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I. NAME

Historic: Samuel Weinstock House

Common Name:

II. LOCATION

3402 W. St. Paul Avenue

Legal Description -
Tax Key No. 401-0214-000
Cont of Merrill’s Park Blks 8 to 12 SE ¼ SEC 25-7-21
Block 12 Lot 16

III. CLASSIFICATION

Site

IV. OWNER

PPI Development LLC
C/O Dwelling Ventures LLC
8405 W. Lisbon Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53222

PPI Development
C/O Dwelling Ventures LLC
2601 Crossroads Drive Suite 173
Madison, WI 53718

ALDERMAN
Ald. Robert Bauman, 4th Aldermanic District

NOMINATOR
Ald. Robert Bauman

V. YEAR BUILT

1889 (permit number 202 dated November 11, 1889)

ARCHITECT: Edward V. Koch (permit number 202 dated November 11, 1889)

VI. PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION

The Samuel Weinstock House is located at the northwest corner of N. 34th Street and St. Paul Avenue in what is commonly called the Merrill Park neighborhood, approximately two and one half miles west of the Central Business District. The area is characterized by mostly frame houses and duplexes built between the mid-1880s and the turn of the twentieth century. There are some large dwellings built by prosperous individuals but they are interspersed by modest houses and many duplexes, reflecting the original economic diversity of the neighborhood. Brick buildings are uncommon and consist of both brick veneer and solid masonry examples. The Weinstock House is the only brick residence on its block. While once a thriving part of the city, the neighborhood surrounding the Weinstock House has experienced much disinvestment.
in recent decades. Many of the surviving houses have been subjected to inappropriate alterations where windows have been replaced, substitute siding has been applied and original architectural details and porches have been removed. Houses have been demolished and some new infill dwellings built.

The Weinstock House is one of the largest houses in the neighborhood and stands out for its masonry construction and ornate detail. It occupies a lot that is 39.42 by 120 in dimension and the house is set back from the sidewalk behind a grassy lawn and positioned close to the west lot line. There is virtually no landscaping at the front of the house aside from a large maple tree on the west side of the front lawn and a large evergreen on the east side of the front lawn. Likewise, the setback along 34th Street shows no plantings other than grass and one bush. The west side yard is very narrow and consists of grass. The rear yard is mostly taken up with a paved concrete parking pad with access from the rear alley. It is screened from the sidewalk by a hedge of very small bushes.

The Weinstock House is an outstanding example of a hybrid residence that is Queen Anne in form but also shows elements from the Romanesque and Gothic Revival and can be classified with those unique buildings in the city that reflect the German heritage of their original owners. The pressed cream brick veneered house features a complex silhouette. Although essentially rectangular in form, it features various bays and porches that extend out from the house and there is a hip roof and cross gables as well as dormers and a prominent corner whose steeply pitched roof accents the composition. The foundation consists of rusticated stone and the basement window openings are filled in with glass block. A very large masonry porch marks the main façade. The masonry work on this building is outstanding. Detailed corbelling is a striking feature of the exterior and can be found in the belt course that divides the first from second story, the belt course below the eaves and the trim around all of the arched openings. Two chimneys survive, one at front hip roof and one near the rear.

The house has two principal elevations, the front main façade facing south on St. Paul Avenue and the east façade facing 34th Street. The house was meant to be viewed looking northwest. The rear and west elevations are more utilitarian in character.

The front elevation is essentially rectangular in form, two stories in height and crowned with a hip roof. A cream brick chimney, truncated in height, rises from the ridge of this roof. A pent roof dormer is located at the roof, featuring a single paneled window that is framed by casings with recessed panels. The side walls feature ornamental half timbering with the spandrels covered by wood shingles. The pent roof is supported by ornamental brackets. The dominant feature of the façade is the massive, gabled, masonry porch. Rather than centered on the façade, the porch is offset to the east or right and covers almost the entire first story. The ridge of the gable actually extends about halfway up the second story. The gabled roof frames a large central arch flanked by two rectangular openings that are framed by brick piers. The entire ensemble is very much like a Palladian window or opening but here the squat proportions, stone capitals, rusticated impost and buttresses have a Romanesque appearance rather than the more attenuated proportions and classical detail found in the true Palladian window. Shaped rafter tails enliven the porch's roof and a turned, baluster-like spindle marks the apex of the gable, almost like a bracket, an element that was commonly used on Victorian Gothic buildings. The top rail of the porch balustrade is of cut stone and it is not known at this time if the balusters were stone or turned wood. The front steps have been removed and there may have been wing walls. The front entrance door and at least one window are sheltered by the porch but are not visible due to the plywood across the entry. The porch is in need of a new roof and the entire structure is pulling away from the main body of the house. The remainder of the front façade features a pair of windows with one-over-one sash on the west end of the second story and a single window with one-over-one sash at the east end of the second story.

