## Rose/deJong

September 7, 2016

## **VIA OVERNIGHT MAIL**

Alderman Jose G. Perez City of Milwaukee City Hall, Room 205 200 E. Wells Street Milwaukee, WI 53202

Re:

Application for Historic District Designation for 200-235 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Walker's Point;

Objection Letter

Dear Ald. Perez:

Please be advised that this firm represents Lloyd and Ann Parks, the owners and occupants of the property located at 217-219 S. 2nd Street (the "Property").

You are hereby advised that the Parkses object to your application for the designation of 200 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street through 235 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street as a historic district pursuant to a Historic District Designation Application (the "Application").

While my clients recognize the public's interest in protecting historic buildings, there are circumstances in which the rights of property owners are overlooked. This is one of those circumstances. A historic district designation would force the Parkses into the unfortunate position of giving a governmental entity significant control over what they do with their Property - a circumstance that they did not bargain for when they purchased the Property over two (2) years ago.

One of the most important factors in my clients' decision to object to the Application is the fact that they are the only owner-occupants on the entire block. Should the Application be approved, it would disproportionately affect them as opposed to other developers. While my clients plan to renovate the first floor of the Property for commercial use, their primary use of the Property is as their home. They have a vested interest in helping to ensure that their use of the Property meets the needs of their community. They have plans, hopes and dreams for their Property which will likely be significantly hampered should the Application be granted due to the significant restrictions on renovations and bureaucratic hurdles to getting work approved.

Alderman Jose G. Perez September 7, 2016 Page 2

The driving force behind the Parkses' concerns about having to obtain approval for renovations is apparent to anyone with any familiarity with the Property. It was the victim of some very extensive and ill-advised exterior and interior renovations during the 1970s, the most glaring of which is the green stucco facade. Unlike many of the neighboring properties, for which redevelopment has been largely completed, the Property will require significant work in the future. Accordingly, my clients' position diverges from the alleged "general consensus" among property owners referenced in the Application because their situation and the Property are markedly different than most of the other property owners within the proposed historic district. In the evaluation of the merit of the Application, the needs of all property owners and properties within the proposed historic district – not just those who support it – should be given due consideration and weight.

My clients hope to return the Property to a historically accurate condition; however, the imposition of restrictions and the need to obtain approvals would be overly burdensome on my clients and stands to needlessly increase the costs my clients would have to incur. Given the circumstances, it is difficult to foresee a scenario where the historic district designation benefits my clients or the Property. Unless all property owners benefit from the designation, one struggles to see how it would benefit the community as a whole.

For the foregoing reasons, Lloyd and Ann Parks object to the application for designation of the 200-235 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street as a historic district.

Very truly yours,

ROSE & deJONG, S.C.

Christina L. Ruud

CLR/ms

cc: Lloyd and Ann Parks

√Linda Elmer