



Project Name & Address: 2114 Chamberlain Avenue

Application Type(s): Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations in the University Heights historic district

Legistar File ID # [58905](#)

Prepared By: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner, Planning Division

Date Prepared: January 7, 2020

Summary

Project Applicant/Contact: Boone Cates, Associated Housewrights

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting that the Landmarks Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of windows, front door, and garage door; installing new siding on the addition; and rebuilding the rear deck.

Background Information

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

Relevant State Statute Section:

Wisc SS 62.23(7)(em)2m. In the repair or replacement of a property that is designated as a historic landmark or included within a historic district or neighborhood conservation district under this paragraph, a city shall allow an owner to use materials that are similar in design, color, scale, architectural appearance, and other visual qualities.

Relevant Ordinance Sections:

41.24 UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT.

- (5) Standards for the Review of Exterior Alterations and Repairs in TR-C2, TR-C3, and TR-C4, Zoning Districts.
 - (a) Height. No alterations shall be higher than the existing structure; however, if the existing structure is already a nonconforming one, alteration shall be made thereto except in accordance with Section 28.192. Roof alterations resulting in an increased structure volume are prohibited unless they meet the requirements in Sec. 41.24(4)(a)5. and are permitted under Chapter 28, or approved as a variance pursuant to Sec. 28.184 or approved as a conditional use or as part of a planned residential development.
 - (b) Second Exit Platforms and Fire Escapes. Second exit platforms and fire escapes shall be invisible from the street, wherever possible, and shall be of a plain and unobtrusive design in all cases. In instances where an automatic combustion products detection and alarm system is permitted as an alternative to second exits, use of such a system shall be mandatory.
 - (c) 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.
- (d) Restoration. Projects that will restore the appearance of a 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.
 - (e) Re-Siding. Re-siding with aluminum or vinyl that replaces or covers clapboards or nonoriginal siding on structures originally sided with clapboards will be approved by the Landmarks Commission provided that the new siding imitates the width of the original clapboard siding to within one (1) inch and provided further that all architectural details including, but not limited to, window trim, wood cornices and ornament either remain uncovered or are duplicated exactly in appearance. Where more than one layer of siding exists on the structure, all layers except the first must be removed before new siding is applied. If insulation is applied under the new siding, all trim must be built up so that it projects from the new siding to the same extent it did with the original siding.
 - (f) Alterations Visible from the Street and Alterations to Street Facades. Alterations visible from the street, including alterations to the top of structures, and alterations to street facades shall be compatible with the existing structure in architectural design, scale, color, texture, proportion and rhythm of solids to voids and proportion of widths to heights of doors and windows. Materials used in such alterations 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 structure or of other structures 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 structure where the existing building materials and architectural details differ from the original. Alterations that exactly duplicate the original materials in composition are encouraged. Alterations that destroy significant architectural features are prohibited. Side alterations shall not detract from the design composition of the original facade.
 - (g) 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 structure is located will be approved by the Landmarks Commission if their design is compatible with the scale of the existing structure 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 structure rather than contrast with it.
 - (h) Roof Shape. The roof shape of the front of a 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 structure and similar in location and shape to original dormers on structures of the same vintage and style within the district. Alterations of the roof shape of the sides or back of a structure shall be visually compatible with the architectural design of the existing structure.
 - (i) Roof Material.
 1. If the existing roof is tile, slate or other material that is original to the 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.

2. 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.

3. 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

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the front door, two rear attic windows, and the garage door; install new siding on the rear addition; and rebuild the rear deck. The home was constructed in 1922 for Robert M. Marling, and was later the home of James Overton, a noted professor of plant physiology at the University of Wisconsin. The building is a vernacular Prairie-style residence.

The current front door was installed in 1991. Staff has located an earlier image (ca. 1980s), which shows a cottage-style door that seems unlikely to have been original. The current door, while it is simple in style, does not allow for installation of a deadbolt for security. The applicant is proposing some Prairie-style doors as replacements. While they are more in keeping with the architectural vocabulary of the building, none of the proposals has a window pattern that is similar to the windows on the front of the house. However, the difference may help to differentiate the original windows from the replacement door.

The windows proposed for replacement are two three-over-one double hung windows located in a dormer on the rear of the building. The three-light upper sashes are leaded glass. When the addition was constructed in 1970, the roof height of the addition is such that it comes right up to the base of the attic windows. The result is that snow build-up allows moisture infiltration into the window. The applicant is asking to remove the existing windows, modify the window openings by raising the base by 8 inches. They are asking to not replicate the look of the original windows and instead to match the windows on the 1970s addition. Staff believes that the replacement windows should replicate the appearance of the original three-over-one windows that they are replacing, albeit with modified dimensions. The proposed replacement windows are wood with exterior aluminum cladding.

The existing garage door is located on the back of the building and is part of the 1970s addition. The style of door currently installed is not in keeping with the architectural vocabulary of the building. The proposal is to replace the uninsulated Colonial-style garage door with an insulated steel door with simple horizontal panels. The horizontal bands are in keeping with decorative elements that are found in Prairie-style architecture, but will also highlight that this is on a modern addition to the historic building.

On the 1970s addition, there is a brick foundation-level course, and the rest of the structure is covered in painted plywood meant to mimic the cementitious stucco on the historic house. The applicant is proposed to repair any water-damaged areas, and then to cover the wood-sided areas with cementitious stucco in the same style as the historic house.

Finally, the applicant would like to replace the existing deck, which is located on the back of the house and attached to the 1970s addition. The deck would largely be in the same style, with the same dimensions. The applicant is proposing to use Azek deck boards and a cedar railing with square balusters. The proposed railing is showing a copper cap on the posts and staff would recommend a wood cap.

A discussion of the relevant ordinance sections follows:

41.24 UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT.

- (5) Standards for the Review of Exterior Alterations and Repairs in TR-C2, TR-C3, and TR-C4, Zoning Districts.
 - (a) Height. None of the proposed alterations would be taller than the existing structure.
 - (b) Second Exit Platforms and Fire Escapes. N/A
 - (c) Repairs. The replacement siding on the addition will be using the stucco, which is original to the historic portion of the house, but not original to the addition. And the current deck appears to be beyond repair and is non-historic. While this standard calls for using the original materials for a repair to the failing siding or the deck, the intent of this standard is to maintain historic building materials. This proposal does that and utilizes materials that are comparable to the original.
 - (d) Restoration. N/A.
 - (e) Re-Siding. This standard primarily addresses clapboard siding, but the proposal follows the intent in that the original layer of plywood siding will be repaired prior to the installation of cementitious stucco.
 - (f) Alterations Visible from the Street and Alterations to Street Facades. The only alteration on a street façade is for the replacement of the door. The proposed door options are in keeping with the architectural character of the building.
 - (g) Additions and Exterior Alterations Not Visible from the Street. The design of the stucco replacement siding on the addition, the new garage doors, and replacement deck are in keeping with the character of the existing structure. The proposed replacement windows are in keeping with the character of the 1970s addition, but are out of character with the style of the windows on the historic portion of the building.
 - (h) Roof Shape. N/A
 - (i) Roof Material. N/A

Recommendation

Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness are met and recommend that the Landmarks Commission approve the request with the following condition:

1. Specify which of the front door options proposed by the applicant is appropriate for the building
2. Approval of the garage door and residing of the addition as proposed
3. Approval of replacement and modification of the two rear windows, with the new windows to replicate the existing three-light pattern in the upper sash
4. Approval of the replacement deck with the condition that the caps on the railing posts be wood, not copper