

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 7/29/19

TITLE: 1314 Jenifer St - Addition in the Third
Lake Ridge Hist. Dist. - Enclosed
Rear Entry and Addition of
Sunroom; 6th Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 8/5/19

ID NUMBER: 56712

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Anna Andrzejewski, Richard Arnesen, and Katie Kaliszewski. Excused were Arvina Martin and David McLean.

SUMMARY:

Vaughn Brandt, registering in support and wishing to speak

Bailey described the applicant's proposal, which includes constructing a covered rear porch entry and installing solar lights on the third-floor balcony. She explained that in 2018, the Landmarks Commission approved a design for the already-constructed rear addition with conditions, one of which was that the siding be clapboard down to a skirt board that would transition to the foundation materials. In the 2018 plans, she pointed out the two symmetrical picture windows on the addition, which were constructed differently, as shown in the new plans. She said that the large picture window was shifted to the east and there is now a door and a double-hung window on the west side of the rear addition. She said that there is also a gap between the picture window and the wall of the enclosed entry that is just open space, making it more of an open air porch. She displayed photos taken by Building Inspection during their site visit.

She said that staff and Building Inspection have concerns about the areas on the house that are intended to deflect snow. When approving the skirt board in 2018, Bailey explained that staff's intention was that the skirt board be flush with the wall of the building, not angled out, and could be wrapped. She said that there are multiple angles coming out of the building, which draw the eye. For the area on the enclosed porch, she said that there is not siding going down to the skirt board above the foundation materials.

She said that staff believes the standards could be met, and recommends that the project be approved with several conditions. She said that the installation of solar lights on the third-floor deck should be denied because the lights are out of character with the period of the building and would shine light from a substantial height onto the adjacent neighbors throughout the night. She said that the siding for any enclosed sections of the porch should be lapsiding that terminates at an apron board to transition to the foundation material and the apron board must be flush with the wall plane and may be wrapped with aluminum. She said that the eastern picture window on the rear porch should either be removed or centered on the bay for the enclosed porch entry with siding or trim details to be approved by staff because it is currently off-center and intersecting with the porch.

Levitan asked if the proposed solar lights comply with the City's dark sky ordinance. Bailey said that she can't see how they would because any light fixture needs to have full cut off, but the proposed fixtures are meant to

radiate light out. Levitan asked Brandt if he checked to see if the proposed lights conform to the ordinance, and Brandt said that he did not.

Kaliszewski asked for clarification that the Landmarks Commission approved a project in 2018, but the Certificate of Appropriateness was not followed. Bailey confirmed that was correct, and explained that Building Inspection was at the property and noticed that the work completed did not meet the requirements of the Certificate of Appropriateness. She said that she had a conversation with Brandt and gave him the option to comply with the Certificate of Appropriateness or come before the Landmarks Commission to request approval for a different design.

Bailey said that regarding condition #4 in staff's recommendation, the 2018 plans had two different bays with the windows centered within each space; currently, the window frame is coterminous with the edge of the support beam, so it is off-center and there is no siding as was proposed because of being at the edge of the beam and having open space between the windows. Brandt said that he is proposing to get rid of the picture window because it is gigantic and an odd fit. Levitan asked what will be there in place of the picture window. Brandt said that it will be an open airway with a lower handrail feature that would be about two feet high. Levitan asked staff if that is acceptable for meeting condition #4, and Bailey confirmed that it is one of the options.

Brandt said that when Building Inspection came to the property, he thought they were just looking at the interior of the rear addition, not at the exterior work. He said that the Building Inspector told him that he did not build the porch according to the submitted plans. Brandt said that he thinks he did follow the plans for the enclosed section of the porch and the issue is that the drawing he had initially submitted was inadequate and not detailed enough to meet the needs of the Building Inspectors. He provided photos of the work he has completed on the rear addition. He explained that he changed the area where the roofline meets the deck handrail on the second floor above the addition based on feedback received from the Landmarks Commission, so he cleaned up the jagged line of step flashing and said that it looks better now.

