been completely obliterated by brick infill, but the integrity of the upper façade with its patterned brick work, terra cotta tiles and carved stone work has been retained. The façade is horizontally articulated with a succession of stone bands across the front of the building. At the top of the building each of the piers terminates in clustered colonettes with oversized foliated carved stone caps. Foliated stone panels ornament the parapet over the central bay."

A historic photograph shows that the building once had a pediment at the top. There is no record of a permit being taken out for its removal.

6. **235 South 2nd Street** (1859) John Borger / Henry Meirose (Meyrose) Building
Much like the Salentine Building this building historically was divided between two owners. The north 20 feet consists of three bays while the south 30 feet consists of four bays. Tax rolls from 1858 show no improvements on the property except for the west 20 feet on which was a dwelling in the early years. In 1859 the North 20 feet showed an improvement of $1000 while the south 30 feet showed improvements of $1200. We know from city directories that John Borger occupied the north part of the building as of 1859 and had a fancy dry goods store on the premises. His ownership continued into the 1870s. Henry J. Millmann followed into the early 20th century.

The south part of the building was owned/occupied by Henry Meirose (sometimes Meyrose) from at least 1868 through the first decade of the 20th century or longer. The upper floor held a rental hall. To quote from the National Register nomination: “As an important example of pre-Civil War architecture, it evokes the post and lintel construction of the Greek Revival with its rectilinear form, restrained facades and stone lintels incised with compressed ogee arches. It is a substantial block that is sited at the northwest corners of South Second and West Oregon Streets. It is four stories high, seven bays wide, nine bays long and clad with cream brick [actually solid masonry]. Across the top is simple saw tooth corbelling.” The use of corbeled masonry at the top of the building was a feature of these early years and would later make way for the less expensive sheet metal cornices that would be produced in Milwaukee’s burgeoning metal shops.

Drake Brothers, a pharmacy company, occupied the south part of the building for a number of years in addition to other locations.

7. 133 West Pittsburgh (1894) Larkin Building

This building was originally addressed at 200 South 2nd Street (old number 140-144 Reed Street) and built on land that members of the Larkin family had owned going back to the 1840s. To quote from the National Register nomination: “The Larkin Building is a former factory that was occupied by a succession of companies that manufactured bicycles, wool goods and candy. Located at the southeast corner of South Second Street and West Pittsburgh Avenue, it is four stories high and constructed of cream brick that is now painted. Between the third and fourth floors on the angled corner bay is a plaque with the name “Larkin”. Both facades are similarly treated with segmental openings on the second and third floors and round arched openings on the fourth floor. Across the top is brick corbelling and merlins. The ground floor has been altered with brick infill and glass block, but the rusticated stone entrance arches at the corner and on South Second Street remain.”

A number of important manufacturers occupied the building. See addendum.
The building is currently being renovated into housing and the infilled first story will be opened up.

127-133 West Pittsburgh (1929, 1950) Sperry Candy Company addition

Part of the same tax key as the Larkin Building, the Moderne Style Sperry Candy Company addition had been addressed at 127-133 West Pittsburgh. During Sperry’s occupancy of the old Larkin Building, they built a 5 story commercial style structure with concrete skeleton as an addition to the east in 1929 then later rebuilt it as a sleek Moderne structure with curved wall and ribbon windows in 1950. It is an excellent example of this style and has remained relatively intact. It is currently undergoing renovation for housing.

210-212 South 2nd Street (1888-1894) Larkin Investment Building

A third building associated with the tax key under today’s address of 133 West Pittsburgh is the 2-story solid masonry Italianate building at what was 210-212 South 2nd Street (146-148 Reed Street). It was constructed sometime between 1888 and 1894. Tax rolls show that C. H. Larkin owned much of the frontage along South 2nd Street between W. Pittsburgh and the alley to the south so it is likely this was built as additional income property. The simple building has undergone a number of alterations. The ground floor, which would have had two commercial storefronts, has been blocked up with one recessed entrance located at the southernmost end of the façade. The upper story is divided into three bays. Pairs of round headed windows are positioned at either end and a single window is located at the center. All windows are framed in brick and have keystones. The entry into the upper story was located below the center window per fire insurance maps. The cornice features very modest masonry work. It may have once has a pediment. The building was incorporated into the Larkin building interior and is undergoing renovations at this time.

