



Project Name/Address: 2131 Chadbourne Avenue

Application Type: Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations in historic district

Legistar File ID # [37498](#)

Prepared By: Amy L. Scanlon, Preservation Planner, Planning Division

Date Prepared: March 11, 2015

Summary

Project Applicant/Contact: Tracy & Cayle Tompkins

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations involving the conversion of a sleeping porch and the front porch and other items in the University Heights Historic District

Background Information

Parcel Location: The subject site is located in the University Heights Historic District.

Relevant Landmarks Ordinance Sections:

33.19(12)(d) Criteria for the Review of Additions, Exterior Alterations and Repairs in TR-C2 and TR-C3 and TR-C4 Zoning Districts.

1. Height. All additions shall be no higher than the existing building; however, if the existing building is already a nonconforming one, no addition shall be made thereto except in accordance with Section 28.192 of the Madison General Ordinances. Roof additions resulting in an increased building volume are prohibited unless they meet the standards in Section 33.19(12)(d)6. and are permitted under Chapter 28 of the Madison General Ordinances, or approved as a variance pursuant to Sections 28.08(2)(e) and 28.12(8)(d) or approved as a conditional use or as part of a planned residential development in accordance with Section 28.184.
2. Second Exit Platforms and Fire Escapes.
3. Repairs. Materials used in exterior repairs shall duplicate the original building materials in texture and appearance, unless the Landmarks Commission approves duplication of the existing building materials where the existing building materials differ from the original. Repairs using materials that exactly duplicate the original in composition are encouraged. (Renum. by ORD-08-00122, 11-22-08)
4. Restoration. Projects that will restore the appearance of a building or structure to its original appearance are encouraged and will be approved by the Landmarks Commission if such projects are documented by photographs, architectural or archeological research or other suitable evidence. (Renum. by ORD-08-00122, 11-22-08)
5. Re-Siding.
6. Additions Visible from the Street and Alterations to Street Facades. Additions visible from the street, including additions to the top of buildings or structures, and alterations to street facades shall be compatible with the existing building in architectural design, scale, color, texture, proportion of solids to voids and proportion of widths to heights of doors and windows. 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 of 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. Additions and exterior alterations that exactly duplicate the original materials in composition are encouraged. Additions or exterior alterations that destroy significant architectural features are prohibited. Side additions shall not detract from the design composition of the original facade.

7. Additions and Exterior Alterations Not Visible from the Street. Additions and exterior alterations that are not visible from any streets contiguous to the lot lines upon which the building or structure is located will be approved by the Landmarks Commission if their design is compatible with the scale of the existing building and, further, if the materials used are compatible with the existing materials in texture, color and architectural details. Additions and alterations shall harmonize with the architectural design of the building rather than contrast with it. (Renum. by ORD-08-00122, 11-22-08)
8. Roof Shape. The roof shape of the front of a building or structure shall not be altered except to restore it to the original documentable appearance or to add a dormer or dormers in a location and shape compatible with the architectural design of the building and similar in location and shape to original dormers on buildings of the same vintage and style within the district. Alterations of the roof shape of the sides or back of a building or structure shall be visually compatible with the architectural design of the existing building.
9. Roof Material.
 - a. If the existing roof of a building or structure is tile, slate or other material that is original to the building or structure and/or contributes to its historic character all repairs thereto shall be made using the same materials. In addition, in all cases any such roof must be repaired rather than replaced, unless the documented cost of repair exceeds the documented cost of re-roofing with a substitute material that approximates the appearance of the original roofing material as closely as possible, in which case re-roofing with a material that approximates the appearance of the original roofing material as closely as possible will be approved by the Landmarks Commission.
 - b. If the existing roofing material is asphalt shingles, sawn wood shingles or a nonhistoric material such as fiberglass, all repairs shall match in appearance the existing roof material; however, if any such roof is covered or replaced, re-roofing must be done using rectangular sawn wood shingles or rectangular shingles that are similar in width, thickness and apparent length to sawn wood shingles, for example, 3-in-1 tab asphalt shingles. Modern style shingles, such as thick wood shakes, Dutch lap, French method and interlock shingles, that are incompatible with the historic character of the district are prohibited.
 - c. Rolled roofing, tar and gravel and other similar roofing materials are prohibited except that such materials may be used on flat or slightly sloped roofs which are not visible from the ground.

Analysis and Conclusion

Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of the addition to the residence

A brief discussion of the related sections of 33.19(12)(d) follows:

1. Height. The height of the existing building is not being modified.
2. Second Exit Platforms and Fire Escapes. NA
3. Repairs. Repairs to stucco shall match existing adjacent stucco texture and appearance.
4. Restoration. The removal of windows at the front porch to return the porch to an open porch configuration is consistent with the intent of this section. Please refer to the discussion of item 6 for more information.

5. Re-Siding. NA The exterior cladding on this building is stucco. Any repairs or installation of stucco shall match the existing adjacent stucco texture and mixture in appearance.
6. Additions Visible from the Street and Alterations to Street Facades. The sleeping porch was probably originally screened with removable glass storms and a guard rail as the lower portion of the wall. It is also possible that the sleeping porch was a later addition and that there was originally an open porch (no roof) on the garage; however, this seems unlikely because the columns of the sleeping porch seem to terminate into the adjacent building wall in a way that would be unlikely as a later modification. Assuming the sleeping porch was part of the original structure, the enclosure of the sleeping porch is a logical progression of the addition of square footage and does not detract from the design of the street facade; however, the design and treatment of the proposed sleeping porch enclosure must be compatible with the design of the existing building.

