



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Approved LANDMARKS COMMISSION

Monday, October 19, 2009

4:45 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room LL-110 (Madison Municipal Building)

NOTE - ROOM CHANGE: The Landmarks Commission will be in Room LL-110 of the Madison Municipal Building. Unless noticed differently, Room LL-110 will be the permanent new location for the Landmarks Commission.

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 7 -

Bridget R. Maniaci; Daniel J. Stephans; Stuart Levitan; Robin M. Taylor;
Michael J. Rosenblum; Christina Slattery and Erica Fox Gehrig

APPROVAL OF October 5, 2009 MINUTES

A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Levitan, to Approve the Minutes from October 5, 2009 with the following correction:

Corrected to say that Ms. Gehrig was referring to how the new 1252 Williamson Street building facade nicely reflected the Schaefer Pharmacy.

The motion passed by voice vote/other.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

- 16280** 611 South Dickenson Street - Marquette Bungalows Local Historic District
Replacement of Windows
Contact: Kent Elbow and Jason Wipperfurth
Mr. Elbow, 611 Dickinson Street, presented information about the project and brought a window display unit for the Commissioners to consider.
Mr. Stephans asked if the pattern will match the existing 3-over-1 window design. Mr. Elbow said that it will.
Ms. Gehrig asked what the projected life span of the new windows will be? Mr. Elbow did not know.
Ms. Taylor asked about the exterior material, was it fiberglass or vinyl?. Mr. Elbow said that it is vinyl.
Ms. Gehrig noted that there have been many window replacements in historic districts, and that we are losing historic fabric. She added that these windows have lasted for upward of 80 to 100 years in some cases, and that she has heard that replacement windows sometimes

only last 20 years. Ms Gehrig added that heat loss through windows is approximately only 10% of the thermal envelope, and that there are many other energy efficient things that can be done to make a bigger impact on energy costs. Mr. Stephans noted that the replacement windows at the Governor's Mansion had to be replaced after only 6 years.

Mr. Levitan asked if it mattered as long as the windows match the appearance, since that is what the Ordinance refers to. Mr Stephans added that the Commission has been approving replacement windows in the other historic districts.

Ald. Maniaci said that maybe we need to look at the larger policy issue. Perhaps staff could do some research and create a handout about repairing and maintenance of historic windows. Mr. Stephans added that perhaps the Ordinance should be revised to support original fabric.

A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Maniaci, to Approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new windows, but asked to have staff continue to send such cases to the commission rather than approve them administratively pending a larger discussion of windows by the Commission. The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 -

Bridget R. Maniaci; Daniel J. Stephans; Stuart Levitan; Robin M. Taylor; Michael J. Rosenblum and Christina Slattery

Noes: 1 -

Erica Fox Gehrig

2. [16281](#)

1602 Regent Street - University Heights Local Historic District,
Owner is seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness for previously installed vertical metal siding on garage.

Contact: Lee Howard

Mr. Howard, 4884 Pine Cone Circle, Middleton, described the project and the process of how it came to be before the Commission.

Ald. Maniaci asked who owned the adjacent fence. Mr. Howard said that the fence belongs to the neighbors, but he helps maintain it.

Ms. Gehrig asked staff if the \$500 building permit thresholds kicks in the notice that it has to be approved by the Landmarks commission. Staff replied that she has been working with the building inspectors on getting better notice to owners that have to respond to code compliance issues even if the repair work is less than \$500, but that yes, owners may not be aware of historic requirements unless they come in for a building permit.

Ald. Maniaci said that she represents a lot of student rental areas, and that ongoing maintenance and building code compliance is a very large issue. She appreciates Mr. Howard's past historically appropriate work, but added that the new siding really doesn't match.

Mr. Levitan asked about how much of the siding is visible from the street. Mr. Howard replied that the upper part of the main garage door area can be seen from Breese Terrace, and that about 4 feet can be seen from Regent Street.

Ald. Bidar-Sielaff said that this house is at the entrance of the neighborhood and commends the owner on past work, but says that they are trying to raise the level of maintenance in the neighborhood. Mr. Howard replied that it used to be plywood in the front, and that he could replace the plywood. Mr. Rosenblum asked if a flat material would look better.