8. 216 South Second Street (1911) Schueppert-Zoeller Printing Company

This 32×75, 2-story, brick building (Stanley Kadow, architect) was constructed in 1911 for the Schueppert-Zoeller Printing Co. per permit records. An earlier building once stood on this site.

The two story solid masonry structure shows the transition to a more classical restraint in buildings constructed after the turn of the 20th century. There is still the traditional storefront arrangement with large glass panes to either side of a center entrance as well as a bulkhead below and a prominent cornice to define the two stories. The five upper windows are rectangular in shape with no embellishments. The one flourish on this building is the fine corbeled brick cornice.

Known since 1913 as the Schueppert Printing Co., the firm operated here for 30 years. By 1941 the building was used for sheet metal and
insulation storage by the Louis Hoffmann Co., sheet metal contractors located in the same block, on W. Pittsburgh St. A few years later Diamond Ink & Adhesives moved in, manufacturing here until 1966. After several years as a drafting supplies store, Milwaukee Art Process Co., screen printers, purchased the structure. The façade has been altered but the storefront design is in keeping with the building’s original construction date.

VI. SIGNIFICANCE

This district is significant both for its architecture and history. There are fine examples of Italianate, Queen Anne, Romanesque and Commercial Style buildings all within this one block. It represents the very early phase of Milwaukee’s transition from frame to masonry commercial buildings. Between the late 1850s and the early 1870s virtually all frame buildings on this block had been replaced with structures that incorporated architectural elements intentionally used to convey a sense of permanence and style.

This block is also significant for being within the original business district of Walker’s Point and for continuing to evolve with the decades as a viable business hub. Located near Lake Michigan and the confluence of three rivers, not to mention the area into which the earliest railroads made their approaches into the city, this area became the center for a variety of business types that continued to evolve from the 19th into the latter part of the 20th century. From the early German Jewish retailers dealing with dry goods, medicines, clothing and hardware, later owners began to incorporate machining and even warehousing and the largest building in the district, the Larkin was home to a number of manufacturers. Seen as expedient places in which to carry on business the buildings entered a later period of neglect with storefronts blocked up and repairs deferred. In recent decades, this block of South 2nd Street became the hub of LGBTQ nightlife with such nightclubs as the Oregon House, the Phoenix, C’est La Vie, Gary’s, Circus and Club 219. As the area became more attractive to developers, the nightlife moved further south. Today the area is seeing conversions to housing, returning retail and a busy restaurant scene.

V. HISTORY

This one block portion of South Second Street lies near the confluence of the Menomonee and Kinnickinnic and Milwaukee Rivers just under three-quarters of a mile from the intersection of East Wisconsin Avenue and North Water Street. The area was part of the city’s Fifth Ward and was located on land claimed by George Walker in 1834, one of the city’s original three settlements. Along with Juneautown (Solomon Juneau) east of the Milwaukee River and Kilbourn Town (Byron Kilbourn) west of the Milwaukee River the settlements combined to create the city of Milwaukee in 1846. Walker experienced technicalities in clearing the title to his land until 1854 and explains why his settlement lagged behind Kilbourn’s and Juneau’s. But access to water and rail transportation would soon
change this. Newspaper articles in the Milwaukee Sentinel in 1858 seem to indicate that this was the year development really took off in the Fifth Ward. On one or two occasions it was Charles H. Larkin who accompanied the writer and pointed out the many improvements. Interestingly, in contrast to other wards where one family would occupy a single house and lot, the “Democratic” Fifth Ward was experiencing a population boom and dwelling units were being built for multiple families. Likewise the streets which were said to have been in bad condition “are now all paved in the low places”. In a listing of buildings constructed per street, Reed Street/South Second Street took the honors with nineteen buildings being completed that June, six of them brick structures. Grove Street/South Fifth Street came in second with twelve buildings. (Milwaukee Sentinel, 26 June 1858 1/5, ½, and 24 July 1858 1/3)

The following is directly taken from the National Register Nomination for the South First and Second Street Historic District.