The prominent two and a half story tower is located at the house's southeast corner and forms a transition from the front to the east elevation. It is crowned with a tall, polygonal, pointed roof.
that projects out over the body of the tower like a hat. The walls of the tower are basically rectangular in form with chamfered corners. The tower rests on a rusticated stone base that features two basement window openings that are filled in with glass block. The entire ensemble of windows and spandrels are contained below a decorative arch that is embellished with ornamental corbelling. Window openings gradually decrease in size as you go up the tower but are more embellished the higher up the elevation. The first story window is a single paned sash that appears to be a replacement for what was probably a landscape sash that would have consisted of a large fixed pane topped by an ornamental transom. This windows features a stone sill. At the second story is a pair of windows, each consisting of a single pane. Again, these appear to be replacements for originals that would most likely have had one-over-one sash. The topmost window is a semi-circular light, a small version of a Diocletian window with the center portion containing a medallion. This medallion might have originally been filled with art glass. The spandrels between the windows of each story are detailed differently and give the tower its visual punch. A double spandrel is positioned between the first and second story. The first features four rectangular panels with chamfered edges. The spandrel directly above has two panels with chamfered edges and the infill brick is set at an angle. The spandrel just below the arched attic window features splayed ornament meant to look like half-timbering. The two shallow sides of this tower have similar treatment but with smaller windows that feature one-over-one sash and small arched windows at the attic level. There is no window on the southwest side of the bay on the first story due to the position of the porch roof. The transition of the tower to the elaborate roof is very complex. Pairs of colonnettes and single colonnettes spring from the impost of the arched attic windows to a narrow wood stringer that supports the ornamental brackets of the roof. There is not another arrangement like this in Milwaukee.

The east elevation along 34th Street is also highly embellished. The elevation’s two stories are demarcated by the same corbelled belt course found on the front façade and corbelling is also located just below the eaves. The main feature of this elevation consists of a shallow but broad two story, gabled bay of rectangular form, positioned somewhat south of center of the facade. Its large arched opening with corbelled surround echoes the scale of the front porch arch and gives the impression that the entire upper level is open and light filled. The prominent projecting bay has a number of distinctive features. The first story consists of a projecting three sided bay with three windows sharing a wrap around stone sill. The center window is a landscape sash with fixed lower pane topped by a narrow transom. Two smaller, narrow windows flank this center one and have one-over-one sash. Each is set into a segmental arch opening. A cornice with brackets marks the transition to the upper level which features a very large Diocletian window that dominates this elevation by its size and level of detail. A three-part window opening marks the second story with a center large window flanked by smaller sash. The center window consists of a landscape sash with two-light transom. The side windows have one-over-one sash and appear to be vinyl replacements. They are each topped with a single light transom. All of the transoms were probably filled with art glass originally. The Mullions dividing the windows have chamfered edges. Above this window grouping are highly ornamented panels that fill in the top portion of the Diocletian window. Directly above the center window of the second story is a rectangular spandrel divided into three panels by fluted boards. Above this three-part spandrel is located a small, rectangular attic window with arched top. To either side of the three-part spandrel and attic window are decorative panels filled with cut scroll work that resembles strapwork, a feature found on many German buildings of this time as a revival of a type of embellishment once popular in pre-Renaissance architecture. The gabled roof projects dramatically beyond the wall of the bay and features shaped brackets or rafter tails. Colonnettes are positioned at an angle at the center and either end of the gable in place of traditional brackets and are tied to Victorian Gothic design. The elevation of the main block of the house is treated differently to either side of this projecting bay. To the south or left, the hip roof extends beyond the wall of the house and is supported by ornamental shaped brackets or rafter tails. A shed roofed dormer with two small one-over-one sash windows is located in this roof and probably matched the dormer at the front at one time. At this time the dormer lacks the paneled sides and half-timbering of the
front dormer. There are no windows in the wall to the south or left of the projecting bay. To the right of the bay the wall is capped with a half gable at the roofline. The first story one-over-one sash is set into a segmental window opening with brick voussoirs while the second story features a one-over-one sash window set into a pointed, Gothic style opening.

