



Milwaukee Historic Preservation Commission Staff Report

LIVING WITH HISTORY

HPC meeting date: 1/10/2022
Ald. Russell Stamper II District: 15
Staff reviewer: Jacqueline Drayer
PTS CCF 211263

| | | |
|------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Property | 2422 N Sherman Boulevard | Sherman Boulevard Historic District |
| Owner/Applicant | David Griffin 2422 N Sherman Boulevard Milwaukee, WI 53210 | |
| Proposal | Retroactive approval for a stain that was already applied to the brick house. A complaint brought this to HPC attention. The applicant said that the stain is Sherwin-Williams Woodscapes 2305 "Railto," and that the intent of applying it was to "allow the brick to breathe freely." | |
| Staff comments | <p>Staff found the Sherwin-Williams Woodscapes stain line, but was unable to find the precise color (searching by number and by name, using Railto and Rialto). Photos provided by the applicant do confirm that the brick is stained.</p> <p>The guidelines for Sherman Boulevard clearly prohibit painting and covering masonry. Covering would seem to include stain. Specifically?</p> <p>A.2.a.(i). Unpainted brick or stone should not be painted or covered. Avoid painting or covering natural stone and unpainted brick. This is likely to be historically incorrect and could cause irreversible damage if it was decided to remove the paint at a later date.</p> <p>A.4. Trim & Ornamentation</p> <p>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 turned and carved wood trim, all terra cotta ornament, all pressed metal elements including the cornices, pediments and oriels, and all carved and cast stonework. Replacement features shall match the original member in scale, design, color and material.</p> <p>However, after significant research on options for reversing a stain, and talking to several material conservators about options and best practices for stain removal, there is no "one size fits all" or generally agreed upon method of resolving this issue. The most practical option presented was to have a consultation with a conservator; however, any non-abrasive methods recommended appear likely to be experimental or exceptionally costly.</p> <p>Staff initially intended to advise the applicant to consult with a local conservator and share findings so that a plan forward could be devised. This is unlikely to result in a satisfactory option that balances risk to permanently damaging brick with mitigating the present change. This is true specifically because stain, rather than paint, was applied. Paint is easier and less costly to remove. sThe applicant consulting with an expert appears highly likely to simply reaffirm staff's opinion that the best course of action is to not disturb the brick further.</p> <p>Staff also discussed with the applicant that all exterior changes to his historic property require HPC approval.</p> | |

Recommendation

Recommend HPC approval with conditions.

Conditions

Brick is not to be re-stained or otherwise painted or covered again without advance HPC approval.

Previous HPC action

Previous Council action