The south side was not without its promoters, however, and other than Walker, various men including Horace Chase, John Ogden, and Henry Comstock leveled bluffs, filled swamps and constructed streets to encourage settlement. Probably the first major public improvement was the erection of the Menomonee Bridge at the confluence of the Milwaukee and Menomonee Rivers in 1838 by Byron Kilbourn. This was the first bridge built in Milwaukee and it connected today’s Plankinton Avenue with South second Street. The bridge was intended by Kilbourn to provide a direct route to his plat for new arrivals coming from the south on the Chicago trail, thus diverting potential settlers away from Juneau’s competitive east side plat. (Harry H. Anderson and Frederick I. Olson, Milwaukee at the Gathering of the Waters (Tulsa: Continental Heritage Press, 1984) ,p. 17) The ploy was successful in encouraging the growth of Kilbourntown, but settlers virtually by-passed Walker’s Point because of the uncertainty of the land title and the swampy terrain.

After clear title to the Walker’s Point plat was finally secured in the 1850s and a significant amount of land was made available for building, settlement in Walker’s Point began in earnest. Milwaukee’s population had grown dramatically between 1840 and 1850 from 1,712 to 20,051 persons. (Kathleen Neils Conzen, Immigrant Milwaukee 1836-1860 (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1976), p. 14.) Only a fairly small percentage of this growth was attributable to the birth rate or Yankee immigration from the east coast, since European immigrants contributed the overwhelming majority of the new settlers. Between 1848 and 1850 new arrivals were pouring into the city at a rate of 300 per day. (Conzen, p. 131) Milwaukee was hard pressed to provide housing, since available homesites in established east and west side neighborhoods were becoming scarce. A characteristic of the various European immigrant groups was their desire to live in close proximity to one another. The Irish had settled on the low ground on the east side north of the Milwaukee River, while the Germans clustered on the west side. The Germans were the largest single immigrant group. Although the majority of the Germans continued to locate on
the west side, the undeveloped Walker's Pont Plat attracted some German settlement in the late 1840s, and more importantly in the 1850s. Scandinavians and immigrants from the United Kingdom also contributed to the growth of Walker's Point’s [sic].

Another impetus for settlement in Walker’s point was its proximity to the major transportation arteries of the pre-Civil War era. The pioneer Walker’s Point settlement was founded in a strategic location at the confluence of the Milwaukee and Menomonee Rivers, and at the point where Milwaukee’s first two railroads would terminate. Until the city was connected by rail with Chicago in 1855 and the Mississippi River in 1857, the waterways were Milwaukee’s economic lifeline. The Milwaukee River estuary linked Milwaukee with the Great Lakes and the east coast via the Erie Canal. In the 1840s a number of industries developed in Milwaukee that processed the raw materials of the agricultural hinterland. Industries such as meat packing, tanning, flour milling and brewing all built facilities along and near the rivers. Milwaukee became a maritime trading center shipping agricultural products east, and importing finished goods, raw materials and new settlers. The business community that evolved to support this trade included commission firms, wholesale houses, warehouses, and the retail shops and stores that supplied the needs of the local populace. It was no coincidence that Milwaukee’s first business districts were located at the river’s edge.

Commercial activity in Walker’s Point was originally concentrated in the first block south of the river along South First and Second Streets. Lithographs of the city published in 1847 and 1854 show a small business district of Federal and Greek revival style commercial blocks, as well as a few substantial warehouses of masonry construction, three and four stories in height. This town center, however, paled in comparison with the much more extensive commercial areas along both sides of the Milwaukee River in Juneautown and Kilbourntown. These up-river settlements had the advantage over Walker’s Point during this period because river traffic was inhibited by the lack of a deep water harbor entrance. This prevented the largest of the Great Lakes ships from sailing up the Milwaukee River into the city proper or docking at Walker’s point. Instead the large ships were accommodated by three piers that were erected in the early 1840s and extended into Lake Michigan at the foot of East Clybourn Street. This enhanced the development activity on the east side, since the bulk of waterborn commerce was funneled directly into Juneautown and to some extent Kilbourntown, but by-passed Walker’s Point. Of the few boats that did enter the river, most sailed directly to Kilbourntown and Juneautown where the majority of the city’s population was located. Thus, in spite of its early promise as a shipping center, Walker’s Point was largely ignored by waterborn commerce and it never really developed beyond its early 1850s infancy as a cargo port.