The rear or north elevation is a rectangular block that is stepped back from the side walls of the main block of the house and crowned with a hipped roof. On its east end, where the rear block meets the center block of the house, is a pent roofed masonry porch that again mimics the design of the front porch with a large center arch supported by piers that create a medieval looking Palladian motif. Impost blocks and railings are of stone and there may have been stone balusters at the balustrade. One colonnette remains as ornamentation in the spandrels flanking the center arch. The porch appears to have had brick knee walls but they have been removed and replaced with pipe railings set into cast concrete steps. This porch accesses a door and also shelters a window. A single one-over-one sash window is positioned above this porch on the second story and may be a replacement window. On the north elevation of this rear wing are located two one-over-one sash windows on the second story, and two one-over-one sash windows on the first that correspond to interior room arrangements. The focal point of this east façade is the rear entrance that is framed with a pent roofed hood supported by brackets. A modern hollow core door is set into the opening. This entrance accesses a cast concrete stoop and steps. To the left of this entrance and attached to the side masonry porch is an exterior stair to the basement that has metal bulkhead doors. On the west side of this rear block are two rectangular windows

The west elevation is relatively simple in design compared to the other facades. The corbelled belt course wraps this portion of the house but stops before reaching the rear block. A gabled, rectangular bay extends out slightly from the main block of the house at about the center of the elevation. It features paired windows set into segmental arched openings on the first story and a pair of rectangular windows on the second. In the gable end is a three-part arched Diocletian window. All of the windows have stone sills. This gable is treated in much the same fashion as that on the east elevation but two of the colonettes are missing. To the right or south of the projecting bay is a rectangular window with transom that most likely illuminates the staircase. To the right of this window is a small three part window with segmental arch and shaped mullions. This window probably illuminated the stair landing and most likely had art glass panels.

Alterations to the house have been chiefly the result of deferred maintenance. The front porch is detaching from the body of the house. The front porch steps and possibly knee walls are missing. The roof needs re-shingling in most areas. The two chimneys have been shortened. Various brackets and colonettes are missing. Some of the original wood windows have been replaced with vinyl ones. There is no leaded glass or art glass in any of the transoms. The brick was cleaned in 2006 but the painted surface remains on the west elevation.

VII. SIGNIFICANCE

The Weinstock House is a significant Milwaukee example of an exuberant, masonry dwelling that is reminiscent of the type of houses being designed in Germany in the late 19th century. While the basic form of the house, with its projecting bays and complex roofline and tower, has its roots in the Queen Anne style, the house displays elements of Gothic Revival, Romanesque Revival and Germanic half-timbering and masonry work that lends it an Old World character. There is no other house still extant in Milwaukee like it. Built in 1889, this is the largest and most elaborate of the known works of local architect Edward V. Koch, whose career includes such well known icons as the Lion House (George Koch House) on Highland Boulevard and the Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Church (Our Savior's) on West Scott Street.
MERRILL PARK NEIGHBORHOOD

Merrill Park is the name of a Milwaukee neighborhood located south of Wisconsin Avenue and west of today’s 27th Street. The first portion of Merrill Park was platted by Sherburn S. Merrill in 1883. Merrill was the general manager of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway, what came to be called the Milwaukee Road railroad, and had a substantial home on property located at 33rd Street and Wisconsin Avenue. He would eventually own all of the land between 30th and 35th Streets from Wisconsin Avenue to the Menomonee Valley. Due to his oversight, the extensive shops of the Milwaukee Road were located in the Menomonee Valley beginning in 1879. Railroad cars were built and repaired here to service a company that was expanding each year and had thousands of miles of track. The shops became the largest industrial complex in the valley and Milwaukee’s largest employer with 28,000 workers throughout its system. The location of this complex spurred residential development south of Wisconsin Avenue as workers from the railroad, everyone from the laborer to the managers and skilled engineers, came to live close to their jobs. The original subdivision laid out by Merrill was typical for the time and had lot sizes that ranged from 40/45 feet wide by 120 feet deep. Of note for this period was the fact that developers like Merrill began to incorporate deed restrictions for land that was being subdivided. The different subdivisions created out of the Merrill holdings contained language prohibiting saloons and places that brewed or dispensed alcohol, as well as prohibiting livery stables and businesses that were detrimental to first class residential neighborhoods. (Gurda, The West End pp. 10-14, 21, 26)

The portion of Merrill Park in which the Weinstock House was built is legally known as the Continuation of Merrill’s Park and was platted in 1885 by the executors of the estate of Sherburn Merrill that included David S. Wegg, David C. Green, Benjamin G. Lenox, and Mary E. Merrill, Sherburn’s widow. Houses range from large single family Queen Anne style dwellings to duplexes and more modest vernacular houses. Masonry buildings are uncommon. Ethnic groups once living in Merrill Park included the Irish and the Germans and some Yankees in the years when the neighborhood was first being developed.

