

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 1/13/20

TITLE: 2114 Chamberlain Ave - Exterior
Alterations in the University Heights
Hist. Dist.; 5th Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 1/22/20

ID NUMBER: 58905

Members present were: Anna Andrzejewski, Richard Arnesen, Betty Banks, Katie Kaliszewski, Arvina Martin, David McLean, and Maurice Taylor.

SUMMARY:

Boone Cates, registering in support and available to answer questions

Bailey described the proposed work to replace the front door, modify two rear window openings and replace windows, replace the garage door, alter the siding on the rear addition, and replace the existing rear deck. She showed a photo of the previous front door from the 1980s alongside the existing door that was replaced in 1991, and pointed out that the previous front door was unlikely to be original. She said that the proposed options for the replacement door have a similar architectural vocabulary to the house, but do not follow the same window pattern as the front of the house, which would differentiate the new door from the historic house. She said that when the rear addition was built in 1970, the roof was built up to the base of the attic windows, so any snow or water buildup can come into the windows. She explained that the applicant is proposing to raise the bottom of the window opening by 8" so that it is higher than the adjacent roof. They are also proposing to replace the existing three-over-one windows with simple one-over-one windows to be in keeping of the simple style of windows on the addition. She pointed out that the standards for University Heights emphasize what is visible from the street, and the windows on the rear of the house are not. Bailey said that the garage door is also on the back of the house; the existing door is a Colonial style, and the applicant is proposing a more modern door with simple horizontal bands. She said that is a feature one would see in Prairie-style architecture, so it is more in keeping with the architectural vocabulary of the whole house. She said that the rear addition is currently painted plywood meant to replicate the cementitious stucco on the historic house, but the plywood has not held up well and the applicant proposes to clad the addition in stucco. She said that in most places, there is a 90-degree angle where the plywood meets the historic portion of the building; however, that becomes less toward the top. She asked commissioners if they would like to see trim added to serve as the demarcation between the 1970s wing and the historic building. Lastly, she said that the existing rear deck is having structural problems and will essentially be replaced in kind with the same dimensions and support structure. She said that the deck boards will be Azek with a cedar railing. She referred to a photo of the proposed railing and said that she recommends using wood caps rather than copper. Cates said that he did not mean to include the copper cap in the photo, and they intend to use wood caps. Bailey discussed the applicable standards and pointed out that the language calls for reusing the existing siding on the addition, but because it is failing and will continue to be problematic, she doesn't see a problem with using stucco. She said that she recommends approval with the conditions that commissioners specify which of the front door options is appropriate for the building, the two rear window replacements replicate the existing three-light pattern in the upper sash, and the garage door and residing of the addition be approved as proposed. She also included the

condition that the caps on the railing posts of the rear deck be wood, not copper, to which Cates had already agreed.

Arnesen asked if the air conditioning units were remaining on the addition, and Cates said they are being removed. Andrzejewski asked if commissioners had any concerns about the repairs to the deck, and McLean said that it was okay because it was not visible from the street. Cates said that they proposed a cedar railing because the neighbors could see it, but asked if they could make it simpler. Andrzejewski read from 41.24(5)(g) for exterior alterations not visible from the street, and said the commission could approve it if the "design is compatible with the scale of the existing structure and, further, if the materials used are compatible with the existing materials in texture, color, and architectural details. Additions and alterations shall harmonize with the architectural design of the structure rather than contrast with it." Cates said that in terms of upkeep and affordability, they would prefer to use an Afco aluminum railing instead of cedar. Arnesen asked about the style of railing, and Cates said that it would be the same style as proposed, but aluminum instead of cedar. Bailey pointed out that it is not visible from the street. Andrzejewski asked if there were any issues stylistically. Bailey said it would be similar, and Arnesen said that he did not have an issue. McLean said that aluminum would probably match the addition better. It was agreed that railing details would be discussed with and approved by staff.

Andrzejewski asked for opinions on the front door. Kaliszewski asked what the property owner would prefer. Cates said that they haven't picked out the exact door yet, but they would like a similar option to the styles proposed; however, they are open to suggestions the commission might have because they want the door to be appropriate for the house. Andrzejewski said the guidelines are strange in University Heights because they say that alterations should be compatible with the historic building. She said that they also do not want to create a false sense of history, so the door should be compatible but read like it is newer. Arnesen said that he liked options #3 and #4 (on the right) from staff's presentation, and did not like the first two options on the left because the profile of the bottom panels looks Colonial. Kaliszewski said that she had no strong feelings. Bailey said that the grid pattern of the lights on the first two options is Arts and Crafts-style, but that pattern does not show up anywhere else on this building, so it would be a little out of place. She agreed that options #3 and #4 would be better options because the windows on the back of the house also have a three-light pattern. She said that option #4 also has an arch pattern, which one could argue is in keeping with the brick surround for the front door. McLean said that they should let the arch be in the brickwork only and that he prefers option #3 because the three blocks speak to the three front upper windows, but the four blocks in option #4 throw it off. He said that a door without muntins in the glass would also be an acceptable option. Taylor said that he likes all four door options proposed because they are similar to what one would see on this style of home. Cates said that he will pick a couple of doors with a three-light pattern and give the property owners those options to choose from, and then work with staff on the final details.

McLean asked about the angled buttress on the addition. Cates said that he thinks it is part of the historic structure, and they abutted the new addition right up to it. He said that the buttress grows as it comes down. Arnesen asked if it was cementitious stucco, and Cates said that it was. McLean said that if they add new stucco on the addition, there will be some extra depth on the exterior. Cates said they would have to do a return at the top or they could build out the buttress to float out to the top and then return back. McLean said that it looks like there are similar buttresses at the front of the house too, so he was hesitant to have the back one restructured. Arnesen asked if the existing addition is plywood on studs. Cates said he didn't know, but given that it was from the 1970s, there could be a layer of foam underneath. He said that he thinks there is likely about 1" or ½" of foam under the plywood as a thermal break, so they would be able to pull it off and get the same depth when installing the new materials. McLean said that if it is the same depth, he has no concerns. Andrzejewski agreed that it should be the same depth. She asked if they could include a condition regarding the potential change in profile. Bailey asked commissioners if the profile expands past the existing wall, whether they would like to see the introduction of trim board to serve as a demarcation between the addition and historic building instead of curving it down. Kaliszewski said that she thought the change in height and foundation color of the brick was enough to clearly demarcate this as a new structure, but putting up the trim would make it look cleaner. Arnesen suggested that once the applicant starts working on it, if they find the depth has changed, they can work with staff on a solution. Commissioners agreed that was acceptable. Cates

said they could add trim board, and Bailey said they could discuss it once it gets to that point, but that would likely be her recommendation.

Andrzejewski asked what commissioners thought about the proposed garage door, and there was agreement that it was acceptable. Andrzejewski read staff's recommendation that the rear replacement windows replicate the existing three-light pattern in the upper sash. Kaliszewski asked the applicant if it would be a problem to make the windows three-over-one, and Cates said that it would not be a problem. Arnesen requested confirmation that they were raising the bottom sash 8", and Cates confirmed they were. Andrzejewski asked if they could still do a three-over-one with the raised sill, and Cates said that it would be the same Marvin window that they have proposed, and they would add mullions to it.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Kaliszewski, to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the conditions that the two rear windows replicate the existing three-light pattern in the upper sash and that specifications for the front door and metal railing for the rear deck be approved by staff. The motion passed by voice vote/other.