Thus the apparent advantage of being located at the river confluence, even after the waterways were improved, was not the main impetus for the growth of the historic district. In fact, the village at Walker’s Point might have lapsed into obscurity if it had not become the city’s first rail center. In 1851, the Milwaukee and Mississippi Railroad Company built the state’s first railway between Milwaukee and Waukesha. (Anderson, “Milwaukee’s Southside”, p. 36) The railway originally began in Milwaukee at the foot of Plankinton Avenue, but in 1857 a spur was built across the Menomonee River at South Second Street. In
1863, this railway was absorbed into Alexander Mitchel’s Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway Company, which eventually grew into the giant Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad extending to the west coast. In 1866 the latter railroad built a depot at the intersection of South Second and West Seeboth Streets.

Milwaukee’s second railway was the Green Bay, Milwaukee and Chicago Railroad Company. The company was incorporated in 1851 and a line from Milwaukee had been completed to Chicago by 1855. (Anderson, p. 36) Its first terminus in Milwaukee was located just east of the intersection of South First and West Washington Streets. In 1856 the tracks were extended north to Florida Street, where a temporary depot was built. In 1856 this railway became part of the Chicago and North Western Railroad Company and extended its tracks to Seeboth Street so that it could share the fine new Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul depot. Because both railroads jointly used the building, it was subsequently known as Union Depot. This made it possible for rail travelers from Chicago and the east to connect directly with westward bound trains.

Union Depot was Milwaukee’s first major train station…Union Depot served as Milwaukee’s primary rail center until 1872 when the Chicago Milwaukee & St. Paul established its own line to Chicago and the rival Chicago & Northwestern [sic] was forced to move out of the depot and build its own station at the end of East Wisconsin Avenue on the lakefront. (Milwaukee Sentinel, 1888 February 25 p. 4 col. 4)

The railroads significantly encouraged commercial activity in Walker’s Point and the business district around the station grew in response to the increased traffic. Buildings were built not only to accommodate the production and storage of goods to be shipped by rail, but a substantial retail and service sector evolved to meet the day to day needs of the immediate neighborhood. By the end of the 1850s there was a solid commercial fabric of mixed business uses along First and Second Streets, and on the cross streets as far south as Florida Street. The business district housed four primary activities: retail, service, light manufacturing and processing. The retail sector was by far the largest and there were shops that sold clothing, shoes, millinery, dry goods, hardware, jewelry, groceries and liquor. With the railroads came traveling salesmen and other travelers in need of temporary food and lodging. To meet their needs, service businesses such as hotels, barber shops, saloons and restaurants were established. Also located in the area were a significant number of artisans and craftsmen who operated small metal products businesses including brass and iron foundries, a bell foundry and numerous tinmakers and sheet metal goods makers…One characteristic that distinguished this business district from the business district in Juneautown and Kilbourntown was the lack of a professional class. There is little evidence from business directories and the business listings in the city directories of the 1850s that the upper floors of these buildings were used as offices for professionals engaged in medicine, dentistry, law, architecture or engineering as they were in Juneautown. There were also no banks, insurance companies, newspaper publishers or commission offices.

During the Civil War years, Milwaukee experienced tremendous economic growth and the city’s business districts were expanded and rebuilt with substantial, masonry commercial blocks. From 1860 to 1870, the district was
rebuilt with a significant number of Italianate Style commercial buildings that ranged from two to four stores in height. The businessmen who erected these buildings were overwhelmingly of German [or German-Jewish] origin, and had come to the city with the education, skills and, sometimes, the investment capital necessary to establish successful businesses. The Germans were the largest single immigrant group on the south side constituting 50% of the households in 1850 and 40% in 1860. The Irish were the second largest group followed by residents from the United Kingdom and Scandinavia. Although the Germans were statistically dominant, the Fifth Ward was not thought of as an exclusively German part of the city. There was a balance between the German merchant community and the Scandinavians, who worked almost exclusively in ship buildings and related maritime businesses, and the British, who were mostly employed in the foundries, tin shops and other metal works.

[note: some paragraphs not included]

After 1870, the character of South First and Second Streets began to change. The center of retailing shifted south to the newly developing business district along National Avenue. The historic district became more of an area for light manufacturing, wholesaling and warehousing. A later example [of this shift] is the Larkin Building at 200 South Second Street/133 West Pittsburgh [built 1894] …and the Milwaukee Lace Paper Co. Building at 131 West Seebold [outside of the area under consideration for local historic designation]. These latter two buildings were built as factories not warehouses…The trend to light manufacturing and warehousing continued into the twentieth century and culminated in the construction of the Sperry Candy Company plant in 1950 at 127-33 West Pittsburgh Avenue.