He explained that there are two parts to the proposed work, the enclosed porch addition and an open covered entryway on the other side of the rear porch, so at the end of the process there will be separate entrances for each unit. He said that what he had originally submitted in 2018 was not built because the Zoning Board of Appeals said that he must move the wall 1 ½ feet and suggested that he could have a similar amenity by building part of the addition on the porch. He took the Board's advice, and the 10x10 side addition is done.

Brandt said that he agrees with most everything Bailey is recommending, but wants to contest the recommendation for the bumpout. He said that the bottom angle matches what is existing on the side of the house, which he described as a 30-degree bumpout of the bottom two pieces of siding over the foundation. He said that it was originally clad in metal, but he would prefer solid PVC because it looks like cedar but does not rot. He said that when the driveway was poured in 2010, they installed a curb to protect the foundation and to keep water away from the back doors. He explained that there is a 3" gap behind the curb, so the reason for the 30-degree bumpout is to keep snow off of the curb and from getting behind it. He said that the metal bumpout had originally been approved, so he continued it through to the addition where the driveway and curb are located. He said that he would like to retain it because it is there to protect the base of the structure from taking on moisture. Levitan asked if Brandt was speaking to condition #3 in staff's recommendation, and Brandt confirmed that he was. Levitan asked if Brandt agrees to conditions #1, 2, and 4. Brandt confirmed that he agreed.

Regarding condition #3, Bailey said that in looking through the meeting minutes and speaking with the previous Preservation Planner and Building Inspection, it was a surprise to everyone that the apron board was angled. She said that while the applicant may have intended for it to be angled, it was not part of the discussion at the meeting, the submittal narrative, or the drawings. Levitan asked about the applicable standards. Bailey referenced ordinance 41.18(1)(d) and said that changes to a building must preserve the historic character. Levitan asked if the angled bumpout frustrates the public interest. Bailey said that it is not in character with this building or any other building in the historic district. Levitan asked where the bumpout is located, and Bailey

said that it is on the back of the house. Brandt said that there is also a 30-degree bumpout clad in cedar siding above the sandstone foundation on the side of the house by the driveway, which is a little smaller than the new one. He said that the new bumpout is 7 inches and the older side bumpout is about 4 ½ inches. Levitan asked if the side bumpout is a historic element of the house. Brandt said that he thinks it is, and it was on the house when he purchased it in 1997.

Andrzejewski expressed confusion. Brandt said that he gets in trouble later when every detail isn't specified, so he wants to be sure of all the details. Andrzejewski asked for clarification that the applicant is requesting retroactive approval for something he already built, but wants to change again. Brandt said no, and then asked if she was referring to the open air entry because that is the remaining variable. Andrzejewski said that there are a lot of different parts to this project, and the Commission has standards they use in their review, so it would be easier if they had a plan showing all of the proposed work in order to avoid misunderstandings that have continued to occur. Kaliszewski said that if plans change along the way, the applicant should return before the Landmarks Commission to request approval for those changes. Brandt said that he did come back to the Landmarks Commission. Kaliszewski said that he came back after he had already built it, which is not the same. Brandt said that he came back to the Landmarks Commission after the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting, and that is when he had submitted the drawing that he described as not capturing the plans adequately. Kaliszewski said that he still built it, which is the issue she has. She said that he changed the plans in the middle of this process without coming back to Landmarks Commission, which is why he is continuing to have issues.

Bailey said that another issue Building Inspection highlighted are the beams projecting northward from the house that are used to store ladders. She pointed out that the Commission had previously discussed brackets that are perpendicular to those in question and had issued a Certificate of Appropriateness to clad those brackets so they match the appearance of the decorative roof brackets. She said that at that time, they did not discuss the additional brackets projecting off the north side because they did not know about them. She said that Building Inspection informed her of the unpainted posts, and she found no previous approvals or documentation in any staff reports that mention the posts. She said that given the amount of discussion they had about the other brackets needing to have historic character, it seems they should have addressed these brackets as well. Brandt said that they were discussed in February 2018. He said that the previous Preservation Planner, Amy Scanlon, asked him what they were and he told her they were brackets to hold ladders. He said that he did not see that conversation included in the minutes from that meeting, but it was briefly discussed among a lot of other things. Brandt said that he did go back for approval when he moved the door, so he has been going through the process very carefully. He said that he understands that the Zoning Board of Appeals did not give him permission for the addition, and that he came back to the Landmarks Commission for that.

