

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 3/11/19

TITLE: 1811 Regent St - Exterior Alteration in the
University Heights Hist. Dist.; 5th
Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 3/14/19

ID NUMBER: 54858

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Richard Arnesen, Katie Kaliszewski, David McLean, and Marsha Rummel. Excused was Anna Andrzejewski.

SUMMARY:

Daniel DeSlover, registering in support and available to answer questions

Deanna DeSlover, registering in support and available to answer questions

Bailey described the proposed work, which includes siding replacement, basement window replacement, and the demolition and reconstruction of the rear deck. She mentioned that this tudor style home is unusual for University Heights because of its cottage form. She explained that it is also rare to see painted cedar shingles because they do not take paint well and require frequent repainting. She said that the existing basement window is deteriorated, and the applicant has proposed a two light slider replacement, but staff recommends installation of a three light window that matches the existing. She explained that the applicants would like to enlarge the rear balcony that is currently unusable because of its small size. She said that the existing balusters match the design carried over from the front of the house, and she would like the new balusters to replicate the style of the historic balcony. Because the new balcony is larger in size, they need to install posts rather than using brackets as the existing balcony does, and staff recommends that the foundations for the piers shall not be visible above grade. Bailey pointed out that the balcony is not visible from the street, so the proposed cellular PVC replacement materials are acceptable on the rear of the house.

Levitan said that the support posts for the balcony seem large, and asked how tall they are. Daniel DeSlover said they would be 10-11' tall, and noted that the brackets would not support the weight of the larger balcony.

Levitan asked if the applicants had any response to the staff report recommendations. Daniel DeSlover said that they agree to the conditions, and requested confirmation that LP SmartSide shingle is acceptable as long as it matches the look of the existing siding. Bailey confirmed that the proposed replacement siding is acceptable because it has a little texture and will replicate the historic appearance of the shingle siding. However, she said that the materials proposed for the belt band have an exaggerated faux texture, and she recommends a non-textured board instead in order to replicate the current appearance.

McLean asked if it was possible to strip and stain the existing shingles. Bailey said that it is difficult to strip cedar shingles because of the deep crevices that form, and it is hard to get down to a layer that will take in the new paint or stain. She pointed out that in her research, she found that the house was painted in historical photos, not stained.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by McLean, to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the conditions that replacement shingle siding match the existing profile and exposure of the historic shingle siding, the replacement belt band and other trim be untextured, the replacement basement window have a three light configuration, the balcony balusters replicate the style of the original, the foundations for the balcony piers not be visible above grade, and all replacement balcony materials match the trim details of the house. The motion passed by voice vote/other.