VI. SOURCES

Additional sources are listed with each building in the addendum.


Milwaukee City Building Permit Records (various addresses)

Milwaukee Sentinel.

Milwaukee Tax Rolls, Fifth Ward, Walker’s Point, Blocks 10 and 11.

National Register of Historic Places. “South First and Second Street Historic District,” City of Milwaukee, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin, Reference Number 87002092.


VII. **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the 200 Block of South Second Street (including contiguous properties as described above) be given historic designation as a City of Milwaukee Historic District as a result of its fulfillment of criteria e-1 and e-5 of Section 320-21(3) of the Milwaukee Code of Ordinances.

**e-1.** Its exemplification and development of the cultural, economic, social or historic heritage of the city, state of Wisconsin or the United States.

**RATIONALE:** This block along with adjacent areas has been listed in the National Register of Historic Places as of November 11, 1987. This block represents the earliest phase of the development of Walker’s Point. As one of the three settlements that grew to become Milwaukee, Walker’s Point initially lagged behind the east and west sides due to problems with the land title. Resolution of the matter in 1854 along with the construction of the city’s first bridge (1838) and location of the first major railroad depot (1866) put South Second Street in a prime location for growth. City directories and Milwaukee Sentinel articles confirm that there were a host of businesses here by 1855; most were frame buildings. Fire insurance maps confirm that by 1876 most of the building in this stretch had been occupied by solid masonry buildings. Their success and long term ownership by stable owners allowed the buildings to withstand the shift to the new center of Walkers Point at South 5th and National. Uses changed from service and retail to light manufacturing and even warehousing. In recent decades South Second Street became the entertainment center for the LGBTQ community. Today the area is experiencing renewed interest by persons interested in historic settings. Housing, restaurants and retail are again occupying the buildings and history is circling back.

**e-5** Its embodiment of distinguishing characteristic of an architectural type or specimen

**RATIONALE:** The district today contains very good examples of the Greek Revival, Italianate, Queen Anne, and Romanesque styles as they were applied to commercial buildings. Not overtly flamboyant, the buildings nevertheless distinguish themselves from one another by use of detail and fenestration and building materials. Buildings from this period of commercial development in Milwaukee have virtually disappeared from the other two original settlements, Juneautown and Kibourntown.
PRESERVATION GUIDELINES

The following preservation guidelines represent the principle concerns of the Historic Preservation Commission regarding this historic designation. However, the Commission reserves the right to make final decisions based upon particular design submissions. Building maintenance and restoration must follow accepted preservation practices as outlined below. The intent of the guidelines are to preserve the buildings as closely as possible to their original form and details. Nothing in these guidelines shall be construed to prevent ordinary maintenance or restoration and/or replacement of documented original elements.

Any exterior alteration, exclusive of painting, will require a Certificate of Appropriateness. Any existing exterior features can remain. The historic designation does not mean that owners are required to restore their buildings to original condition, but that when major changes are made, such as the installation of new windows, storefronts, doors and exterior staircases for example, that they are compatible with the historic character of the building.

These Guidelines apply to the building exteriors only.

Guidelines for Rehabilitation

The South 2nd Street Historic District is important because of its concentration of period commercial buildings from the 19th and early 20th centuries. Throughout the district’s history a sense of integrity has been maintained by the consistency in scale, setback, siting and materials. This has resulted in visually distinct blockfaces. These guidelines are based upon those contained in Section 320-21-11 and 12 of the historic preservation ordinance. These guidelines are not intended to restrict an owner’s use of his/her property, but to serve as a guide for making changes that will be sensitive to the architectural integrity of the structure and appropriate to the overall character of the district.

1. Roofs

   Retain the original roof shape. Dormers, skylights, satellite dishes and solar collector panels may be added to roof surfaces if they are not visible from the street. Avoid making changes to the roof shape that would alter the building height, roofline or pitch. This includes parapets, pediments and cornices. For rooftop additions see Additions.

