

## AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** 5/14/18

TITLE: 138 S Franklin - Exterior Alteration in the  
First Settlement Hist. Dist.; 6th Ald.  
Dist.

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: 5/23/18

**ID NUMBER:** 51428

---

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Chair; Anna V. Andrzejewski, Vice Chair; David WJ McLean, Richard Arnesen, Marsha A. Rummel, and Katie Kaliszewski. Excused was Lon Hill.

### **SUMMARY:**

*Daniel Gorman, registering in support and available to answer questions.*

*Daniel Kornaus, registering in support and available to answer questions.*

*Bert Stitt, registering neither in support nor in opposition, and wishing to speak.*

Staff requested that Gorman provide an update on the muntins, and Gorman stated that he doesn't know if muntins can be retrofitted to existing windows or if they will need to install new windows.

Kornaus asked if it would be acceptable to apply retrofitted muntin to the interior and exterior of existing windows, or if the Commission would require new windows with muntins. Staff stated that it depends on the appearance and dimension of the retrofitted muntin.

Gorman asked if he could find samples of retrofitted muntin and submit them for staff approval. Staff stated that if the Commission is agreeable and she maintains the discretion to bring it back before the Commission, then it would be acceptable. Gorman confirmed that he will contact his contractor and submit samples to staff.

Staff pointed out that she expected to see a window in the rear bedroom on the North elevation of the first floor that was not included in the revised plans.

McLean noted that this is an issue because the window was originally shown in the 2016 approved plans, and has since been removed. He then stated that because it is located in the new addition and is not visible from the street, it would be okay to remove the window.

Rummel stated that she would welcome the window because of the expansive blankness on the North elevation. Kaliszewski said that it would be nice to have a window, but doesn't have strong feelings about it.

Kornaus noted that the window was removed because having windows on all three exterior walls created a difficult floor plan for the bedroom.

Levitan asked if any Commissioners wanted to argue for inclusion of a third window, but no one in the group felt strongly about it.

Staff noted that the porch railing height has been revised in these plans and is now too high. On a two unit building, railings must be 36" high, and current plans show the railing at 42" high.

Levitan pointed out that the ordinance states that railings must be no less than 36" high, but can be higher. Staff confirmed this interpretation of the ordinance and stated her feeling that railings must be 36" high in this case for aesthetic purposes.

Gorman said the railings were changed to a height of 42" as a safety measure, but because the previous railings on the home were 36", he was willing to change them to that height.

Staff noted that when one sits on the porch, the 42" railings will be at eye-level and will obstruct one's vision. Gorman proposed to install 42" high railings on the second floor and install 36" railings on the first floor. Staff agreed that this is acceptable. Levitan asked if the Commission was amenable to this, and the group concurred.

Gorman stated that he spoke to neighbor Bert Stitt after the last Landmarks Commission meeting, and would be willing to recreate the grape arbor that previously existed on the property.

Stitt indicated that he thinks things are evolving relatively well at the property, though it is overbuilt from the historic context of the original house. He noted how much he values the First Settlement Historic District and suggested that a historic marker be put on the house to honor Georgia Ramos' family, who had previously lived there. He also mentioned his sadness at the loss of the grape arbor.

Stitt suggested that a window be added to the second floor in order to view activity in the rear parking lot. Levitan asked for Stitt's thoughts regarding the driveway, and Stitt responded that it violates the historic integrity of the property. Gorman stated that there is no garage on the property and that he needs to obtain a curb cut permit in order to create a driveway. Stitt noted that he had thought there was a garage on the property.

Levitan asked whether the legal status of the curb cut and driveway were in the Commission's purview. Staff responded that they are not, nor is the grape arbor.

Gorman stated that putting a plaque up to honor the Ramos family is a great idea, as Georgia's grandson works for his father's company and often stops by the property. Levitan asked if the Commission could make the plaque a condition for approval, and staff indicated they could not.

Kaliszewski asked if Gorman would need a Certificate of Appropriateness to install the plaque on the building. Staff confirmed that he would need a Certificate of Appropriateness and noted that the plaque does not need to be affixed to the building and could be placed on the ground.

McLean pointed out the varying window heights in the revised plans, with most drawings reading 62" and some at 72", noting that window sizes need to be unified. Gorman indicated the dimensions listed are correct, with the window closest to the front of the house on the North elevation as 72" tall and the others as 62", all with the same head height. Kornaus stated that the floor thickness in the original house is thinner than the flooring in the new addition, so the head height was held consistent with other windows on the same elevation.

Kaliszewski noted that the new window nearest the front on the North elevation should be the same size as the original front windows, but the drawings do not list dimensions for the original windows.

Gorman asked if the new window nearest the front on the North elevation should mimic the original single window on the front of the house. Staff stated that this is incorrect, and that the new window should mimic the dimensions of the double window on the front of the house, but as a single window. She also noted that when one is inside the room, one wants the meeting rails to line up, as well as the head and sill to line up, so the head still seems to be in the wrong place in relation to the front window.

Gorman stated that for all of that to line up, the window on the first floor of the South elevation would need to be raised several inches. Staff confirmed this to be correct and stated that the new window on the North elevation and window below the door on South elevation need to match the size of the original double window on the front of the house so that head height and sill height are aligned in the bedroom.

Gorman pointed out that the windows won't be equal with one another, and staff confirmed that this is okay. McLean noted that windows will be equal in the historic part of the building, not in the addition, and the group agreed that this is acceptable.

Kaliszewski reminded the group of Stitt's suggestion to add a window on the second floor with a view of the parking lot. Gorman noted that he would be willing to add a single window to the second floor North elevation if he could change the second floor rear window to a single rather than a double.

Levitan asked if the group was okay with this alternative proposal, and the group agreed to the changes. Levitan confirmed this as correct. Staff confirmed that there would be no windows added to North elevation on the first floor, and the group agreed that was correct.

Andrzejewski advised Gorman to revise the plans to reflect these changes and resubmit them to staff.

**ACTION:**

**A motion was made by Andrzejewski and seconded by Kaliszewski to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness subject to staff report recommendations and conditions agreed upon by the Commission. The motion passed by voice vote.**