



Project Name & Address: 1709 Regent Street

Application Type(s): Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition, new construction, and exterior alterations in the University Heights historic district

Legistar File ID # [66877](#)

Prepared By: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner, Planning Division

Date Prepared: May 3, 2022

Summary

Project Applicant/Contact: Milissa Turke, Milissa Turke Homes LLC

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting that the Landmarks Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition an existing garage, construction of a new garage, and exterior alterations to the principal structure.

Background Information

Parcel Location/Information: The subject site is located in the University Heights Historic District.

Relevant State Statute Section:

Wisc SS 62.23(7)(em)2m. In the repair or replacement of a property that is designated as a historic landmark or included within a historic district or neighborhood conservation district under this paragraph, a city shall allow an owner to use materials that are similar in design, color, scale, architectural appearance, and other visual qualities.

Relevant Ordinance Sections:

- 41.18 STANDARDS FOR GRANTING A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS.** A certificate of appropriateness shall be granted only if the proposed project complies with this chapter, including all of the following standards that apply.
- (1) New construction or exterior alteration. The Landmarks Commission shall approve a certificate of appropriateness for exterior alteration or construction only if:
 - (a) In the case of exterior alteration to a designated landmark, the proposed work would meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.
 - (b) In the case of exterior alteration or construction of a structure on a landmark site, the proposed work would meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.
 - (c) In the case of exterior alteration or construction on any property located in a historic district, the proposed exterior alteration or construction meets the adopted standards and guidelines for that district.
 - (d) In the case of any exterior alteration or construction for which a certificate of appropriateness is required, the proposed work will not frustrate the public interest expressed in this ordinance for protecting, promoting, conserving, and using the City’s historic resources.
 - (2) Demolition or Removal. In determining whether to approve a certificate of appropriateness for any demolition or removal of any landmark or structure within a historic district, the Landmarks

Commission shall consider all of the following, and may give decisive weight to any or all of the following:

- (a) Whether the structure is of such architectural or historic significance that its demolition or removal would be detrimental to the public interest and contrary to the general welfare of the people of the City and the State.
- (b) Whether a landmark's designation has been rescinded.
- (c) Whether the structure, although not itself a landmark structure, contributes to the distinctive architectural or historic character of the historic district as a whole and therefore should be preserved for the benefit of the people of the City and the State.
- (d) Whether demolition or removal of the subject property would be contrary to the policy and purpose of this ordinance and/or to the objectives of the historic preservation plan for the applicable historic district as duly adopted by the Common Council.
- (e) Whether the structure is of such old and unusual or uncommon design, method of construction, or material that it could not be reproduced or be reproduced only with great difficulty and/or expense.
- (f) Whether retention of the structure would promote the general welfare of the people of the City and the State by encouraging study of American history, architecture and design or by developing an understanding of American culture and heritage.
- (g) The condition of the property, provided that any deterioration of the property which is self-created or which is the result of a failure to maintain the property as required by this chapter cannot qualify as a basis for the issuance of a certificate of appropriateness for demolition or removal.
- (h) Whether any new structure proposed to be constructed or change in use proposed to be made is compatible with the historic resources of the historic district in which the subject property is located, or if outside a historic district, compatible with the mass and scale of buildings within two hundred (200) feet of the boundary of the landmark site.

Prior to approving a certificate of appropriateness for demolition, the Landmarks Commission may require the applicant to provide documentation of the structure. Documentation shall be in the form required by the Commission.

41.24 UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT.

- (4) Standards for the Review of New Structures in the TR-V1, TR-V2, TR-U1, TR-U2, TR-C2, TR-C3, TR-C4, MNX, TSS, and LMX Zoning Districts.
 - (a) Principal Structures.
 - 2. Materials. Materials for the exterior walls shall be the same as or similar to materials prevalent in the University Heights Historic District. Permitted materials include brick, narrow gauge horizontal clapboards four or less inches in exposed width, stone, stucco, smooth shingles or combinations of the above provided the combinations occur in a manner and location similar to the materials on existing structures in University Heights (e.g., brick on first floor with clapboard on second floor). Other materials, such as aluminum or vinyl must be visually compatible with structures within two hundred (200) feet of the subject property. The following materials are prohibited: concrete block, asbestos, wide clapboards over four inches in exposed width, diagonal boards, vertical boards, rough sawn wood, rough split shingles, shakes.
 - (b) Accessory Structures. Accessory structures, as defined in Section 28.211, MGO, shall be compatible with the design of the existing structures on the zoning lot, shall not exceed fifteen (15) feet in height and shall be as unobtrusive as possible. No accessory structure shall be erected in any yard except a rear yard. Exterior wall materials shall be the same as those for construction of new principal structures as set forth in Sec. 41.24(4)(a)2.