2. Exterior Finishes

   A. Masonry

   (i) Unpainted brick or stone or terra cotta must not be painted or covered. Painting masonry is historically incorrect and could cause irreversible damage if it was decided to remove the paint at a later date. Covering masonry with other materials (wood, sheet metal, vinyl siding, etc.) is not allowed.
(II) Re-point defective mortar by duplicating the original in color, hardness, texture, joint finish and joint width. See the masonry chapters in the books, As Good As New or Good For Business for explanations on why the use of a proper mortar mix is crucial to making lasting repairs that will not contribute to new deterioration of the masonry. Using much harder, contemporary Portland cement mortar will not make a lasting repair and can damage the historic brick and stone and terra cotta. Replaced mortar joints should be tooled to match the style of the original. Do not use mortar colors and pointing styles that were unavailable or were not used when the building was constructed. Consultation with historic preservation staff and a Certificate of Appropriateness is required before starting any re-pointing.

(iii) In the future should masonry cleaning be necessary it should be done only with the gentlest method possible. Sandblasting or high pressure water blasting or the use of other abrasive materials (baking soda, nut shells, dry ice, etc.) on limestone, terra cotta, pressed brick or cream brick surfaces is prohibited. This method of cleaning erodes the surface of the material and accelerates deterioration. The use of accepted chemical products to clean masonry is allowed and a test panel is required before general commencement of the work. Work should be done by experienced individuals as the chemical cleaning process can have a negative impact on the masonry. Consultation with historic preservation staff and a Certificate of Appropriateness is required before any cleaning would begin.

(iv) Repair or replace deteriorated masonry with new material that duplicates the old as closely as possible. The use of EIFS (exterior insulation and finish systems) which is synthetic stucco is not permitted. Neither is fake brick veneer. Consultation with historic preservation staff and a Certificate of Appropriateness is required before attempting work on the masonry.

B. Wood/Metal

(i) Retain original material, whenever possible. Avoid the indiscriminate removal of architectural features that are in most cases an essential part of the building’s character and appearance.

(ii) Retain or replace deteriorated material with new material that duplicates the appearance of the old as closely as possible. Covering wood or metal with aluminum, artificial stone, brick veneer, asbestos or asphalt shingles, or vinyl, aluminum or other substitute material is not permitted. Spot replacement or spot repair of any deteriorated elements is encouraged rather than complete removal and replication. Structural wood epoxies are suggested for the lasting repair of damaged or decayed areas of wood trim. Any new elements must replicate the pattern, dimension, spacing and material of the originals. Changes to or removal of fire escapes require consultation with Historic Preservation staff and a Certificate of Appropriateness.
C. Terra Cotta

(i) Unpainted terra cotta should not be painted or covered. Avoid painting or covering naturally glazed or finished terra cotta. This is historically incorrect and could cause irreversible damage if it was decided to remove the paint at a later date.

(ii) Clean terra cotta only when necessary to halt deterioration and with the gentlest method available. Sandblasting terra cotta is prohibited. This method of cleaning destroys the material.

(iii) Repair or replace deteriorated terra cotta with new material that duplicates the old as closely as possible. Pre-cast tinted concrete or cast fiber glass is recommended replacement materials as long as it is finished with a masonry coating to resemble the original appearance. Avoid using new material that is inappropriate or does not resemble the original.

3. Windows and Doors

a. Retain existing window and door openings. Retain the present configuration of panes, sash, lintels, keystones, sills, architraves, pediments, hoods, doors, shutters and hardware except for the restoration to the original condition. Do not make additional openings or changes in the fenestration by enlarging or reducing window or door sizes to fit new stock window sash or new stock door sizes. Avoid changing the size or configuration of windowpanes or sash. Avoid discarding original doors and door hardware when they can be repaired or reused. Use storm windows or protective glazing which have glazing configurations similar to the prime windows and which obscure the prime windows as little as possible. The use of structural wood epoxies is strongly encouraged to repair and minor damage or decay to windows.

b. Respect the stylistic period or periods the building represents. If replacement of window sash or doors is necessary, the replacement should duplicate the appearance and design of the original window sash or door. Avoid using inappropriate sash and door replacements such as unpainted galvanized aluminum storm and screen window combinations. Avoid the filling in or covering of openings with materials like glass-block or the installation of plastic or metal strip awnings or fake shutters that are not in proportion to the openings or that are historically out of the character with the building. Avoid using modern style window units such as horizontal sliding sash in place of double-hung sash or the substitution of units with glazing configurations not appropriate to the style of the building. In the event and windows need to be replaced, however, consultation with Historic preservation is required to determine appropriate glazing patterns. Tinted low-e glass is not acceptable. Vinyl, vinyl clad, metal, metal-clad or fiberglass prime window units are not permitted.

c. Steel security doors and windows guards are generally not allowed where they are visible from the street. If permitted, the doors or grates
must be of the simplest design and installed so as to be as unobtrusive as possible. A Certificate of Appropriateness is required for this type of installation.

