Madison Landmarks Commission

University Heights Historic District Criteria for the review of additions, exterior alterations and repairs Parcels zoned R2 and R4A

Address: 1602 Regent Street

Date: October 12, 2009

Form Prepared By: B. Fruhling

Does the project meet the following guideline criteria?

(For the complete text of the criteria, please see Madison General Ordinances Sec. 33.01(12)(d), available on the web at www.cityofmadison.com)

Yes	n/a	No	1.	Height.
Yes	n/a	No	2.	Second exit platforms and fire escapes.
Yes	<u>n/a</u>	No	3.	Solar apparatus.
Yes	<u>n/a</u>	No	4.	Repairs.
Yes	n/a	No	5.	Restoration.
Yes		No <u>X</u>	6.	Re-siding.
Yes	<u>n/a</u>	No	7.	Additions visible from the street and
				alterations to street façades.
Yes	<u>n/a</u>	No	8.	Additions and exterior alterations not visible
				from the street.
Yes	<u>n/a</u>	No	9.	Roof shape.
Yes	<u>n/a</u>	No	10.	Roof material.
Yes	<u>n/a</u>	No	11.	Parking lots.

Explanation:

The owner of this property received a Building Code violation in May 2009 to repair the stucco on the attached two-car garage. The owner chose to replace the stucco (and the plywood siding facing Breese Terrace) with vertical metal siding. He also installed two replacement windows and a door in the garage. This work was completed without obtaining a Certificate of Appropriateness.

In a phone conversation with Rebecca Cnare, the owner was told that if the garage was sided with siding that matched the existing siding on the dormers of the house (brown clapboard siding), that it could be administratively approved. Although the siding the owner installed on the garage is similar in color to the dormers, it is very different in style.

Section 33.19(12)(d)5 <u>Re-Siding</u> of the Landmarks Ordinance states, in part, that "Re-siding with aluminum or vinyl that replaces or covers clapboards or non-original siding on buildings originally sided with clapboards will be approved by the Landmarks Commission provided that the new siding imitates the width of the original siding to within one (1) inch and provided further that all architectural details including, but not limited to, window trim, wood cornices and ornament either remain uncovered or are duplicated exactly in appearance."

Section 33.19(12)(d)6 Additions Visible from the Street and Alterations to Street Facades of the Landmarks Ordinance states, in part, that "...alterations to street facades shall be compatible with the existing building in architectural design, scale, color, texture, ..."; and "Materials used in such alterations and additions shall duplicate in texture and appearance, and architectural details used therein shall duplicate in design, the materials and details used in the original construction of the existing building or other buildings in University Heights of similar materials, age and architectural style, unless the Landmarks Commission approves duplication of the texture and appearance of materials and the design of architectural details used in the existing building where the existing building materials and architectural details differ from the original."

Staff does not object to the replacement windows and door in the garage. However, staff does not feel that the above-cited criteria are met regarding the siding on the garage and recommends that the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness be denied. Staff further recommends that the Landmarks Commission approve residing of the garage with siding that matches exactly the siding of the dormers in style, dimension and color, subject to staff approval of plans showing this alternative complete with trim details. Staff finally recommends that any other siding alternative the owner may wish to propose must be approved by the Landmarks Commission.

Respectfully submitted, Bill Fruhling and Rebecca Cnare October 13, 2009