

## AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** 1/11/21

TITLE: 719 Jenifer St - Exterior Alterations in the  
Third Lake Ridge Hist. Dist.; 6th  
Ald. Dist.

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: 1/25/21

**ID NUMBER:** 61086

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

*Ryan Reda, registering in support and wishing to speak*

*Tyler Weavers, registering in support and available to answer questions*

*Also present: JoseMaria Donoso, Housing Inspection Supervisor, City of Madison Building Inspection*

Andrzejewski said that she would like the commission to consider items 4 and 5 together.  
Andrzejewski opened the public hearing.

Bailey discussed the history of the demolition by neglect case, referencing two reports from Building Inspection that detail the work to be completed. Because the work was not completed, Building Inspection issued a notice on October 23, 2020 stating they believed demolition by neglect was occurring. Since then, the Preservation Planner has worked with the applicant to prepare a viable Certificate of Appropriateness application to address the items in the Building Inspection work order. Bailey discussed the applicable standards and pointed out that the demolition by neglect process is a last resort with the goal of salvaging the historic resource and making sure it is preserved. She showed photos taken by Building Inspection of the existing conditions and deterioration. She referenced the submitted timeline for completion of the work, which estimates that most of the work will begin in May and be completed in mid-June. She suggested that rather than making a final finding at tonight's meeting, the Landmarks Commission could refer consideration of the item to the May 17, 2021 meeting where they could check in and see if work is underway with the idea of coming back in June or July to make the final determination.

JoseMaria Donoso, Housing Inspection Supervisor in the Building Inspection Division, provided background information on the property and maintenance issues. He said that the current owner purchased the property in July 2017 and was aware of the review process for a property in a local historic district. He explained that when there is a change in ownership, BI typically reissues any outstanding notices to the new owner, but in this case they did not do that. He said that BI knew the new owner planned to do repairs, so they decided to give him time to do so. He said that there was a good start when permits were pulled in July 2017 and a COA was issued in November 2017; however, little to no progress was made and both expired in 2019. Because of the lack of progress, a notice was issued in September 2019 for 15 exterior-related violations, with a due date in August 2020. In May 2020, another notice was issued requiring the property owner to obtain building permits for any interior alterations that were occurring. The property owner applied for a COA in June 2020, but due to

incomplete applications, the request is still in progress and a COA has not been issued. After a September 2020 reinspection which found no progress on the exterior violations, the case was referred to the Office of the City Attorney for prosecution. Donoso said that none of the notices have been complied with, no permits have been obtained for the exterior or interior work, and BI has seen no progress. Given these circumstances, BI issued the notice of demolition by neglect on October 23, 2020. He said that the delay of maintenance is causing the property to decay and deteriorate; the property owner needs to stop further neglect by complying with the BI official notices.

Bailey provided information on the history of the property, which was constructed in 1854 with an addition in 1867. She pointed out that the original building was the rear wing and the later addition was on the front. She said there was a long history of deferred maintenance of the property, and when the current owner purchased the property in 2017, there was an understanding of the maintenance that needed to occur. She listed the current proposed work to repair the historic windows on the front of the building; replicate the deteriorated or missing windows on the side of the building; secure the rear window openings so that they are weather tight; install storm windows on front; install a storm door on front; install LP Smartside 6" exposure smooth clapboards; preserve and repair all deteriorated window trim, soffits, and fascia with profiles to match the existing or historic; construct a new rear stoop and door; properly secure electrical to building; and repair basement access doors. She discussed the applicable standards in Third Lake Ridge, which focus on the street façade. She said that the applicant is proposing alterations to the front of the building with a goal of returning it to a more historic condition. She provided the example of installing clapboard-style siding based on evidence of historic clapboards found on the house. She showed photos of the existing windows and pointed out that the windows on the front of the house are historic and have a curved upper sash, which is different from other windows on the building. She referenced the submission materials, which discuss specific treatment for the windows. She said that staff recommends approval of the proposal with the condition that final window specifications be approved by staff. She said that she approves of the window repairs proposed, but they will need to provide more detailed information regarding the window replacements. She said that the applicants will remove the existing siding down to the bottommost layer; because we don't know what they will find, she suggested the commission consider a condition for ensuring the new siding follows the profile of the most historic layer of siding.

Taylor asked the property owner, Ryan Reda, about his thoughts on staff's recommendation of approval with final review of the windows by staff. Reda said that the project timeline is based on how long it will take for the windows to get ordered and fabricated, so he wanted to be sure this wouldn't affect the timeline. Bailey said that she will work with the applicant team in order to get more information on the replacement windows and said that her understanding was that the applicants had agreed to repair the windows recommended for repair in the third party window assessment. Tyler Weavers, contractor for the project, said that they have no problem going over more detailed specs for new windows with staff.

McLean asked if the applicants thought it was possible to look for the most historic layer of siding as they tear off all of the existing siding. Weavers said that looking inside the house, there was evidence of 6" clapboard siding as the bottom layer. He said they are not opposed to tearing off the siding to that point in order to investigate more closely, but he wanted to be sure the building wouldn't be opened up to the elements in the area where siding was removed.

Andrzejewski asked the applicants about their timeline and a potential check-in in mid-May. She asked if they thought progress could be made by May 17. Weavers said that they feel confident about the timeframe they've set, though the start date will depend upon when they receive all the necessary approvals. He pointed out that the start date will already be pushed out a month because the timeline shows it starting on December 14. He said that if they need to confirm window sizes and siding, it could take longer. Bailey said that they can see the bottom layer of siding is clapboard, so it is okay to approve clapboard and order the necessary materials. She clarified that she was wondering about finding trim details showing the outline of the original portion of the house in relation to the front addition or whether the siding is continuous, which they won't be able to see until the non-historic siding is removed. She said that it will be important to replicate any details they might find.

Andrzejewski closed the public hearing.

Taylor asked if the applicants would receive the Certificate of Appropriateness early enough to keep the project on schedule. Bailey said that she would work with the applicants this week on the final window specs. Regarding the siding, she said the bottom layer appears to be clapboard, so the commission could approve clapboard with the condition the applicants work with staff upon removal of the non-historic siding in case they find any details. She said that she could approve an amendment to the COA if the applicants find significant details that need to be replicated, but at the moment we don't know what they will find underneath the siding. Taylor asked what the applicants should look for as they tear off the siding. Bailey said that they should be able to see the different layers of siding, which currently has shingle siding on top; once they get down to the clapboard siding, then they should reach out to staff.

Andrzejewski said that when the non-historic siding is removed, they could find that there is a change in siding between the different phases of the building, which was not uncommon. She explained that this could be significant because of the different periods in which the building was built. She said that constructing the addition on the front of the building was a big statement that changed the orientation of the building, so one might see design changes there, which is what staff would be interested in.

**ACTION:**

**A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Arnesen, to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the conditions that final window specifications be approved by staff and the applicant work with staff upon removal of non-historic siding to look for any original details. The motion passed by voice vote/other.**