

Bailey, Heather

From: Laura McClure <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2026 3:55 PM
To: Madison Landmarks Commission
Subject: 1722 Regent Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

Categories: Heather

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Members of the Landmarks Commission,

We write as the owners of 1722 Chadbourne to express our strong opposition to the proposed accessory dwelling structure at 1722 Regent Street, which mentions our house as the inspiration for various design features in the application.

The Commission's charge is to ensure that new construction is compatible with the historic character of its surroundings, particularly in terms of massing, scale, and the established pattern of development. In this case, the proposed building does not meet those standards.

1. The proposed structure is not subordinate in massing or scale

Accessory buildings in historic residential settings are typically modest in size and clearly secondary to the primary structure. The proposed building, however, presents as a full-scale residential structure, with a broad footprint and multiple stories. Its size and volume approach that of a principal building, rather than a subordinate outbuilding. As a result, it would compete visually with the primary structure rather than defer to it.

2. The building disrupts the historic pattern of accessory structures

Historically, rear-yard buildings—such as carriage houses or garages—are smaller, simpler, and visually recessive (compare the unit recently approved by the Landmarks Commission at 1716 Chadbourne). The proposed design departs significantly from this pattern. Its width, height, and overall presence create a profile that is inconsistent with the traditional relationship between primary and accessory structures on similar lots.

3. The design reads as a primary structure rather than an accessory building

The symmetry, scale, and multi-level massing give the building the appearance of a principal residential structure placed at the rear of the lot. This undermines the established hierarchy that is a key characteristic of historic residential properties, where the primary building remains dominant and accessory structures are clearly secondary.

4. Approval would erode the standards governing compatible infill

If a structure of this size and intensity is considered compatible as an accessory building, it would set a precedent that weakens the Commission's ability to maintain the historic scale and character of similar properties. Over time, this could significantly alter the defining spatial relationships that the Commission is charged with preserving.

For these reasons, we respectfully urge the Commission to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness for this proposal, or require substantial revisions that reduce the building's massing and ensure it is clearly subordinate to the primary structure.

Thank you for your careful consideration.

Sincerely,

Laura McClure and Richard Heinemann
1722 Chadbourne Avenue
Madison, WI 53726
