

Thank you for your report. We agree with your recommendations that the Commission approve the replacement of the front and back doors and the 4 windows in the bathroom. We were disappointed, however, in your recommendation that the Commission require us to “repair” rather than replace the remaining 15 windows.

While you took into account the report from the door professionals; you seem to have overlooked the report from the window professional who strongly advised to replace rather than repair. **His recommendation was based on safety, cost, a long term solution, as well as consideration of the architectural integrity of the window.** As I pointed out in my letter of April 21, Iver Bryan’s business is Historic Window Repair, not replacement. He is listed in the Wisconsin Trust for Historic Preservation and has years of experience assessing and repairing historic windows.

As the Commission reviews your report, I hope they will also take into consideration the following points:

- Mr. Bryan’s assessment and recommendation (see note below)
- Cost: an approximate cost to repair 19 windows--- Between \$57,000 and \$76,000 in contrast to \$21,606 to replace--- a significant difference
- Of the 19 windows only 4 face the street
- New windows would not require storm windows thus the historic window design would not be obscured by storm windows
- The replacement windows would be nearly identical to the original windows in texture, size, and architectural details, thus meeting the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness. Differences being:
 - Exterior clad rather than wood
 - None of the glass in the existing windows appears to have the look of old wavy glass, therefore glass would look the same
 - Muntin width would be the same
 - Rail and stile size only slightly different

- Screen frame would match the existing exterior trim color; trim detail remains untouched and the same
- While the photos we provided show significant deterioration of the windows, it may be difficult to show the overall condition of the windows without being there. Please take that into consideration.

We hope you will take these points into consideration as you make your final decision. One reason we bought the house last year was that we wanted an older home with character. We were delighted to learn the home was within a designated historic district, and it is our intention to maintain the historic character of the home. We have made friends in the community and look forward to spending many years in Madison.

Note: from conversation with Iver Bryan of Historic Window Repair, originally sent in my April 21 letter---

Going through my files today, I came across two window repair invoices (see attached) from the previous owners of 210 N Breese Terrace. Work was performed by Iver Bryan of Historic Window Repair in Columbus, WI. Mr Bryan is listed under "window repair" on the website for the Wisconsin Trust for Historic Preservation, advocates for Wisconsin's historic places.

He remembers the house very well as he had done work there in Sept. 2015 and again in June of 2016. He did some glazing and rope replacement, and repaired some panes and mullions that her dogs had damaged. He had a very clear recollection of the house and the windows. Apparently he told Rachel that she would be "much better off replacing the windows than repairing them". He remembers them as being in "really bad condition--- loose, drafty, and deteriorating". As he was repairing one of them, he said it basically popped out into his hands and threw him off balance, thus posing a safety hazard in addition to overall poor condition.