

## AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** 3/19/18

TITLE: 1224 Spaight Street - Exterior Alteration  
in the Third Lake Ridge Hist. Dist.;  
6th Ald. Dist.

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: 3/27/18

**ID NUMBER:** 50889

---

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Chair; Anna V. Andrzejewski, Vice Chair; David WJ McLean, Richard Arnesen, Marsha A. Rummel, Lon Hill, and Katie Kaliszewski.

### **SUMMARY:**

*Gavin Langhammer, registering in support and available to answer questions.*

*Jim Vincent, registering in support and available to answer questions.*

Langhammer provided a brief description of the proposal. Staff explained that she requested the registrants' presence because the project was too large to approve administratively. Staff went on to discuss the muntin/decorative piece inside the front casement window. Vincent responded that it was a façade treatment and would not affect the form of the window. Langhammer is willing to comply with the Commission's requests.

McLean asked if egress was needed on both front and back. Per Staff, it is, as the building is a two-unit.

McLean asked if all of the upstairs windows would be new. Per the Applicant, windows would only be new on the addition and where the jump platform is. All other windows on the upper floor are existing/double hung and will remain.

Andrzejewski requested confirmation that the Commission should be mainly concerned with the street façade. Staff confirmed, but noted that the public interest element also needed to be considered.

Arnesen asked Staff whether a casement without an applied muntin would be more appropriate. Staff confirmed.

There was some discussion about building codes as they pertain to egress requirements. McLean asked if it had been a two-unit for some time. Per the Applicant, it was when he purchased it.

The Commission discussed the windows and whether they were all casements. Staff confirmed that the windows were, in majority, double-hung. There may be a few casement windows. There will be casements in the front gable. On the dormer addition, there will be a casement. The remainder of the double-hung windows will stay in place. The drawings need to reflect the actual window alteration request.

Rummel asked if the Commission needed to see revised drawings. Staff is comfortable approving revised drawings when they reflect the discussion noted above.

The jump platform and the door will be changed to two casement windows without decorative muntins, and all the existing double-hung windows on the second floor will remain. There will potentially be two new casements in the back addition of the dormer.

Langhammer asked if he could put two double hung windows next to each other, or whether they should be casement windows in the front gable.

Arnesen said the preference was for double-hung windows, but understands that building/safety code may require casement.

**ACTION:**

**A motion was made by Andrzejewski and seconded by Rummel to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the stipulations that the jump platform and the door will be changed to two casement windows without decorative muntins, all the existing double-hung windows on the second floor will remain, and that there will potentially be two new casements in the back addition of the dormer. The motion passed via voice vote.**