

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 4/16/18

TITLE: 210 N Breese Terr. - Exterior alteration in
the University Heights Hist. Dist.;
5th Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 4/25/18

ID NUMBER: 51179

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

SUMMARY:

Daniel Schwartz, registering in support, wishing to speak, and available to answer questions.

The Applicant provided a brief summary of the proposal.

Levitan referenced the staff report and noted that the previous owner had replaced windows without obtaining a Certificate of Appropriateness. He asked the Applicant to note how many have been replaced and how many the Applicant is proposing to replace now.

Arnesen asked what the replaced windows look like. To the Applicant's perception, they look similar to the historic windows. Staff drew the Commission's attention to the proposed muntin width change. There was general discussion and clarification regarding which windows have and have not been replaced.

Kaliszewski asked why the Applicant feels that the front door requires replacement. The Applicant noted that it is warped, old, and that air comes in.

Levitan asked whether new legislation was in effect that would affect the deliberations of the Landmarks Commission for this agenda item. Attorney Strange responded that, while the legislation was not yet in effect, it would likely influence discussion once it is enacted. He went on to explain the language of the legislation and how it might be interpreted.

Andrzejewski asked if there was a second door proposed to be replaced. Per the Applicant, there is. He went on to note that the issues mentioned for the front door were also present in the back door. Andrzejewski asked if weather stripping was attempted. The Applicant didn't know. Both Kaliszewski and Andrzejewski feel the door is character-defining and generally oppose replacement. Kaliszewski asked if the Applicant had pursued tax credits. Per the Applicant, they have not.

Hill commented that the windows do not appear beyond repair. The rest of the Commission concurred.

Arnesen asked whether the windows had been tested for lead paint. The Applicant does not know. He asked whether the windows were all in a condition similar to what was photographed. Per the Applicant, almost all of them are. Arnesen asked about the upstairs window conditions and whether they're aluminum and/or original.

The Applicant doesn't know if they're original. He stated that they're in bad shape. Arnesen stated that he would possibly be in favor of window replacement in the interest of removing the storm windows.

There was general consensus among the Commission that the already-replaced windows were not historically correct. Arnesen asked for clarification as to which windows would be matched. The Applicant wasn't clear, but Kaliszewski noted that the proposed replacement windows were historically correct. Andrzejewski asked whether the Commission needed more information in order to vote, and suggested a window inventory keyed to each window in the house.

McLean noted that there are wooden storm windows available. He asked whether the door can be repaired. The Commission felt that it could be from the photos provided. There was consensus from the Commission that the front door is important and should be repaired. The Commission was less concerned about the back door.

The Applicant requested a referral to provide more information at a future meeting, including an inventory of the condition of each window proposed to be replaced and what it would take to repair them.

ACTION:

A motion was made by McLean and seconded by Kaliszewski to refer the item to a future meeting. The motion passed on a voice vote.