Samuel Weinstock

Samuel Weinstock was born in Bavaria on May 30, 1825 and came to the United States in 1845 at the age of twenty. He first lived in New York City then relocated to Milwaukee in 1852. After spending seven years here in the mercantile business, he moved to rural Rubicon, Wisconsin and was occupied in buying and shipping cattle.

In November of 1863 Weinstock married Fannie Bamberger, a Bavarian native, and the wedding took place in New York City. In 1866 Weinstock relocated to Brandon, Wisconsin in Fond du Lac County, and opened Weinstock & Brother, a general merchandise store. His son Gilbert was born a year later in January of 1867 and daughter Saline was born in 1869. In 1870 Samuel sold the store to his brother and that fall opened a store on his own that carried everything but hardware. His daughter Theresa was born in 1877. Weinstock was active in his community, serving on the village board and having membership in the Masons and the International Order of Odd Fellows. At the time of his published biography in the 1880 The History of Fond du Lac County, Wisconsin, he was said to have been “continuously in mercantile life in Brandon longer than any other merchant; has a good trade from both foreigners and Americans”. (The History of Fond du Lac County, p. 1055.)

At the age of 64 Samuel Weinstock apparently decided to retire and moved to Milwaukee where he had once lived. There were a number of other Weinstocks listed in the city directories at this time and perhaps they were all related. Maybe Weinstock wanted to be in an urban community that provided jobs for his family. He purchased Lot 16 as well as 15 in Block 12 in the Continuation of
Merrill's Park on June 29, 1887 from Herman Jahns. Jahns had previously purchased the two parcels from the developers on June 24, 1887 on land contract. Deed restrictions indicated that the house had to be set back from the centerline of Fowler Street (today's St. Paul Avenue) no closer that 55 feet and that the property could not be used for the sale, manufacture or dispensing of alcoholic beverages and that no boarding or livery stable was allowed for this first class residential neighborhood. (Deeds 217:70, 228:178) We do not know why Weinstock chose Merrill Park to be the site of his retirement home. It was closer to the commotion, the pollution and the industrial activity of the Menomonee Valley and did not have the cache that neighborhoods north of Wisconsin Avenue had. Perhaps the property was more affordable and then again, perhaps the perception was that it was not much different from other areas of the booming west side. Architect Edward V. Koch took out the permit for Weinstock’s brick veneered house two years later on November 11, 1889, and it was estimated to cost $3,000. We do not know why Edward V. Koch was chosen as the architect for the project. Perhaps there were ties through an association with the Masons or the Odd Fellows, both organizations in which Weinstock was active. The very large house that was constructed was an eye-catching example of ethnic architecture, a dwelling that was Queen Anne in form but with a prominent tower, massive masonry porch and half-timbering details that were reminiscent of architecture in Weinstock's native Bavaria.

We do not know much about Samuel Weinstock’s life in retirement. He was said to have a large party each Memorial Day to which he invited friends, neighbors and acquaintances to celebrate his birthday. The 1900 census lists him as a “capitalist” and he probably had income from investments. Weinstock’s family, with the exception of Saline (also known as Freda), all lived with him in the St. Paul Avenue house. At the time the house was completed his wife Fannie was in her early 60s, his son Gilbert was age 23 and working as a dry goods dealer, and his daughter Theresa was age 13 and worked as a stenographer in a law office. On the premises, in 1900, was a maid Annie Neuberger. (United States Census 1900)

Weinstock continued to be active in Masonic circles and with the Odd Fellows as he had when he was in Brandon. He is also said to have devoted his life to his garden which had flowers, herbs and fruits. This garden was most likely located on the adjacent lot to the west, known today as 3406 W. St. Paul, as fire insurance maps show the plot vacant with only a small shed at the northwest corner. There was never a coach house, barn or garage built on the property. Deeds confirm that Weinstock owned both parcels. (Deeds 950:527; Sanborn map 1894 vol.2 page 212 and 1910 vol. 4 page 347.) Theresa Weinstock never married and continued to live with her parents until their deaths. Samuel's wife Fannie Weinstock died in 1919. Samuel Weinstock died in October 1920 at the age of 97. He was at the time the oldest Mason in Wisconsin and the oldest Oddfellow in America. The Milwaukee Journal obituary headline read “Samuel Weinstock, Oldest Mason and Oddfellow, Is Dead. Never Scolded Boys Who Cut Corner Across His Lot; Lived Ideal Family Life and Practiced Tolerance.” Neighbors recalled having cut across the corner on the way to school and forgetting to go around the corner once the house was built. Weinstock never scolded the children but met them after school or in the morning with genial greetings. “He shamed us into respecting his property rights” said one person. Weinstock’s burial service was held at the house and performed by Reform Rabbi Charles S. Levi, associated with temple Bne’Jeshurun up until its merger with congregation Emanu-El in 1927. The burial rites were handled by the Masons at Greenwood Cemetery where Weinstock was buried. (Milwaukee Journal October 12, 1920; Swichkow and Gartner, The History of the Jews of Milwaukee, p. 205)

