

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 5/14/18

TITLE: 210 N Breese Terr. - Exterior alteration in
the University Heights Hist. Dist.;
5th Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 5/23/18

ID NUMBER: 51179

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

SUMMARY:

Daniel Schwartz, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Staff provided a brief summary of the submission materials and noted that the applicant provided the additional information that was requested and has agreed to a 5/8" muntin.

Schwartz noted that the primary problem at the last Landmarks Commission meeting was the disorganized drawings that had been submitted, so he hoped the new information was clearer. He also pointed out that he got an additional estimate from a restoration expert. The expert recommended that he replace the deteriorating windows rather than repair them because of the significant difference in cost.

Schwartz stated that a different company that looked at the two doors recommended they be replaced as well, as restoration would be a temporary fix. The front door is in poor condition, has water damage, and doesn't fit properly in the frame. He proposed that they replace the existing front door with one of similar appearance, the only difference being an added rail at the bottom. The rear door is in fairly good condition and would need new paint, but he would still like to replace the rear door with something similar in appearance.

Andrzejewski asked what the replacement windows would look like. Schwartz responded that he does not have photographs of the new windows, but they would be similar in appearance aside from the size. He pointed out that the four windows in the bathroom would be different because right now they are double paned glass and they are changing to single paned. Andrzejewski noted that under ordinance, the language states that replacements "shall duplicate" the originals, so she wanted to confirm that was the case.

Staff indicated that the meeting rail on the new Marvin unit is a different dimension than the existing double hung windows, and the historic meeting rail is much thinner. She noted that the reduction of the muntin from 7/8" to 5/8" will help. Additionally, the four windows in the bathroom need to be tempered, and the current muntins are too narrow to put tempered glass in the units; by code, those windows must be replaced. Schwartz pointed out that these windows are not visible from the street.

Andrzejewski asked for clarification from the applicant that he is not changing the windows that had previously been replaced. Schwartz confirmed that the previously replaced windows will not change. Andrzejewski asked if the new replacement windows would be of similar appearance to the existing original windows or the

previously replaced windows. Schwartz confirmed that the new windows would match the existing original windows, not the previously replaced windows.

Staff noted a correction to the staff report recommendation regarding the replacement of the front door, item one. It should read that the “door is being custom made to match the existing door (4 lights wide with narrow muntins, sill and 3 brackets), but with one large bottom rail,” with the word “rail” replacing “panel.” She pointed out that the new door will look like the existing front door with the addition of a bottom rail, on which the grain will be horizontal.

McLean pointed out the splitting, cracking, and water infiltration that can be seen in the photographs of the current front door and that he has no problem with the applicant replacing it.

Staff stated that the applicant would like to replace the rear door, but repair was found to be acceptable. Schwartz confirmed that the rear door needs new paint, but that it is still older and not in the best shape, so he would prefer to replace it.

Kaliszewski asked what the replacement for the rear door looks like. Schwartz stated that they have not selected a replacement yet, but that it would comply with ordinance and look similar to the old door.

Levitan noted that the Commission can approve repair of the door, but cannot approve replacement without a photo of the new door. Arnesen asked if staff could approve the replacement of the rear door later. Staff confirmed this, and mentioned that she thought there was an example of the replacement rear door in previous correspondence with the applicant.

Andrzejewski read from ordinance 41.24(5)(g) that alterations not visible from the street must be compatible with the existing materials in texture, color, and architectural details. She went on to say the replacement rear door would need to replicate the old door, just as he has done for the front door. The Commission voiced agreement.

McLean asked if the four rear replacement windows have the same detailing as the existing windows. Schwartz confirmed that they do, though they are tempered. Staff noted that they are casements, and the current windows are losing their ability to function. The Commission agreed that replacement casements with the same detailing are acceptable.

Levitan began discussion of the rest of the windows. Staff reminded the Commission that a portion of the windows on the house have already been replaced by a previous owner without obtaining a Certificate of Appropriateness, and thanked the applicant for the level of detail in his new submission.

Arnesen stated he was glad the applicant got a range of estimates for replacing the windows because of how costly it can be. He indicated he was leaning toward allowing replacement of the windows in light of the fact that a number of them have already been replaced.

Andrzejewski said that the replacement of other windows is a factor for her as well, though she does not like the other windows that were replaced. Kaliszewski agreed. Andrzejewski noted the importance of window maintenance in historic homes, and if these windows would have been maintained properly, it would be a different story. Kaliszewski pointed out that catching one window at a time rather than repairing all of them at once is a big difference.

Andrzejewski noted that it would make her happy if they could potentially save and repair the back door.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Arnesen and seconded by Kaliszewski to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness subject to conditions agreed upon by the Commission, with a preference to restore the rear door and replacement as a second option with staff approval. The motion passed by voice vote.