Mr. Stephans said that we should be looking at this is if it was coming before for the first time.

Mr. Rosenblum said that in light of the owner's previous work, he thinks that we can grant an exception, and approve the material as is.

Mr. Levitan noted that if this material was coming to us before installation, we would have rejected it.

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Taylor, to Approve a Certificate of Appropriateness as installed. The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 -

Daniel J. Stephans; Robin M. Taylor; Michael J. Rosenblum; Christina Slattery and Bridget R. Maniaci

Noes: 2 -

Stuart Levitan and Erica Fox Gehrig

3. [15469](#)

2021 Van Hise Avenue - University Heights Historic District

Consideration of Issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness for a side yard addition.

Contact: Colin Godding

Mr. Fred Osborne, 2021 Van Hise, and Colin Godding, 107 N Hamilton St., presented the project and described the changes that had taken place since the neighborhood meeting and the last Landmarks Commission meeting. Mr. Osborne said that they looked at over 200 houses in Madison, and that they fell in love with this house and the large mature yard. He said that they are only the third owner, and that the house has not been updated since it was built 100 years ago. He said that they have tried to listen to the neighbors and the Commission when they worked on plan revisions.

Mr. Godding discussed the details of the revisions and provided letters of support from 8 neighbors.

Ald. Maniaci asked about the size of the addition. Mr. Godding said that the original house is about 2,500 square feet, and that the new addition will add approximately 1270 square feet (635 per floor) plus a 575 square foot detached garage.

Mr. Levitan asked that given the size of the house, why did you buy a house that didn't meet your needs? Mr. Levitan noted that they could combine the lots and push the addition further back to still meet zoning codes. Mr. Osborne replied that the style of the house appealed to them, along with the large lots. He added that the current house is a fire hazard due to the old wiring.

Ms. Slattery was also concerned about the sill height and window groupings, and asked what the applicant thought about the two staff conditions? Mr. Godding replied that they are willing to raise the sill height, but that they would prefer the more modern railing system to have less visual impact.

Mr. Levitan wondered how many trees would need to be removed if they put the garage further back. Mr. Godding replied that it was an issue of both grade and trees.

Lawrence Shriberg, 2015 Van Hise, registered in opposition and talked about the impact of the proposal on both the neighborhood and his own property next door. He said that the garage placed halfway back on the lot completely obstructs views into the back and doesn't reflect the placement of garages throughout the neighborhood. He added that many of the neighbors seem to be confident that the Commission would vote this project down, and are perhaps not at the meeting this evening because of that. He added that he would like the neighbors to build on the back of the house with a backyard garage.

Joyce Knutson, 24 North Prospect Avenue, registered in support and is in favor of the revised proposal. She said that while the addition is not what she might have done, she has different needs than the Osborne's. She was at first very concerned about the oak tree in the front tree terrace, and is happy the Osbornes have committed to save the tree. She said that the Osbornes have been responsive to many of the concerns expressed by the neighbors.

Lynn Gilchrest, 113 Ely Place registered in opposition and gave a brief update on the North Spooner addition proposal that did not receive a Certificate of Appropriateness. She said that the family found another house in the neighborhood, and actually ended up switching houses

with another University Heights family. She wanted to let the Commission know that things do work out. Ms. Gilcrest said that the visual effect of this proposal on the block will be very different than the sizes of the existing homes on that block. She asked what the tipping point was of how much of an addition is visually acceptable. She said that while the revised proposal is a significant improvement, it is still too large.

Mr. Levitan stated that the ordinance says that the Commission has to evaluate scale, size and whether or not the side addition detracts from the original façade. This design does detract from the façade. 2021 Van Hise is a pivotal house in the neighborhood and historic district that also appears to meet at least two of the three criteria for landmark status, which makes it potentially eligible for being a local landmark. This also appears to be a self created problem about buying a house that doesn't meet the new owner's needs. In addition, there are many houses in this neighborhood that have either no garage or a one car garage, and when there is a garage, it is set way back against the rear property line. Mr. Osborne stated that there are at least 35 houses in the neighborhood that have two-car garages, and that this lot is atypical for University Heights in that it is so large.