Theresa Weinstock continued to live on the premises after her father's death. The following year, 1921, a Herbert Fritschel, who worked as a chemist, was also living in the house with his wife so it appears that some of the rooms in the house were being used for tenants, probably to provide an income for Theresa. The Weinstock children, Gilbert, Theresa and Salina, sold the house and adjacent lot to Theresa Nicklas on May 10, 1922. Interestingly, Theresa Weinstock continued to live in the house as a tenant after the sale to Nicklas. Nicklas lived on the premises along with another tenant Ludwig Jung then John Murray. Murray would rent here from 1923 to 1930. Theresa Nicklas sold the house to John Lutz on June 20, 1924. Lutz did not live on the premises. Nicklas or Lutz apparently sold off the adjacent lot to the west (Lot 15) sometime in this period to a
G. A. Losy as new construction on that lot is documented by a permit for a house that was taken out on March 28, 1925. That new house is addressed today as 3406 W. St. Paul Avenue. (Deeds 950:527, 1042:106)

Theresa Weinstock remained in the house as a tenant through 1930. She had begun working as a saleswoman at the Boston Store and kept this job thereafter when she was living in her final home 3104 W. Wells Street Apt. #105 through 1956. She apparently died at that time.

During the worst period of the Great Depression, the old Weinstock house sat mostly vacant from 1931 through 1935. Mrs. Cora Gill moved in during 1936 and probably operated a rooming house on the premises. Joseph and Mary Zupat followed in 1928 and permit records show that Mary Zupat received an occupancy certificate for a rooming house on August 18, 1940 with 2 2-room units on the first floor, 2 2-room units on the second floor, 1 1-room units on the second floor and 1 sleeping room. The third floor was to remain vacant. Later city directories show a whole host of occupants with as many as three couples as well as individual tenants living on the premises.

Research has yet to be done on daughter Selina (Frida) Weil. Son Gilbert had moved out of the St. Paul Avenue house by 1915 and lived at 719 Hackett Street (today’s 2925 N. Hackett) then at 775 Stowell Street (today’s 3023 N. Stowell). His family consisted of wife Tessie, and children Aimee, Elsie, Fannie J., and Gilbert B. Jr. Gilbert Weinstock Sr. died in 1932/1933.

Later owners of the Weinstock House included Clifford Ray Parmley (1978-2004), rental Properties LLC (2004), Rex Rental Properties LLC (2004-2006), and Royal Property Investments LLC (2006-2008). The current owner, PPI Development LLC has owned the property since April 2008. The property is currently tax delinquent and has had numerous code violations and condemnation orders in recent years.

THE ARCHITECT

Not much is known about the career of Edward V. Koch outside of surveys conducted by the historic preservation staff. The subject of this interim petition was incorrectly attributed to local architect Henry C. Koch when surveyed in 1979 although permit records clearly show that Edward V. Koch was the architect. The Weinstock commission was clearly one of Edward V. Koch’s most significant residential designs and has given us new insights into his talents.

Edward V. Koch first appeared in the Milwaukee city directories in 1878 at the age of 16 and he is listed as an apprentice. He was living with miller John Koch and appears to have been a brother or relative of George Koch, later associated with the West Side Bank. In 1886 he opened his own architectural office under the name Edward V. Koch & Co. with offices in the Colby-Abbot Buildings. No partner is listed in the city directory. He moved to the Metropolitan Block in 1892 then the Iron Block by 1894. He subsequently worked out of his home at 739 4th Street (today’s 2125 N. 4th Street). In 1901 Edward V. Koch was listed as the assistant inspector of buildings with the city and then the building inspector in 1904. The common Council confirmed his appointment as Inspector of Buildings on June 27, 1904 to serve out the appointment of Michael Dunn who had resigned. Koch was subsequently confirmed for a four year appointment on February 17, 1908. (Common Council Proceedings, 1904-1905 p. 323 and 1907-1908 p. 1461) His office was located on the fourth floor of City Hall. By this time he had moved to today’s 2415 N. Humboldt Avenue. It seems he completed his term of office in 1911 as scheduled. He then resumed his architectural practice and appears to have worked out of his home most of the time. He and his wife Lucy last rented a flat at 2873 N. Sherman Boulevard where they lived from about 1924 through 1931. Koch died on August 7, 1931 at the age of 69. His wife had preceded him in death.