Andrzejewski requested confirmation that conditions #1, 2, and 4 have been agreed upon. Levitan said that his understanding is that Brandt is accepting of conditions #1, 2, and 4 and is disagreeing with #3. Arnesen said that they still need to deal with the issue of the ladder brackets, and also need drawings that reflect the final plans. Brandt said that the plans he submitted are exactly what he plans to do. Andrzejewski asked about the picture window. Brandt said that he wants to remove the picture window and create an opening there, which is what it shows in the plans. Brandt asked if the plans label it as a picture window. Levitan read from the plans that it is labeled as a "fresh air opening." Kaliszewski asked if Brandt is going to close the current open area between the two windows, or if it will also be open. Brandt said that he wants to remove the picture window, so there will be one door and one window that is appropriately sized and the rest will be open air. Levitan said that he thinks the submission shows the removal of the picture window. Commissioners agreed, and said that it had appeared to be a framed window in the plans, which caused confusion. Brandt said that he is interested in input on trim details or it could be worked out later. Bailey recommended they work it out now. Arnesen pointed out that the ladder brackets are also included on the drawing.

Discussion moved to the angled bumpout. Brandt said that he is willing to clad the bumpout in cedar siding down to an acceptable apron board-like height of 5 inches or so. Kaliszewski said that in previous discussions regarding the apron board, she thinks staff intended it to look more like the older side bumpout than what

Brandt built as the new bumpout. Brandt said that he could clad it in siding. Kaliszewski said that the shape is important. Arnesen said that cladding with siding would make it worse and it is more important to remove it. Brandt said that his goal is to keep snow off the curb. Bailey pointed out that there is a mix of multiple angles in the area with the new bumpout, whereas in the area of the existing side bumpout, everything angled follows a similar line and there is a cohesive nature to it. Brandt said that it is almost exactly the same. Kaliszewski said that it is not the same; one is a straight line and the other is not. She asked if the green half-wall railing was going to remain outside of the open air porch. Brandt said that it was. Arnesen asked if Brandt could remove the new bumpout, install siding, and if he would like it to jut out, to build it similarly to the existing side bumpout. Brandt said that he would like it to jut out so that it keeps snow off the curb. Arnesen asked if he could recreate the look of the other bumpout. Brandt said that it would be a little bigger in order to cover the curb. Arnesen asked why it has to cover the whole curb. Brandt said that if there is snow sitting on the flat curb, it is going to roll in by the house. Levitan said that this is in the back of the house. Brandt referred to the photos he submitted, and said that the bumpout serves a functional purpose because it is important to keep water and moisture out of the house.

Andrzejewski said that the cumulative effects of the work are important. She said that they are working through this incrementally and are trying to help the applicant through the approval process, but when one starts to add up all of the work that has been done, all of a sudden there are a lot of elements that are out of keeping with the ordinance. She reiterated that the Landmarks Commission prefers to have a complete set of plans for all of the proposed work ahead of time rather than approving projects in pieces over several meetings. She said that now she is looking at all of the changes to the property and wondering when they have reached the point where it is out of keeping with the historic district. Kaliszewski said that she feels the same way.

Arnesen asked about the brackets. Kaliszewski said that she remembers discussing them but never really making a decision. Arnesen said that he does not see any circumstances under which they would have approved them. Andrzejewski said that she does not remember discussing them. Arnesen said that he would relent on the bumpout, but does not see how they could approve the wood brackets to hold ladders. Andrzejewski and Arnesen asked if the Commission had previously approved the ladder brackets. Bailey said that she found no documentation that specifically calls out the ladder brackets. Kaliszewski said that she thought someone had asked about the ladder brackets at the 2018 meeting in question and Brandt explained what they were, but because they were not part of the Certificate of Appropriateness request at that time and the Commission had a lot of other things to discuss at the meeting, it didn't move any further than that. Brandt said that he thinks Kaliszewski is correct, and pointed out that at the time, the drawings he had submitted were not as detailed as they needed to be.