Ms. Taylor thanked the owners for detaching the garage, but noted that the addition still has a very large presence. While the architecture of the new addition is very good, the addition itself seems inappropriate. She asked about removing the 'bump-out' between the house and the new addition in order to add space as a buffer between the two. Mr. Godding replied that that could be done if the Commission thought it was a good idea.

Ald. Bidar-Sielaff stated that the owners really took to heart what the neighbors and Commissioners have said previously, and while the neighborhood meeting had a lot of attendees, there still seems to be a 50/50 split within the neighborhood about this project. She added that while the site is very large, moving the garage much further back would create a lot of concrete. She added that she thinks that for an addition, this design does a very good job of separating the old from the new, and that there probably isn't a side addition that doesn't detract somewhat from the original house.

Ald. Maniaci said that there is a buildable lot with a lot of space in the back, and that maybe they should still think about a rear-yard addition or a single car garage. She added that while the design details are very good, she still is unsure about what to do.

Mr. Rosenblum noted that the back is just as visible as the front considering that the house is on a corner lot. He appreciates the details and the work with the neighborhood, but it is still a very large addition.

Ms. Slattery agreed with the complements on the design details, but still has issues with the addition to this "jewel box". She asked if the garage should be looked at under the "new construction" requirements in the ordinance. Staff replied, that yes, the garage, as it is a separate building would be considered new construction.

Ms. Gehrig likes that someone is interested in taking care of and updating this house. She would prefer that the facade would stay as the primary focus of the house, but doesn't see how this can't be approved.

Mr. Stephans added that any significant addition will detract from what the house is today. He added that the windows on the addition should be raised to match the other windows of the house.

Ald. Bidar-Sielaff says that while it is a tough call, the back addition ideas seems to be really unrealistic, so thinks that this is the best that could be done.

Mr. Rosenblum says that for better or worse, this is a unique lot with a unique amount of space.

Mr. Levitan asked if there could be any living space above the garage. He also noted that the garage is positioned in such a way that it obstructs views and is not in the normal location as other garages in the neighborhood. Mr. Godding replied that they would consider moving that garage back an additional 10 feet.

There was a motion by Maniaci to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness, with the following conditions was seconded by Taylor for discussion purposes. The motion failed.

1. The windows sills on the addition are to be raised to match the other windows as recommended in the staff report.
2. The more modern railing is okay as designed.
3. The eastern facade 'bump-out' between the original house and the addition is to be removed to create a better separation.
4. The garage is to be push back an additional 10 feet.

Ayes: 3 -

Bridget R. Maniaci; Michael J. Rosenblum and Erica Fox Gehrig

Noes: 4 -

Daniel J. Stephans; Stuart Levitan; Robin M. Taylor and Christina Slattery

4. [16282](#)

1314 Jenifer Street - Third Lake Ridge Local Historic District

Proposal for rear yard two-car garage and workshop.

Contact: Vaughn Brandt

Vaughn Brandt, 1314 Jenifer Street, described the project as submitted.

Mr. Levitan asked about how far back the garage was from the street. Mr. Brandt replied that he thinks it is approximately 100 feet.

Ald. Maniaci asked about what kind of work will be done in the workshop, as she knows that there are zoning issues about having a business in a workshop. Mr. Brandt replied that it will be for mostly hobby work, and projects around the house and with friends, not for a business.

Ms. Gehrig asked about how much of the sliding glass doors will be visible form the street. Mr. Brandt thinks that the new railing will obscure the bottom half of the glass doors, and they will be set back up on the second level. He thinks that their presence will be minimal.

Ald. Maniaci asked about the materials. Mr. Brandt replied that the siding will be new cedar, windows will be reclaimed from his own house, asphalt shingles will match the house, and the wood handrail will also match the front porch.

A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Rosenblum, to Approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the project. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

OTHER BUSINESS - DISCUSSION

5. [08717](#)

Buildings proposed for demolition

Buildings proposed for demolition. There were two single family houses on the Demolition notification system. There was no discussion.

6. [07804](#)

Secretary's Report

No discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Maniaci, seconded by Rosenblum, to Adjourn at 7:55 p.m. The motion passed by voice vote/other.