The proportion of the proposed window on the street façade of the sleeping porch is not consistent with the proportion of other existing windows in the street façade. In addition, the drawings indicate that windows are not proposed for the side and rear elevations of the sleeping porch. The lack of windows is discussed in item 7 below.

The drawings indicate that the plane of the new wall will be set back to allow the columns on all elevations of the sleeping porch to project as a visual reminder of its original function and appearance.

The new stucco walls of the sleeping porch do not have an indication of the original low wall/guard rail element and this treatment removes an architectural feature that explains the progression of the structure. The loss of this feature is discussed in item 7 below.

Eave brackets currently do not exist on the sleeping porch element, but are shown as added features in the proposed drawings. Eave brackets that exist on the side and rear elevations of the residence are not shown in the drawings and the roof kick at the eave is shown with a reduced overhang depth.

The images of the existing residence show soffits that appear to be stucco; however the soffits could be bead board. If the stucco soffits exist, they should be retained as the removal of the original stucco would remove an architectural feature that relates to the Craftsman style. If the existing soffits are bead board, damaged areas should be repaired with bead board of matching profile. More information is necessary to review this item.

The drawings note that windows are proposed to be replaced, but the note may only relate to the dormer window. The Landmarks Commission typically does not approve the replacement of original wood sash windows unless previous attempts have been made to repair the windows. A repaired and weather-stripped window with storm window is preferable to replacement. More information about the condition of the existing windows is necessary to review this item.

The drawings note that all shutters and related hardware on the front elevation are proposed to be replaced. The drawings show shutters with louvered panels. The existing shutters have a lower louvered panel and a solid upper panel with decorative cut out pattern which is indicative of the Craftsman style.

The front porch was probably originally open with columns and a low wall or guardrail. It is possible that the original roof was "flat" with a decorative railing as it currently exists. The stucco portions of the upper rail seem to terminate into the wall in a way that would be unlikely as a later modification. If the upper stucco portions of the rail and the sleeping porch columns are original, then the corresponding existing front porch columns are also original and should be retained. In addition, the column bases tie into the brick foundation detail which indicates the square stucco columns are original. Given the likelihood that the upper stucco portions of the railing and the porch columns are original, it is very possible that the stucco low wall of the front porch is also original. The drawings show the removal of the flat roof and related rail, the porch columns, and the low wall.

The original fenestration of the street facing exterior wall is unknown and has been obscured by the porch enclosure. French doors seem foreign to the Craftsman style, but might have been original. It

is also possible that there was originally a window to the right of the front door. More information about the physical evidence in the framing of the front wall is necessary to review this item.

7. Additions and Exterior Alterations Not Visible from the Street. The drawings indicate that windows are not proposed for the side and rear elevations of the sleeping porch. The lack of windows on large expanses of wall is not compatible with the architectural design of the existing building or of other buildings in the historic district of similar age and style.

The drawings also indicate that the new stucco walls of the sleeping porch do not have an indication of the original low wall/guard rail element and this treatment removes an architectural feature that explains the progression of the structure.

8. Roof Shape. The front porch roof is proposed to be changed which would remove the railing detail that appears to be original. Item 7 above addresses the front porch roof. The drawings show the front dormer roof and the sleeping porch roof differently than they currently exist.
9. Roof Material. The drawings do not indicate the replacement of the roof shingles, but it is assumed that the proposed modifications to the front porch would suggest that a new roof will be installed at the front porch.

Recommendation

Given the information submitted, Staff cannot conclude at this time that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed exterior alterations are met and recommends that the Landmarks Commission refer the request to a future meeting unless the following additional information can be provided for review at the March 16 meeting:

1. The Applicant shall provide an alternate front elevation design showing the appearance of the residence with the original existing porch columns, low wall, "flat" roof, and railing.
2. The Applicant shall provide an alternate sleeping porch design to include an indication of the original railing and windows of the correct proportion on each elevation of the sleeping porch. The original columns shall also be retained.
3. The Applicant shall confirm that the existing eave brackets will be retained in their existing locations. The Applicant shall also clarify the additional eave brackets at the sleeping porch as shown in the drawings.
4. The Applicant shall confirm that the existing main roof kick, front dormer roof form and sleeping porch roof form will remain as they currently exist.
5. The Applicant shall confirm the scope of the roof work and if the entire roof is to be replaced, the Applicant shall confirm the type of shingle or roof material to be used.
6. The Applicant shall confirm the existing soffit material.
7. The Applicant shall confirm that the scope of the window project includes all windows. If the proposed project includes the replacement of all windows, the Applicant shall provide photos showing the condition of the existing sash and frames. In addition, the Applicant shall provide manufacturer cut sheet information regarding the size, configuration and material of the proposed replacement windows.
8. The Applicant shall provide photos showing the existing condition of the shutters. If the shutters are beyond repair, the Applicant shall provide information about replacement shutters that maintain the Craftsman style.
9. The Applicant shall confirm that any new wood materials will be painted and that any new areas of stucco will match the existing adjacent stucco texture and appearance.
10. The Applicant shall provide physical evidence of the original configuration of the front wall of the residence. While this information may not be available until demolition has commenced, the Commission's approval should qualify that physical evidence that does not confirm the proposed alterations shall be documented.
11. The drawings do not indicate if the existing front door and proposed French doors are to be retained or replaced. The Applicant shall provide information.