

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** April 27, 2015

TITLE: 2131 Chadbourne Avenue – University Heights Historic District – Convert a sleeping porch

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: April 27, 2015

**ID NUMBER:** 37498

---

Members present were: Erica Fox Gehrig, Chair; Christina Slattery, Jason Fowler, Marsha Rummel, and Michael Rosenblum.

### **SUMMARY:**

Darren Vollmer and Cayle Tompkins, registering in support and wishing to speak. Vollmer described the physical evidence and timeline. He explained that the existing parapet railing is deteriorated with much rot and that the related hip roof was over framed. The original flat roof slopes toward the scupper drain which is located against the house.

Gehrig asked for clarification. Staff drew the roof plan on the board and described the chronology of alterations.

Vollmer asked if the third attempt at this roof design could be designed so that the parapet is different and the stucco element penetrations could be removed.

Gehrig explained that “significant architectural features” shall be retained that the parapet is a significant architectural feature.

Slattery explained that she is struggling to tell him what design is going to be appropriate without having a drawing to respond to. She explained that the Commission does not need detailed drawings right away, but concept images are important to convey the proposed impact on the building. She explained that if the balustrades are still visible with the proposed design, then we’re still good, but how the roof functions next to it, underneath it, and around it, is the question that we can’t personally solve.

Staff explained that the existing parapet can be removed, but it needs to be reconstructed so that it looks like the existing. It needs to go back so it looks like this. The secondary hip roof behind the parapet is not necessary and can be removed to go back to the flat roof if that was a better way to flash and manage water. The issue is the proper installation of the flashing.

Gehrig explained that it seems like there are plenty of places for water to exit the roof. The water needs to properly move around the penetrations.

Staff explained that the solution has to meet the ordinance. The parapet penetrations are like any other penetration on a roof where you have to flash around so that as the water runs past something. The existing flashing is not properly installed. The parapet is a significant architectural feature and I don't know how to structure it if it doesn't touch the roof. The stucco elements are on the corner, in the middle, and at the exterior wall. The reconstruction would need to go down to roof sheathing where a new wood box would be constructed and then flashed.

Tompkins asked how to keep that the parapet feature in the new design if it is deteriorated.

Vollmer explained that he would like to build a roof on top of the existing railing so that there are no roof penetrations.

Staff explained that the feature needs to remain, not this specific fabric of the existing parapet because it's deteriorated and needs to be repaired. The Commission is looking for the reconstruction of the parapet feature so that it looks like the existing.

Rosenblum explained that the parapet is a unique design and that they should find a way to replicate it using modern building methods. The original feature did last 90 years.

Slattery explained that the elements could be reconstructed in different materials. For example, the whole parapet could be a wood railing where the stucco corners are constructed from wood. Slattery explained that you can currently see through the balusters because the feature opens to the sky.

Staff explained that there is a way to build crickets behind the stucco boxes on the flat roof to shed the water away from the stucco boxes. The character of the building would be compromised by the solution which adds a roof to the top of the parapet because it's not the true psychology of how this railing is supposed to work.

### **ACTION:**

**A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Slattery, to refer this to a future meeting. The motion passed by voice vote.**