

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: June 27, 2011

TITLE: 715 South Few Street – Third Lake
Ridge Historic District – Exterior
Alteration Involving Installation of a
Metal Shingle Roof. 6th Ald. Dist.
(22945)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: June 27, 2011

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Stuart Levitan, Christina Slattery, Daniel Stephans, Robin Taylor and Michael Rosenblum.

SUMMARY:

Appearing on behalf of the project was Gillian Blake, who briefly described the project. The home, built in 1941 or 1942 currently has asbestos roof shingles and they want to put something on that will last longer. Photos were shown of the proposed metal panels which will be 1-foot in a caramel color, and material sample brochures were distributed.

The Commission inquired how Blake did not know she needed to come before the Landmarks Commission. She replied that she did not realize she was in a historic district, she thought she was just outside and was surprised. She sincerely believed the historic line was across the street. She stated that after the hail damage she had a roofer come to her door who even stated she was outside the historic district. The Secretary explained that this home is not on the National Register but is on the local register (the map of the Third Lake Ridge Historic District was provided to the applicant). She stated that the Commission has approved metal shingles in the past but the exposure is a bit bothersome. Discussion revolved around the exposure and the different sizes available. Blake distributed solar panel handouts showing how those will be integrated with the new roof. The materials have already been ordered. Metal roofing was chosen for durability and environmental friendliness as the shingles are made out of 95-96% recycled materials. Blake inquired about the bay window at the front of the house. They want to insulate it with some of the proposed roof metal; the Commission replied that they would need to return to proceed with that aspect of the house. The Commission discussed the meaning of "maintaining a historic appearance" and how to incorporate that into their decision when they are unsure of what the original roof looked like or what material it was made of. Levitan stated that a strict interpretation of some of the terms in the ordinance would allow someone to vote against the certificate and be intellectually consistent, but he didn't think the terms of the ordinance compel that conclusion.

ACTION:

On a motion by Rosenblum, seconded by Rummel, the Landmarks Commission **APPROVED** the project as presented. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-1) with Levitan voting no.