

## AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** 15 May 2017

TITLE: 103 Langdon St – Exterior Alteration in  
the Mansion Hill Hist. Dist.; 2<sup>nd</sup> Ald.  
Dist.

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: 23 May 2017

**ID NUMBER:** 46635

---

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:**

Laura Stoller, registering in support, wishing to speak, and available to answer questions.

Nate Yahn, registering in support, wishing to speak, and available to answer questions.

Jenner Weston McLeod, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Franny Ingebritson, registering in opposition and wishing to speak.

Yahn provided a brief summary of current request. Delta Gamma contacted Lake City Glass, which performed condition assessment. The Applicant also requested bids for restoration. Hellenbrand, which provided a quote in 2014, quoted again at \$150,000 for the third floor and \$300,000 for the entire building. The window replacement would cost \$75,000 on the third floor only. Yahn drew the Commission's attention to the details on Lake City Glass' report. The thing he finds most compelling is that the glass has been replaced in most of the windows and that the replacements were installed improperly. The second compelling issue outlined in Lake City's report is that refurbishing windows would still leave them drafty.

Levitan asked the Applicant if they could abide by the third condition on the staff report. The Applicant indicated that they can.

Levitan asked Staff to address the administrative approval of bathroom window replacements in 2016. Per Staff, there was bathroom work happening a year ago. The windows in the bathroom were in bad shape. Staff discussed with the architect present at that time that these windows could be replaced, but the rest were repairable.

Rummel asked for clarification about the materials in the windows. Staff replied that, with an original window with a single pane, there must be a storm window. It is less energy efficient than newer

windows but is still energy efficient. Staff went on to explain proper window installation and restoration practices.

Rummel referenced the last sentence in the Lake City Glass report (indicating that even repaired windows will remain drafty) and asked if it was accurate. Staff replied that it comes down to terminology. All windows will be drafty because they are, technically speaking, holes in a wall.

Ingebritson commented on the beauty of the building. She attended the meeting because she is worried the Commission's decision regarding this building will set a precedent. The window panes do shimmer and reflect differently than the windows in newer homes and apartments. The original personality is evident, and it would be worth it to maintain them. She doesn't want others to see this decision and think they can replace their windows.

Yahn commented that Delta Gamma isn't trying to change the neighborhood and cares about preservation.

Hill asked the Applicant if they have any idea of how many glass panes are original. Yahn replied that they do not know, but Lake City said that the majority had been replaced. Hill commented that any original glass could go to the front façade if they restore street-facing windows.

Levitan asked if it was possible to institute a "mix and match" solution, in which windows with original glass might be repaired and windows with non-original glass be replaced. Yahn said that it's possible, but not necessarily practical, as most of the glass is not original. The Applicants indicated that the financial situation is difficult. If this much money is spent on the windows, it will not be able to be used for other maintenance of the house.

McLean commented that the glass that has been replaced so far will not match the original glass. The new windows will be one piece of glass with spacers. With the new insulated glass, a bow/twist will appear in them. These windows will still be visible, even though they're on the third floor. The new window muntin width is not similar to what currently exists. McLean indicated that he likes the idea of addressing street elevation windows separately from the rest.

Stoller stated that they don't have the means to repair the windows at this time. If they have to wait to replace them, the volunteers tasked with maintaining the house don't know where they'll go from here. The windows will continue to deteriorate.

McLean discussed what needed to be done with the windows. If there was a way to stabilize from the outside only, that might present a simpler solution.

Levitan confirmed which windows they would like to replace and asked which, of the 13 indicated, how many were street-facing. On the third floor, 10 face the street (either Langdon or Carroll). He asked whether the Commission has heard from the district's Alder. It has not. Levitan asked if the fact that most of the original glass does not remain makes a difference in the Commission's analysis. Hill indicated that, if there is original glass that can go into the existing wood frame, that would factor in to his decision.

There was general discussion regarding the importance of street façades and window replacements on them.

**ACTION:**

**A motion was made by McLean and seconded by Rummel to refer the item to the June 5<sup>th</sup> Landmarks Commission meeting, pending further information from Delta Gamma regarding how many of the windows contain original glass panes. The motion passed on a voice vote.**