

## AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** 20 March, 2017

TITLE: 1256 Spaight St – Exterior Alteration,  
Third Lake Ridge, 6<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist.

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

CONTACT: Tom Haver

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: 21 March, 2017

**ID NUMBER:** 46475

---

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Chair; Anna V. Andrzejewski, Vice Chair; Marsha A. Rummel, Lon Hill, and Richard Arnesen. Excused was David WJ McLean. Erica Fox Gehrig arrived after the discussion of this item.

### **SUMMARY:**

Tom Haver, registering in support and wishing to speak.

The Applicant has owned the building for at least 12 years and has been performing repairs throughout. He would like to finish the third floor to create a unit. He needs two exits to comply with City building code. In order to create a second exit, he must create a dormer. The windows were installed in the 1920s and are falling apart. He would like to replace them rather than repair them. He is also requesting skylights.

While examining the submitted plans, Arnesen asked the Applicant whether the skylights would be in the same horizontal plane. The Applicant responded that the representation in the drawings is incorrect, that they will be in the same plane, have the same dimensions, and will not be visible from the street.

Andrzejewski confirmed with the Applicant that the difference in the added dormer will not be visible from the street. She went on to say that she would like the windows to match and to be the same size. Staff asked whether or not the windows needed to be egress size. The Applicant responded that they do not. He went on to say that using smaller windows in the proposed dormer would make them too high to operate, so the larger size and lower placement was selected.

Hill asked whether the windows are the same size as what is in the existing dormer. The Applicant indicated that they are the same size as the windows facing Spaight Street, and are not the same as the existing dormers. The Applicant stated that he is open to suggestions on the windows.

The Commission unanimously agreed that they are satisfied with the plans as they are.

### **ACTION:**

**A motion was made by Arnesen and seconded by Andrzejewski to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion passed by a voice vote.**