

Madison Landmarks Commission

University Heights Historic District
 Criteria for the review of additions, exterior alterations and repairs
 Parcels zoned R2 and R4A

Address: 234 Lathrop Street
 Date: March 30, 2009
 Form Prepared By: Rebecca Cnare and Bill Fruhling

Does the project meet the following guideline criteria?
 (For the complete text of the criteria, please see Madison General Ordinances Sec. 33.01(12)(d), available on the web at www.cityofmadison.com)

Yes	<u>n.a.</u>	No	<u> </u>	1.	Height.
Yes	<u>see below</u>	No	<u> </u>	2.	Second exit platforms and fire escapes.
Yes	<u>n.a.</u>	No	<u> </u>	3.	Solar apparatus.
Yes	<u>n.a.</u>	No	<u> </u>	4.	Repairs.
Yes	<u>X.</u>	No	<u> </u>	5.	Restoration.
Yes	<u>n.a.</u>	No	<u> </u>	6.	Re-siding.
Yes	<u>X</u>	No	<u> </u>	7.	Additions visible from the street and alterations to street façades.
Yes	<u>X</u>	No	<u> </u>	8.	Additions and exterior alterations not visible from the street.
Yes	<u>n.a.</u>	No	<u> </u>	9.	Roof shape.
Yes	<u>n.a.</u>	No	<u> </u>	10.	Roof material.
Yes	<u>n.a.</u>	No	<u> </u>	11.	Parking lots.

Explanation:

The previous owners of 234 Lathrop Street were given a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Landmarks Commission in June 2004, to build a large addition containing a garage and second-story living space connected by a new enclosed breezeway. The previous owners returned to the Landmarks Commission with revisions that were approved in December of 2005.

Over the next two years, some of the large addition to the house was built, however the addition and remodeling were never completed, and the building permit expired in December of 2007. Since work was not being completed, the city began pursuing legal against the previous owners. The house has subsequently been purchased, and the new owners have been completing additional work, and now wish to make some additional alterations to the project.

The new owners are proposing to make changes to the original house, the new attached garage and enclosed connector, as well as to the new detached garage. In total, they wish to remove four windows, remove and relocate a door and exterior porch staircase, extend a porch railing, build a third floor fire escape, add windows to the garage doors, and add an upper window to the detached garage. The changes, and staff recommendations, are outlined specifically on the following pages. Both the previously approved plans, and new plans are provided in the packet.

X Please see continuation sheet

Detailed description of proposed alterations to previously approved addition, detached garage and remodeled house:

1. Removal of window and door behind screen porch area on west elevation.
 - a. Due to the many layers of redesign and subsequent approvals process, it has been virtually impossible to determine the original design of the doors and windows on the first floor of the west elevation. However, due to the extensive redesign already occurring, and that the window and door being removed do not contain the leaded glass features of other windows in the house, staff finds that this change will not be detrimental to the character of the original house, and recommends approval.
2. A new entry door in the connector, along with the removal of one of the four new leaded glass windows, extension of decorative railing, and relocation and redesign of exterior staircase.
 - a. Since the four leaded glass windows and back porch were part of the new addition, and the proposed staircase is a design that matches the original design of the Lathrop Street porch stairs, staff recommends approval.
3. Removal of center window on west elevation of upper floor of new addition:
 - a. Staff has no issue with this removal, as it was part of the addition and is not original to the house.
4. Glass windows in all garage doors
 - a. Staff recommends approval
5. Exterior fire escape on west elevation of house.
 - a. This fire escape may not be needed due to new building codes that may require the sprinkling of the house. However, if the Building Inspection Division finds that sprinkling is not required, the architect should look into other simpler fire escape designs, such as a ladder or other type, if allowed by code. Staff also notes that the profile of the proposed fire escape will be clearly visible from Kendall Ave, and asks that the architect show the missing the profile on the south and north elevations at the 3/6/09 Landmarks Commission meeting. At this time, staff cannot recommend approval of the fire escape until more information is known, and simpler designs are considered. If, after subsequent review, sprinkling is not required, and the Building Inspection Division is unable to approve a simpler fire escape design, staff will reluctantly recommend approval.
6. Removal of the window on the South facade.
 - a. Since this alteration is on the original house, staff has some hesitation to recommend the approval of the removal of the window, however it is on the south facade, and away from the street.
7. Changing the French doors on the south facade back to windows.
 - a. Staff recommends approval, as it appears from a previous photos found in the file, that the window design proposed was part of the original design of the house.
8. A new window with shutters is to be added in lieu of the faux window in the detached garage.
 - a. Staff recommends approval.