



**Project Name/Address:** 1722 Summit

**Application Type:** Certificate of Appropriateness for alteration in University Heights Historic District

**Legistar File ID #** [50888](#)

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

**Date Prepared:** March 11, 2018

## Summary

**Project Applicant/Contact:** Jeff Gaard

**Requested Action:** The Applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations in the University Heights Historic District

## Background Information

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

### Relevant Historic Preservation Ordinance Sections:

**41.24 UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT.**

(4) Standards for the Review of New Structures in the TR-V1, TR-V2, TR-U1, TR-U2, TR-C2, TR-C3, TR-C4, MNX, TSS, and LMX Zoning Districts.

(b) Accessory Structures. Accessory structures, as defined in Section 28.211 of the Madison general ordinances, shall be compatible with the design of the existing structures on the zoning lot, shall not exceed fifteen (15) feet in height and shall be as unobtrusive as possible. No accessory structure shall be erected in any yard except a rear yard. Exterior wall materials shall be the same as those for construction of new principal structures as set forth in sec 41.24(4)(a)2.

(a) Principal Structures.

2. Materials. Materials for the exterior walls shall be the same as or similar to materials prevalent in the University Heights Historic District. Permitted materials include brick, narrow gauge horizontal clapboards four or less inches in exposed width, stone, stucco, smooth shingles or combinations of the above provided the combinations occur in a manner and location similar to the materials on existing structures in University Heights (e.g., brick on first floor with clapboard on second floor). Other materials, such as aluminum or vinyl must be visually compatible with structures within 200 feet of the subject property. The following materials are prohibited: concrete block, asbestos, wide clapboards over four inches in exposed width, diagonal boards, vertical boards, rough sawn wood, rough split shingles, shakes.

## Analysis and Conclusion

The Applicant received a COA from the Commission in 2010 for the restoration of the existing French doors and the replacement of the existing windows with new Marvin wood units. The Applicant is requesting that the Commission review the use of Marvin clad units at this time instead of the previously approved wood units. Staff was not comfortable providing an administrative approval for this change.

The staff report from the 2010 review is attached. The minutes from the 2010 meeting are copied below:

Mr. Jeff Gaard, 1722 Summit Avenue, presented the proposed window and door replacement project. Mr. Gaard explained that he would like to remove the door replacement from the proposal and instead of replacing the French doors, he would repair them. He also stated that he would be agreeable to using new wood windows.

Commissioners briefly discussed the proposal. Mr. Stephans suggested that a LowE window with high iron content be used as a way to make the glass color more historically appropriate. Ms. Gehrig suggested that Mr. Gaard get quotes for window repair work to compare to the cost of window replacement. Mr. Stephans provided an example of a project where historic windows were removed and replaced with new windows. After 10 years the replacement windows were being replaced again and he wished the original windows had previously been repaired instead of replaced.

A motion was made by Taylor, seconded by Levitan, to APPROVE the Certificate of Appropriateness for the repair of existing French doors and the replacement of casement and doublehung windows with the following conditions:

1. The LowE windows shall have a high iron content to provide a more historically appropriate color.
2. The new windows shall have simulated divided lights to replicate the muntin configurations on the existing windows.
3. The Applicant will consider getting estimates to have the existing windows repaired in lieu of replacement.

The motion passed by a voice vote/other.

## Recommendation

Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the change to clad window units may not be met and recommends that the Landmarks Commission deny the request.

---

Regarding: **1722 Summit Avenue – University Heights Historic District – Consideration of Issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations involving window and door replacement. (Legistar #20714)**

---

Date: December 13, 2010  
Prepared By: Amy Scanlon

---

General Information

The Applicant is proposing to alter the exterior appearance by installing replacement windows and doors at 1722 Summit Avenue in the University Heights Historic District.



City Historic Preservation file photo (original source and date unknown)

---

Relevant sections of the Landmarks Ordinance

**33.19(12)(d)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)

**33.19(12)(d)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. (Renum. by ORD-08-00122, 11-22-08)

---

#### Staff Comments

The Applicant requested staff approval of the proposed window and door replacement project a few months ago. Staff denied the request because the existing windows and doors (including sash, frames and sills) appear to be in good repairable condition (the email correspondence is included for your review). Additional Staff concerns are as follows:

1. Upon further review, Staff would support the replacement of the casement window sash if all good faith attempts have been made to repair it and install weather-stripping. The existing frame and sill shall be retained in their entirety and the two new casement units shall be divided to match the existing muntin configuration (two lights wide by three lights high).
2. The Phase 2 work cannot be addressed at this time due to lack of sufficient information about the existing condition of the French doors. Staff requested existing condition images from the Applicant on December 1, 2010.
3. While Staff appreciates the retention of the existing window frame and sill elements, the new replacement window units will have slightly smaller glass size which somewhat changes the character of the design. Staff would prefer to retain the original glass size which would necessitate removal of the existing frame and sill elements and replacement with new historically sized window, frame, and sill elements.
4. The Applicant has received tax credit approval for this work; however, according to Jen Davel, Senior Preservation Architect at the Wisconsin Historical Society, the more strict interpretation of the appropriateness of the proposed work (City Landmarks Ordinance, in this case) would prevail. The tax credit application can be revised to include window repair and weatherization, purchase of new storm windows, and door repair and weatherization for this project.

The Applicant has submitted the request to the Landmarks Commission for relief from the previous Staff decision. Staff believes that the criteria for the Certificate of Appropriateness as highlighted above are not met and recommends that the proposal not be approved (with the exception of the casement window as described above). If the Landmarks Commission finds the criteria can be met, staff recommends the following condition:

- The Applicant shall install wood replacement windows and doors instead of clad.