Levitan said that he thinks the brackets implicate the public interest more than the bumpout. He said that it is a hard argument to make that the public would be frustrated by the bumpout. He said that it is on the back of the house and there is a reasonably legitimate explanation for it. Arnesen said that the back of the house is already so cobbled. Levitan asked if the brackets are before the Commission. Bailey said that they are because it is part of the work that Building Inspection observed for which they cannot find evidence of approval. Levitan asked if they are approaching consensus that the bumpout is okay but the brackets are not. Arnesen said he agreed. Kaliszewski said that if they had known the bumpout was going to look the way it does, they would never have approved it. Arnesen said they also would never have approved a 10x30 inch projecting wood bracket had it been presented to them prior to being constructed.

Brandt asked if the bumpout should remain metal or if it should be a combination of siding and metal. Arnesen said that the consensus was that adding siding would make it worse. Bailey said that when the picture window is removed and the open air porch is created, there will be a railing along the bottom. She asked if Commissioners are okay with it being wrapped in aluminum all the way up, or if they would prefer that siding be installed down to the apron board. Kaliszewski asked what it is currently, and Bailey said that it is all wrapped aluminum. Brandt confirmed that it is aluminum with 1x6 wood trim. He said that he does not want the porch to look cobbled and thinks that covering it in cedar siding would help it match the addition and look more consistent. Arnesen asked if Brandt wanted to recreate the look of the other existing bumpout all the way

down, and Brandt said that he thinks it would look best. Arnesen said that he would agree to that, and there was consensus that siding was acceptable.

Brandt asked for clarification on which exterior walls need to be covered in siding. He explained that the open covered entryway on the driveway side of the house currently has wainscoting on the interior porch wall, and asked if that is acceptable. Levitan asked if it is inside, and Brandt said that it is. Bailey said that it is part of the porch, but is still an outside wall. She described the layout of the open air porch, and said that the wall in question is technically the exterior wall of the house. Arnesen said that the wall inside the open air porch does not need to be covered in cedar siding.

Brandt said that he understood the previously issued Certificate of Appropriateness for the rear addition to mean that he should use like materials and make everything look consistent, but wanted confirmation of that. He said that on the side of the house by his neighbor's fence, the bottom 18 inches consists of foam board insulation with a gravel-like surface treatment to make it look like a stone foundation. He said that he continued that same treatment from the existing structure along the length of the 10-foot addition, and ran cedar siding down to that, so it is consistent with what was already in place on that side of the house. Bailey said that she didn't see any problem with that.

Andrzejewski thanked Brandt for the correction on the removal of the picture window in the submitted plans, and emphasized that it is easier to approve everything with images and complete plans that are submitted prior to the meeting. Bailey said that before issuing the Certificate of Appropriateness, she would request updated drawings that match the conditions of approval.

Brandt said that when originally requesting a variance for the addition, he was advised by the Zoning Administrator to go before the Landmarks Commission prior to going to the Zoning Board of Appeals. He explained that is part of the reason why there were multiple versions of plans for the addition.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Andrzejewski, to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness for the covered rear porch addition with the conditions that siding for any enclosed sections of the porch be lapsiding that terminates at an apron board to transition to the foundation material, the eastern picture window on the rear porch be removed, the rear porch railing be covered in lapsiding that terminates at an apron board to transition to the foundation material, the bumpout on the rear addition be of a consistent angle and dimension, wainscoting on exterior wall of enclosed rear porch can remain, and the north-facing projecting brackets that hold ladders off the second-floor deck be removed; and to deny the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness to install solar lights on the third-floor deck. The motion passed by voice vote/other.