More research will need to be done to determine the full scope of Edward V. Koch’s architectural career. Koch was a common last name in Milwaukee and there seems to be no relationship to the prominent Henry C. Koch who designed Milwaukee’s city hall in addition to other significant local and Wisconsin buildings. Although Edward V. Koch appears to have learned the architectural
profession like others of his time, by starting as a draftsman and working his way up in an architectural firm, some of his commissions are so unusual that we can speculate that he might have had some training abroad. Surveys have turned up approximately eleven commissions in Milwaukee. Most date to the period before he served as city Inspector of Buildings. His residences in the Queen Anne style show a mastery of the form and are comparable with other architects in Milwaukee. These commissions include: Mrs. Marie Krause House at 853 N. 19th Street (1897), 928-930 N. 29th Street (1895), the Emil P. Kron House at 1254 N. 24th Street (1891) and its near twin, reversed, at 1214 S. 9th Street built as the parsonage for the Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Church, predecessor of today’s Our Savior’s Lutheran. The large towered Queen Anne house for W. S. Murphy at 2728 W. Kilbourn Avenue (1892) (demolished) exhibited some of the complexity of form that can be seen on the earlier Weinstock House.

It is in Edward V. Koch’s masonry buildings, however, that his originality can be best appreciated. The house at 1518-1518A N. Astor Street was designed for Mrs. William Gillespie in 1888 and shows some of the detail in the brick belt course and the framing of the arched window openings that will be developed further in the Weinstock commission. The Abraham Breslauer House at 1435 W. Kilbourn Avenue (Kilbourn Avenue Rowhouse NR Historic District) is much like the Weinstock House and has no equal in the city. Both commissions were done for men of German Jewish ethnicity. The bold rounded corner tower dominates the building and the recessed entry and niche-like enframement of a window on the second story are very European in flavor and reflect the original owner’s German heritage. They might have reminded the owner of castles in the old country. Also unusual for Milwaukee is Koch’s design for the Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Church (Our Savior’s) at 835 W. Scott Street built in 1894. The single tower with its tapering spire features corbelling and distinct dormers. There is also unique terra cotta and stone ornamentation on the tower and the front entrances. The large arched window at the transept and front façade are reminiscent of the south elevation window on the Weinstock House. Perhaps the best known of Henry Koch’s commissions is the house he designed for his brother or relative, George Koch, at 3209 W. Highland Boulevard in 1897. The Beaux Arts style house is based on the Neoclassical style country villas of early 19th century Europe. The monumental front portico enhances what is otherwise a small scale house. Koch’s patrons in the late 19th century either allowed him the freedom to experiment with design or had sought him out as someone who could embody their aspirations.

It is not known what led Koch to take on a position with the city. Appointments were political in nature and maybe he was rewarded for his political support or perhaps he sought the work as being steadier that in private architectural practice. We know of only a few commissions after he ended his position as Inspector of Buildings. One is the stucco clad Dallwig House at 3035 N. Prospect Avenue (1912) and the other a remodeling of a commercial storefront for Frank Gorski at 1005-1007 E. Wright Street in 1921. That stucco clad storefront included a shaped gable that reflected the Polish ethnicity of its owner.

The Weinstock House stands as the most exuberant of Koch’s known commissions. Weinstock, like Koch’s other German Jewish client, Abraham Breslauer, may have wanted a retirement home that spoke of his ethnicity and his roots in Bavaria. The house shows Koch to have been well versed in contemporary European design and an architect not afraid to incorporate all the bells and whistles possible into a commission and find craftsmen who could execute his designs flawlessly.
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IX. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Samuel Weinstock House be given interim historic designation as a City of Milwaukee Historic Structure as a result of its fulfillment of criteria e-5 and e-9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance, Section 308-81(2)(e) of the Milwaukee Code of Ordinances.

e-5. Its embodiment of the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or specimen.

Rationale: The Samuel Weinstock House is an outstanding example of ethnic architecture in Milwaukee where the Queen Anne form was merged with elements of Victorian Gothic and Romanesque to create a building that had ties to the architectural renaissance going on in Germany in the late 19th century. It was at this period that German architects were rejecting classical revival forms and striving to find an expression of their native Germanic roots. These roots took them back to the medieval and gothic buildings of the pre-Renaissance era and resulted in the colorful and exuberant buildings that sported towers, gables and intricate masonry work.

The Weinstock House is a tour-de-force of architectural design. Architect Edward V. Koch, noted for his distinctive buildings like the Lion House on Highland Boulevard and the Norwegian Evangelical Church of Our Savior on Scott Street, pulled out all the stops for Samuel Weinstock and provide a house that exhibits distinctive masonry work, and a complex roof as well as bold front porch and side porch and a one-of-a-kind tower with distinctive wood trim. The prominent window at the east elevation, with its scroll sawn decoration has no match in the city.

e-9. Its unique location as a singular physical characteristic, which represents an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community or the city of Milwaukee.

