



**Project Name & Address:** 1610 Chadbourne Avenue

**Application Type(s):** Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition in the University Heights historic district

**Legistar File ID #** [59706](#)

**Prepared By:** Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner, Planning Division

**Date Prepared:** March 10, 2020

## Summary

**Project Applicant/Contact:** Mitch Blazek, Orosz Properties

**Requested Action:** The Applicant is requesting that the Landmarks Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of an existing garage structure.

## Background Information

**Parcel Location/Information:** The subject site is located in the University Heights Historic District.

### Relevant State Statute Section:

**Wisc SS 62.23(7)(em)2m.** In the repair or replacement of a property that is designated as a historic landmark or included within a historic district or neighborhood conservation district under this paragraph, a city shall allow an owner to use materials that are similar in design, color, scale, architectural appearance, and other visual qualities.

### Relevant Ordinance Sections:

- 41.18 STANDARDS FOR GRANTING A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS.** A certificate of appropriateness shall be granted only if the proposed project complies with this chapter, including all of the following standards that apply.
- (2) Demolition or Removal. In determining whether to approve a certificate of appropriateness for any demolition or removal of any landmark or structure within a historic district, the Landmarks Commission shall consider all of the following, and may give decisive weight to any or all of the following:
    - (a) Whether the structure is of such architectural or historic significance that its demolition or removal would be detrimental to the public interest and contrary to the general welfare of the people of the City and the State.
    - (b) Whether a landmark's designation has been rescinded.
    - (c) Whether the structure, although not itself a landmark structure, contributes to the distinctive architectural or historic character of the historic district as a whole and therefore should be preserved for the benefit of the people of the City and the State.
    - (d) Whether demolition or removal of the subject property would be contrary to the policy and purpose of this ordinance and/or to the objectives of the historic preservation plan for the applicable historic district as duly adopted by the Common Council.

- (e) Whether the structure is of such old and unusual or uncommon design, method of construction, or material that it could not be reproduced or be reproduced only with great difficulty and/or expense.
  - (f) Whether retention of the structure would promote the general welfare of the people of the City and the State by encouraging study of American history, architecture and design or by developing an understanding of American culture and heritage.
  - (g) The condition of the property, provided that any deterioration of the property which is self-created or which is the result of a failure to maintain the property as required by this chapter cannot qualify as a basis for the issuance of a certificate of appropriateness for demolition or removal.
  - (h) Whether any new structure proposed to be constructed or change in use proposed to be made is compatible with the historic resources of the historic district in which the subject property is located, or if outside a historic district, compatible with the mass and scale of buildings within two hundred (200) feet of the boundary of the landmark site.
- Prior to approving a certificate of appropriateness for demolition, the Landmarks Commission may require the applicant to provide documentation of the structure. Documentation shall be in the form required by the Commission.

**41.24 UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT.**

- (6) Standards for the Review of Exterior Alterations and Repairs in the TR-VI, TR-V2, TR-U1, TR-U2, NMX, TSS and LMX Zoning Districts.
  - (a) Height. No alterations shall be higher than the existing structure; however, if the existing structure is already nonconforming, no alteration shall be made thereto except in accordance with Sec. 28.192, MGO. In addition, all alterations, including alterations to the top of a structure, shall conform to the height restrictions for the zoning district in which the structure is located.
  - (b) Alterations. Alterations shall be compatible in scale, materials and texture with the existing structure.
  - (c) Repairs. Materials used in repairs shall harmonize with the existing materials in texture, color and architectural detail.
  - (d) Re-Siding. The standards for the review of re-siding are the same as the standards for review of re-siding in the TR-C2, TR-C3 and TR-C4 Zoning Districts set forth in Sec. 41.24(5)e.
  - (e) Roof Shape. Roof alterations to provide additional windows, headroom or area are prohibited unless permitted under Chapter 28, or otherwise approved pursuant thereto as a variance or as part of a conditional use. In addition, all roof alterations shall be visually compatible with the architectural design of the structure.
  - (f) Roof Materials. All repairs shall match in appearance the existing roofing materials; however, when a roof is covered or replaced, roofing materials shall duplicate as closely as practicable the appearance of the original materials. Thick wood shakes, French method, interlock and Dutch lap shingles are prohibited. Rolled roofing, tar and gravel and other similar roof materials are also prohibited except on flat or slightly sloped roofs which are not visible from the street.
  - (g) Parking Lots. No new parking lots will be approved unless they are accessory to and on the same zoning lot as a commercial structure or multiple family dwelling.

## Analysis and Conclusion

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the existing garage structure. Per the 1942 Sanborn Map, there appears to be a garage structure in the same location at that time. Preservation files do not provide information on the date of the garage. However, the existing garage is very utilitarian and minimally visible from the street.

The existing garage structure is not used by the tenants of the multi-unit building on the property. The proposal is to demolish the structure and provide additional surface parking area.

A discussion of the relevant ordinance sections follows:

**41.18 STANDARDS FOR GRANTING A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS.** A certificate of appropriateness shall be granted only if the proposed project complies with this chapter, including all of the following standards that apply.

- (2) Demolition or Removal. In determining whether to approve a certificate of appropriateness for any demolition or removal of any landmark or structure within a historic district, the Landmarks Commission shall consider all of the following, and may give decisive weight to any or all of the following:
  - (a) The structure is not architecturally significant and does not appear to have historic significance.
  - (b) N/A
  - (c) The garage structure does not significantly contribute the architectural character of the property or to the district.
  - (d) The demolition would not be contrary to the purpose and policy of this ordinance.
  - (e) The structure is not of an unusual or uncommon design.
  - (f) Retention of the structure would not benefit the public welfare of the community.
  - (g) While the property owner would like to remove the garage in part because there have been multiple break-ins, the garage is not undergoing demolition by neglect and the primary reason for its removal is that it no longer serves a functional purpose for the property.
  - (h) While there is no new building proposed for the site, a new improvement on the property will be additional surface parking, which is in keeping with the function of the rear area of the multi-family property.

Staff does not believe that this building requires additional documentation prior to its demolition.

**41.24 UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT.**

- (6) Standards for the Review of Exterior Alterations and Repairs in the TR-VI, TR-V2, TR-U1, TR-U2, NMX, TSS and LMX Zoning Districts.
  - (a) Height. N/A
  - (b) Alterations. N/A
  - (c) Repairs. N/A
  - (d) Re-Siding. N/A
  - (e) Roof Shape. N/A
  - (f) Roof Materials. N/A
  - (g) Parking Lots. This is not technically a new parking lot, but rather the expansion of an existing parking lot. Even so, this new parking area meets this standard in that it is for a multiple family dwelling, located on the same lot, and is accessory to the principal structure.

## **Recommendation**

Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness are met and recommends the Landmarks Commission approve the request.