

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 5/20/19

TITLE: 1314 Jenifer St - Exterior Alteration in the
Third Lake Ridge Hist. Dist. -
Installation of third-story sun sail;
6th Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 5/21/19

ID NUMBER: 55788

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Anna Andrzejewski, Richard Arnesen, and Katie Kaliszewski. Excused were Arvina Martin and David McLean.

SUMMARY:

Vaughn Brandt, registering in support and wishing to speak

Bailey explained that the applicant is requesting approval to install a sun sail on the third floor rear balcony and is also seeking retroactive approval for brackets that were installed to support the second floor balcony roof. She said that last year, the applicant requested a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a pergola on the third floor balcony. Staff had recommended denial because it would project over the roofline and no houses within a 200-foot radius had a pergola on a third-story balcony. Staff helped the applicant design a proposed alternative so that he could construct a pergola that did not project over the roofline. There were other requests for COAs over the past year, but the support brackets on the second floor balcony were not discussed. City Building Inspection found the brackets to be new with no COA.

Bailey said that she believes the standards for granting a COA have not been met and recommends the request be denied. She said that based on the submitted design for the sun sail, she does not have enough information; the drawing does not show where the posts are located in relation to the deck or where the sun sail will be hung. She said that on the other hand, it is a rear porch that is not visible from the public right-of-way. She explained that the support brackets on the second-floor balcony are out of character with the house and would not have been approved as part of the original proposal.

Brandt said that last year, staff had suggested a chamfered corner on the third-floor pergola, but he strung up the sail and found that there was only 4.5' of headroom, so he didn't want to proceed with that design on the east side of the deck. He explained that he now wishes to retain the existing post on the west corner of the deck, which is at roof height, and to add a post in the center of the deck at or below the existing roofline in order to install the triangular sun sail. He pointed out that the sun sail will not be visible from the front of the house. He spoke about the support brackets on the second floor balcony, and said they project 12" from the side of the deck. He proposed casing them in PVC trim board and cedar lap siding to match the existing supports on the front of the house, and provided a photo of those supports.

Arnesen asked what purpose the support brackets serve. Brandt said that he installed metal roofing under the third floor balcony in order to keep water and snow melt off of the second floor deck. Bailey asked how the water that collects there drains. Brandt said that it drains into the rain gutter located on the side of the porch. Arnesen referenced the drawings submitted by the applicant, and asked where the posts for the sun sail are

located, noting that they appear to be attached to the face of the house. Brandt said they are at the edge of the deck, about 10' from the face of the house. Arnesen pointed out that there is no information about the sun sail, so it is difficult to get an idea of what the applicant wants to install. Brandt said that the sun sail is a 12'x12'x12' fabric triangle with simple steel grommets. Andrzejewski asked if it was permanent. Brandt said that the posts are permanent, but the sail is not. Andrzejewski asked if the posts are wood, and Brandt confirmed they are. Arnesen said that it would be helpful to have drawings in plan view so that one could look down on the deck and see where the posts and sun sail are mounted; the current drawing does not provide sufficient information for the Commission to make an informed decision. Levitan said that he is concerned about something that is only verbally described, of which they don't have an illustration. Brandt said that the deck is 10'x13' and there are posts at either end. Arnesen asked how the posts are anchored, and Brandt said that they are structurally built into the deck below.

Bailey said that with the current application materials, it is difficult to interpret what is being proposed, and Building Inspection would concur. She explained that when Building Inspection goes out to see if the terms of the COA are met, they would require plans that show exactly where the posts should be and where the sun sail will be located and attached to the building. Without that information, it is difficult for Building Inspection to assess whether the applicant complied with the conditions of the COA.

Bailey said that the existing bracket embellishments found under the roof do not extend out past the roof, but the support brackets in question do extend out past the balcony above. Levitan said that casing the brackets in cedar siding, as shown in the photo provided by the applicant, would look better than what is currently there. Kaliszewski asked if the applicant is planning to paint the support brackets, and Brandt said that he is proposing to paint the brackets in the same color scheme as the existing brackets on the front of the house.