Rationale: Weinstock House is a visual landmark in its neighborhood and in the city. A veritable mansion among more modest houses, the cream brick
residence was inventoried during the very first survey of Milwaukee buildings potentially eligible for historic status in 1979. It is the type of house that grabs the attention of anyone walking or driving by its scale, material, and complex detail.

X. PRESERVATION GUIDELINES

The following preservation guidelines represent the principal 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. Given the level of detail on this house, review of maintenance projects with historic preservation staff is required.

A. Roofs

Retain the roof shape. Skylights are discouraged but may be added to roof surfaces if they are not visible from the street or public right of way. No major changes can be made to the roof shape of the Weinstock House, which would alter the building height, roofline or pitch. Locate mechanical systems and vents on portions of the roof not visible at all from the public right of way and paint them out to minimize impact. If the building gets re-roofed, consultation with historic preservation staff is required to review and approve the new material, flashing, and gutters to determine how to mitigate the water damage that has occurred. The ornamental soffits are one of the most important features of the building. The original brackets and colonettes must be retained and they cannot be removed or covered over with aluminum or vinyl siding or other substitute materials. The owner is encouraged to replace the missing elements. The distinctive pointed roof of the tower may not be removed or altered in form, shape or detail. It is one of the character defining features of the building. There is a satellite dish positioned on a portion of the roof visible along 34th Street. Should additional satellite dishes be installed, or should the current dish be relocated or replaced, their placement and size are subject to review by staff and the commission. Retain existing original chimneys. No rooftop construction is allowed, as this would interfere with the viewing of the house. Preserve the existing dormers. The dormer at the front elevation retains much of its original detail. If the dormer on the east elevation needs to be rebuilt, it should be brought back to the appearance of the front dormer. The construction of dormers or other rooftop features, addition of skylights and satellite dishes, and re-roofing require review by Historic Preservation staff and a Certificate of Appropriateness.

B. Materials

1. Masonry

   a. Unpainted brick, terra cotta, or stone 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. Any further paint removal from the exterior requires a Certificate of Appropriateness.
b. Repoint 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. 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 repointing. Some inappropriate repointing work is evident in places on the exterior. Future repointing should not replicate this inappropriate work.

c. Clean masonry only when necessary to halt deterioration and with the gentlest method possible. Sandblasting or high pressure water blasting or the use of other abrasive materials (soda, nut shells, 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. Avoid the indiscriminate use of chemical products that could have an adverse reaction with the masonry materials, such as the use of acid on limestone. Work should be done by experienced individuals. Consultation with historic preservation staff and a Certificate of Appropriateness is required before any cleaning would begin.

d. Repair or replace deteriorated material with new material that duplicates the old as closely as possible. Do not use new material that is inappropriate for the time period when the building was constructed. Consultation with historic preservation staff and a Certificate of Appropriateness is required before attempting work on the masonry. The front masonry porch, another character defining feature of the house, cannot be removed. If mudjacking and less intrusive methods of stabilization are not successful, the porch must be rebuilt, including its front steps and wing walls, to its historic appearance. The side porch along 34th Street may not be removed. Neither porch may be enclosed or altered from its historic appearance.

2. Wood/Metal

a. Retain original material, whenever possible. Do not remove architectural features that are essential to maintaining the building’s character and appearance.

b. Retain or replace deteriorated material with new material that duplicates the appearance of the old as closely as possible. Do not cover architectural features with new materials that do not duplicate the appearance of the original materials. Covering wood or metal with aluminum or vinyl or other substitute material is not permitted. Ornamental wood details, from the roof to the tower to the dormers to the windows and trim, may not be removed or altered except to restore their appearance. Spot replacement or spot repair of any deteriorated brackets/rafter tails, scrollwork or colonettes or mullions is encouraged rather than complete removal and replication. Any new
elements must replicate the pattern, dimension, spacing and wood species of the original.

C. Windows and Doors

1. Retain existing window and door openings. Retain the existing configuration of panes, sash, surrounds and sills, except as necessary to restore to the original condition. Do not make additional openings or changes in existing fenestration by enlarging or reducing window or door openings to fit new stock window sash or new stock door sizes. Do not change the size or configuration of the original windowpanes or sash. 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.

