

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** 15 May 2017

TITLE: 413 S Ingersoll St. – Exterior Alteration in  
the Third Lake Ridge Hist. Dist.; 6<sup>th</sup>  
Ald. Dist.

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: 23 May 2017

**ID NUMBER:** 47217

---

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Chair, Katie Kaliszewski, David WJ McLean, Marsha A. Rummel, and Lon Hill. Excused were Richard Arnesen and Anna V. Andrzejewski, Vice Chair.

### **SUMMARY:**

Aaron Brown, registering neither in support nor opposition, and wishing to speak.

Brown is the contractor hired to complete the requested work. The first condition does not apply to the applicant, as they are not repairing the foundation wall/parge coat. With regard to the second condition, Brown can confirm that the existing siding exposure is closer to 3", and the customer wants 4". With regard to the third condition, aluminum bends can achieve a two part-looking trim.

In the gables, there is a soffit panel that is basically flat plywood without much detail. Brown showed proposed soffit materials that would give more detail than just a flat soffit. It's a three piece that could be custom bent to replicate existing detail.

Brown indicated that they can comply with Staff's fourth condition.

Staff asked the Applicant what would become of the decorative brackets on the front of the building. The Applicant confirmed the existing decorative brackets would remain exposed and that there would be a J-channel around the window. Staff asked whether they were installing siding and insulation board to determine if the plane of the window trim would need to be built out. The existing siding will be removed and replaced. Staff asked what the plan was for the exiting vents in the gable ends. Per Brown, the vents will be replaced with vinyl ones of the same shape and size. Staff asked about the soffit and fascia material, and whether the bed mold between the wall of the building and the soffit will be retained. According to Brown, the original plan was to remove all of it and run the soffit. The Applicant and homeowner are both open to putting the soffit flat as opposed to covering it or tearing it off. They are open to other suggestions as well.

Brown commented that they will not be doing anything to the front porch.

Rummel asked what would remain exposed as original material. Brown responded that the front porch, front columns, and storm windows (which were changed a long time ago) would remain the same. His customer is interested in making the house as maintenance free as possible.

Levitan asked if there was an objective difference between the 3" and 4" siding. Per Brown, there is not; it's a purely aesthetic decision.

McLean asked if the product that Brown was displaying was different from what was in the provided informational packet. Brown responded that it is, but would still be qualified as a premium product. McLean asked what the impetus for the project was, and whether the original siding is failing. Brown said that the siding was deteriorating, and that there was a lot of spray-foam used to fill rotted areas that were also deteriorating.

Levitan asked Staff about the foundation wall. Staff expressed the need to follow up with the owner about that aspect in order to make the COA more useful. Levitan clarified that the Commission can make it mandatory if necessary. Staff confirmed that the Commission can indeed do that.

Levitan asked if Staff was satisfied that the applicant could comply with all of the conditions. Staff responded that, typically, an applicant will retain the original siding. In this instance, the replication needs to be very similar to the original appearance, as the original siding is not being retained. Levitan asked if a 3" siding is better than a 4" siding in the spirit of replication. Staff confirmed that it would be.

McLean asked the Applicant if he would be wrapping the original material in the window trim. Brown replied that they would be covering what's currently there, not removing it. Brown also indicated that they would replicate the existing trim.

Brown said that they could wrap corner boards & die into the J channel, which would provide a more authentic appearance.

Rummel asked Staff what the strategy was for most applicants to maintain the siding of historic homes. Staff replied that, in this instance, it's not an easy repair, as the siding hasn't been maintained. This particular siding should be removed.

Brown indicated that there used to be a 2 3/4" siding product, but it was not very high quality. He could do more research to find a higher-end product if the Commission would prefer something like that. McLean asked if there is there a durability concern between the 4" and the 3" siding. Brown said that it wouldn't be a concern for another 20 years. McLean asked what the average lifespan of the vinyl is. Per Brown, the lifespan is upwards of 30 years, and that using the better product is worth it.

Levitan asked Staff if any further things from items three and four that still need to be addressed. Staff requested that the Commission discuss the decorative head trim. Hill was in favor of painting the head trim, but is wondering how they'd deal with the trim around the windows. Per Brown, the front window is different anyway, but that's not uncommon. They can duplicate the new trim wrap to make it similar.

Staff asked if there would be any way to leave the soffit flat. Brown replied that they could put an LP product on it, but that's heavier, and he would prefer not to put it on top of what's already there. He would have to tear out what exists. Using the LP would limit them with color as well.

**ACTION:**

**A motion was made by Hill and seconded by Rummel to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the conditions that replacement siding must be no wider than three inches, that the foundation parging/coating must be repaired/replaced, and that the Applicant work with Staff to ensure that all conditions and final details are met. The motion passed on a voice vote.**