

## AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION  
TITLE: 2115 Bascom St - Exterior Alteration;  
University Heights Hist. Dist.; Ald.  
Dist. 5

**PRESENTED:** 10/30/17

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: 11/8/17

**ID NUMBER:** 48760

---

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:**

*David Wood, registering in support and wishing to speak.*

The Applicant gave a brief overview of the proposal. He noted that in 2002-2003, the windows on the second floor were replaced. The Applicant went on to comment that he feels the standards have not changed significantly enough to prohibit the replacement of the remaining windows.

Levitan asked the Applicant which windows shown on the picture in the application materials have been replaced. Per the Applicant, the second floor windows in the picture have been replaced. Levitan asked about the proposed replacement windows and how they compare to the ones that were used in the 2002-2003 replacements. Per the Applicant, they are very similar and are single divided light. Levitan asked how far back the house was from the street. The Applicant estimated about 30 feet, and that it's up a hill.

Arnesen asked if there were combination storm windows on the current windows. The Applicant confirmed that there are. The proposed replacements also have an energy panel.

McLean asked if the proposed replacements were 6 over 6. The Applicant indicated that the visual difference would be that the muntins will be 7/8ths instead of 5/8ths. McLean also confirmed with the Applicant that the number of divided lights currently differ from the first floor to the second floor (6/6 on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor & 6/1 on the 1<sup>st</sup>).

Hill asked about repair vs. replacement. The Applicant indicated that repairing the windows would not be as energy efficient as replacing them, and that there is no way to insert an energy panel into the existing windows. The Applicant is reluctant to consider repair at this time.

McLean addressed the cracking masonry at the sills and suggested that the Applicant repair it during the work.

Wood commented that he has put quite a bit of money into the house in order to make it compliant with the district.

Andrzejewski discussed the Staff Report and the implications for frustrating the public interest for this particular case and asked if there was any guidance for the definition of the frustration of public interest. Staff replied that the only guidance comes from the purpose and intent of the ordinance. Levitan commented that it's subject to the Commission's judgement and interpretation.

Arnesen feels that to a degree, replacing windows does frustrate the public interest as opposed to repairing them. However, he feels that, in this instance, replacement could be considered.

McLean has concerns that the windows do not currently match. Andrzejewski has the same concerns, but commented that the ordinance's language needs significant revision and should offer more guidance.

Hill indicated that the windows didn't look to be in poor condition and did not seem to require replacement.

Kaliszewski is undecided as to whether replacement vs. repair frustrates the public interest, as the potential for repair exists.

Levitan commented that to approve a replacement in 2002-2003 but not now presents an equity issue. He also mentioned that the average person would likely not notice the difference between the old windows and the new.

**ACTION:**

**A motion was made by Arnesen and seconded by Andrzejewski to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion passed on a voice vote, with Arnesen, Andrzejewski, Rummel, McLean, and Kaliszewski in favor; Hill opposed.**