2. Respect the building's stylistic period. If the replacement of doors or window sash is necessary, the replacement should duplicate the appearance and design and material of the original window sash or door. New glass must match the size of the historic glass. Avoid using inappropriate sash and door replacements. Do not fill in or cover openings with inappropriate materials such as glass block or concrete block. Do not use modern style window units, such as horizontal sliding sash or casements, in place of double-hung sash or the substitution of units with glazing configurations not appropriate to the style of the building.

Any original windows on the Weinstock House should be retained and repaired if at all possible. That includes windows on the first and second stories and in the gable ends and dormers. Vinyl, vinyl clad, metal, and metal-clad or fiberglass prime window units are not permitted. Vinyl windows have already been installed in selected window openings. If the owner would want to remove them in the future, wood double hung windows with one-over-one sash would be appropriate replacements. If the owner would want to replace the glass block in the basement window openings, the glass block may be removed in the future and the openings fitted with wood sash windows whose design would be reviewed for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Should the owner want to install art glass back into the transoms, consultation with historic preservation staff is required. The doors at the front of the house and at the side porch were not visible at the time of this nomination. If the original doors are still extant, every effort should be made to preserve them. If that is not possible, then replacement doors should be appropriate to the historic period of the house. The rear or north elevation door is a modern solid or hollow core door. Should the owner wish to change this door, the replacement will more closely match the originals in design, or be period appropriate to the age and style of the house, and fit into the original opening. Any changes to doors and windows, including installation of new doors and windows, require consultation with Historic Preservation staff and a Certificate of Appropriateness.

3. Steel bar security doors and window guards are generally not allowed. If permitted, the doors or grates shall 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.
D. Trim and Ornamentation

There should be no changes to the existing historic trim or ornamentation except as necessary to restore the building to its original condition. Replacement features shall match the original member in scale, design, color and appearance. Existing historic trim in wood and stone, found on the porch and sills and throughout the building, shall not be removed unless it is for the purpose of repair. Decorative brackets may not be removed from the building. Consultation with Historic Preservation staff is required before any changes or repairs are made to the building.

E. Additions

No additions will be permitted on the south (front) or east (right side) elevations of the Weinstock House as this would destroy the character defining features of the building. Any other addition requires the approval of the Commission. Ideally an addition should either compliment or have a neutral effect upon the historic character of the building. Approval shall be based upon the addition's design compatibility with the building in terms of window size and placement, building height, roof configuration, scale, design, color, and materials, and the degree to which it visually intrudes upon the principal elevations or is visible from the public right of way. Additions must be smaller than the building and not obscure the historic building.

F. Signs/Exterior Lighting

The installation of any permanent exterior sign or light fixture shall require the approval of the Commission. Approval will be based on the compatibility of the proposed sign or light with the historic and architectural character of the building. Consultation with Historic Preservation staff is required to assist in the selection of exterior fixtures. Plastic internally illuminated box signs are not permitted.

G. Site Features

New plant materials, paving, fencing, or accessory structures (garden sheds, storage sheds, and gazebos) shall be compatible with the historic architectural character of the building. Any rear deck or patio installation requires a Certificate of Appropriateness. No retaining wall is permitted along the front of the property or the east 34th Street portion of the property. A concrete parking pad is currently located at the rear of the property. Consultation with Historic Preservation staff is required before starting any work that would involve the landscape features, the position of the parking pad and service walks.

H. Guidelines for New Construction

It is important that new construction be designed to be as sympathetic as possible with the character of the structure. No principal dwelling or structure shall be constructed in the rear yard. Small-scale accessory structures, like a gazebo or fountain, may be permitted depending on their size, scale and form and the property’s ability to accommodate such a structure. Any request to construct a garage would be subject to review for code compliance and appropriate design and would require a Certificate of Appropriateness.

1. Siting
New construction must respect the historic siting of the building. It should be accomplished so as to maintain the appearance of the building from the street as a freestanding structure.

2. Scale

Overall building height and bulk, the expression of major building divisions including foundation, body and roof, and individual building components, such as overhangs and fenestration that are in close proximity to a historic building must be compatible to and sympathetic with the design of the building. New construction is to be smaller in size and shorter in height than the historic building.

3. Form

The massing of the new construction must be compatible with the goal of maintaining the integrity of the building as a freestanding structure. The profiles of roofs and building elements that project and receded from the main block should express the same continuity established by the historic building if they are in close proximity to it.

4. Materials

The building materials which are visible from the public right-of-way and in close proximity to the historic building should be consistent with the colors, textures, proportions, and combinations of cladding materials used on the historic building. The physical composition of the materials may be different from that of the historic materials, but the same appearance should be maintained and materials not available when the house was constructed should be avoided.

I. 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 and is beyond hope of repair. See the section on Masonry above with regard to the porches.

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 building is beyond economically feasible repair.

5. Additions

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.
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