Andrzejewski said that she is more concerned about the porch posts than the support brackets. She said that with the existing drawings, they don't know what the posts look like, and the Commission has a legal obligation to review plans and approve or deny requests; whatever they approve has to be enforced, so she has concerns about the legal aspect of this review. Arnesen pointed out that there are no dimensions on the plans. Andrzejewski said that while she wouldn't choose brackets, she could live with them as long as they are finished to match the photo of the existing bracket on the front of the house; however, she said that their hands are tied on the review of the porch posts. Kaliszewski agreed, and said that they need architectural drawings to show the posts with dimensions. Andrzejewski said that she would also like to know how the posts are topped, and suggested the new drawings include different viewpoints to show whether the sun sail and posts can be seen from the street and what it would look like with the sun sail open.

Levitan asked if the Commissioners agreed that they want more information. Andrzejewski said that ethically, she feels badly for asking for more information when the project may be denied, but she can't say yes or no without visuals. Brandt said that he would like to know what he can and cannot do, as he has one post standing in the corner that he would have to cut down if the Commission denies his request. Arnesen asked if there is a solution with non-permanent posts that are not visible from the street. Bailey said that the applicant could create a hole to put the metal pole in, so when it is out of season, he could take the whole thing down and the only permanent piece would be a grommet on the floor of the porch. Brandt said that the deck is 19 years old and the corner posts reinforce the existing posts and handrail, so he would like to retain the posts at or below handrail height. He said that he could attach aluminum posts to the sail so that it could be taken down like a camping shade tent. Arnesen said that is possible, but they would still need to see plans. Andrzejewski asked if that could be administratively approved because it is not permanent, and Bailey confirmed that it could be. Andrzejewski said that she worries about the applicant spending time and money on revising plans, and they still may not be able to tell if the posts and sail are visible from the street. Bailey suggested that the applicant use photographs to mark where things will be and provide information on the product being proposed, noting that there is a way to do this that does not require the hire of an architect. She said that 2D drawings do not provide the information needed.

Brandt said that the posts are 9' from the house, and the middle one is currently not there. Bailey asked if he intends to attach the other end of the sail to the house and how it will be attached. Brandt said that it will be

attached to the house with a hook. Bailey said that they need that information too because Building Inspection will find the hook and ask if there is a COA for it.

Brandt said that he has a COA for an asymmetrical pergola, but he doesn't want it to encroach on headroom, which would require a center post and half of a pergola. Bailey said that the previously issued COA is good for two years. Brandt asked if it would be okay to have half of a pergola that is angled. Bailey said that he already has approval for that design. Andrzejewski said that they have provided the applicant with options to draw very detailed plans for a temporary structure that would be run by staff for approval or to complete the work as approved in the previous COA. Brandt confirmed that the pergola would be at or below the roofline.

Levitan asked for a decision on the support brackets. Andrzejewski said that she does not like them, but can live with them if they are completed as shown in the photo of the existing decorative brackets on the front of the house. Levitan said that the decorative bracket looks nicer than what is currently there. Arnesen pointed out that there is a hodge-podge of finishes on the rear porches right now, so he would like the brackets finished in a cohesive manner. Levitan said that the decorative bracket design is the same colors as the existing porch.

Levitan said that whatever was approved previously is acceptable for the pergola, but the Commission is approving nothing new for the sun sail.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Kaliszewski, seconded by Andrzejewski, to retroactively approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness to install triangular brackets on the second floor balcony with the conditions that they are finished in the style of the house as shown in the photo provided by the applicant and that any unpainted wood be painted to match the building. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

A motion was made by Kaliszewski, seconded by Arnesen, to refer all other aspects of the current application if the applicant were to want to pursue them in the future or seek administrative approval for a variation of the project. The motion passed by voice vote/other.