4. Trim and Ornamentation

There shall be no changes to the existing trim or ornamentation except as necessary to restore the building to its original condition. The historic architectural fabric includes all terra cotta ornament; all pressed metal elements including cornices, pediments and oriel; and all carved and cast stonework. Replacement features shall match the original member in scale, design, color and material.

5. Additions

Make additions that harmonize with the existing building architecturally and are located so as not visible from the public right-of-way, if at all possible. Avoid making additions that are unsympathetic to the original structure and visually intrude upon the principal elevations. Rooftop additions will be reviewed on a case by case basis but no rooftop addition should result in the appearance of entire new story to the building. Rooftop additions are to be set back from the front and side elevations. Ideally an addition should either complement have a neutral effect upon the historic character of the building. Additions must be smaller than the original building and not obscure the historic building.

A. Guidelines for Streetscapes

The visual character of the streetscapes in the South 2nd Street Historic District is maintained by the consistency of the block faces in terms of height, scale, siting and density. This has resulted in compact, cohesive building stock with no intrusions that detract from the district's historic character.

1. Maintain the height, scale, mass and materials established by the buildings in the district and the traditional setback and density of the block faces. Avoid introducing elements that are incompatible in terms of siting, materials, height or scale.

2. Use traditional landscaping, fencing, signage and street lighting that are compatible with the character and period of the district. Avoid introducing landscape features, fencing, street lighting or signage that is inappropriate to the character of the district.

B. Guidelines for New Construction

It is important that additional new construction be designed so as to harmonize with the character of the district.

1. Siting

New construction must reflect the traditional siting of buildings in the South 2nd Street Historic District. This includes setbacks, spacing between buildings, the orientation of openings to the street and neighboring structures, and the relationship between the main building and accessory buildings.
2. **Scale**

   Overall building height and bulk; the expression of major building divisions including foundation, body and roof; and individual building components such as storefronts, overhangs and fenestration must be compatible with the surrounding structures.

3. **Form**

   The massing of new construction must be compatible with the surrounding buildings. The profiles of roofs and building elements that protect and recede from the main block must express the same continuity established by the historic structure.

4. **Materials**

   The building materials that are visible from the public right-of-way should be consistent with the colors, textures, proportions, and combinations of cladding materials traditionally used in the South 2nd Street Historic District. The physical composition of the materials may be different from that of the historic materials, but the same appearance should be maintained.

C. **Guidelines for Demolition**

   Although demolition is not encouraged and is generally not permissible, there may be instances when demolition may be acceptable if approved by the Historic Preservation Commission. The following guidelines, with those found in subsection 9(h) of the ordinance, shall be taken into consideration by the Commission when reviewing demolition requests.

   1. **Condition**

      Demolition requests may be granted when it can be clearly demonstrated that the condition of a building or a portion thereof is such that it constitutes an immediate threat to health and safety.

   2. **Importance**

      Consideration will be given to whether or not the building is of historical or architectural significance or displays a quality of material and craftsmanship that does not exist in other structures in the area.

   3. **Location**

      Consideration will be given to whether or not the building contributes to the neighborhood and the general street appearance and has a positive effect on other buildings in the area.

   4. **Potential for Restoration**

      Consideration will be given to whether or not the proposed demolition is a later addition that is not in keeping with the original design of the structure or does not contribute to its character.

   5. **Replacement**
Consideration will be given to whether or not the building is to be replaced by a compatible building of similar age, architectural style and scale or by a new building that would fulfill the same aesthetic function in the area as did the old structure (See New Construction Guidelines).

D. Fire Escapes

Additional required fire escapes shall be designed and located so as to minimize their visual impact from the public right-of-way.

E. Signs

The installation of any permanent exterior sign other than those now in existence shall require the approval of the Commission. Approval will be based on the compatibility of the proposed sign with the historic and architectural character of the building as well as the city’s sign ordinances.