- (6) Standards for the Review of Exterior Alterations and Repairs in the TR-VI, TR-V2, TR-U1, TR-U2, NMX, TSS and LMX Zoning Districts.
- (a) Height. No alterations shall be higher than the existing structure; however, if the existing structure is already nonconforming, no alteration shall be made thereto except in accordance with Sec. 28.192, MGO. In addition, all alterations, including alterations to the top of a structure, shall conform to the height restrictions for the zoning district in which the structure is located.
 - (b) Alterations. Alterations shall be compatible in scale, materials and texture with the existing structure.
 - (c) Repairs. Materials used in repairs shall harmonize with the existing materials in texture, color and architectural detail.
 - (d) Re-Siding. The standards for the review of re-siding are the same as the standards for review of re-siding in the TR-C2, TR-C3 and TR-C4 Zoning Districts set forth in Sec. 41.24(5)e.
 - (e) Roof Shape. Roof alterations to provide additional windows, headroom or area are prohibited unless permitted under Chapter 28, or otherwise approved pursuant thereto as a variance or as part of a conditional use. In addition, all roof alterations shall be visually compatible with the architectural design of the structure.
 - (f) Roof Materials. All repairs shall match in appearance the existing roofing materials; however, when a roof is covered or replaced, roofing materials shall duplicate as closely as practicable the appearance of the original materials. Thick wood shakes, French method, interlock and Dutch lap shingles are prohibited. Rolled roofing, tar and gravel and other similar roof materials are also prohibited except on flat or slightly sloped roofs which are not visible from the street.
 - (g) Parking Lots. No new parking lots will be approved unless they are accessory to and on the same zoning lot as a commercial structure or multiple family dwelling.

Analysis and Conclusion

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish an existing garage and construct a new garage. The exterior alterations proposed for the principal structure include replacement of a nonhistoric rear deck, convert the nonhistoric windows on the enclosed front porch to screens, replacement of existing siding, and replacement of a side and rear window. The existing house was constructed in 1923 by General Contractor Anton F. Nellen for James B. Jordan, one of the partners of Jordan Brothers Real Estate. It is a simple vernacular bungalow.

The existing garage is a simple hipped roof structure that is deteriorating due to age and quality of the original construction. The new garage is proposed in approximately the same location with a larger footprint. The new accessory structure is proposed as having a front-facing gable, which is typical of the accessory structures in the district. The vehicle door is typical of what is seen on garages in the vicinity. The siding is proposed as the 6" smooth-surfaced LP Smartside, which has a 4-7/8" reveal, and LP Smartside trim. The roof is proposed as asphalt shingles.

On the rear of the principal structure, the applicant proposes to remove the existing nonhistoric rear deck and construct a new larger deck, constructed of wood with possible wood alternative for the railings and trim. The covering on the basement access will be replaced with new Bilco doors. The single attic level window is proposed to be replaced with two double-hung windows of a similar proportion to those found on the rest of the structure. The nonhistoric rear pedestrian door is proposed to be replaced with a Craftsman-style door.

On the west side of the structure, a window opening is being repositioned and a new window of comparable dimensions will replace it. On the front of the structure the existing windows enclosing the porch will be replaced with screens that fill the openings. The current plans show a new post installed to the east of the entry, but the applicant has agreed to remove that feature as it never existing and the open plinth was an original design feature of the asymmetrical porch configuration. The front steps are proposed to be replaced, with the masonry knee-walls remaining.

The applicant is also proposing several hardscaping replacements including the driveway and sidewalks. The applicant is also proposing an alternating board or shadow box style privacy fence along the driveway (east side of the property) in keeping with the style of the existing fence located on the west side of the property.

A discussion of the relevant ordinance sections follows:

41.18 STANDARDS FOR GRANTING A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS. A certificate of appropriateness shall be granted only if the proposed project complies with this chapter, including all of the following standards that apply.

- (2) Demolition or Removal. In determining whether to approve a certificate of appropriateness for any demolition or removal of any landmark or structure within a historic district, the Landmarks Commission shall consider all of the following, and may give decisive weight to any or all of the following:
 - (a) The garage is not significant and retaining it would not benefit the public interest.
 - (b) N/A
 - (c) The existing garage is not architecturally or historically significant such that it would benefit the people of the city and the state.
 - (d) the demolition of a structurally failing garage is not contrary to the policy of this ordinance.
 - (e) The garage is not particularly old or of an uncommon design.
 - (f) Retention of the structure would not promote the general welfare of the people of the city or the state.
 - (g) The condition of the structure relates to the method of construction and the quality of craftsmanship for accessory structures rather than a self-created situation created by the current property owner.
 - (h) The proposed new garage is compatible with the historic house remaining on the property and is of a style typical of other accessory structures in the vicinity.

Staff does not believe that we need additional documentation of the existing structure beyond what the applicant has already submitted.

41.24 UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT.

- (4) Standards for the Review of New Structures in the TR-V1, TR-V2, TR-U1, TR-U2, TR-C2, TR-C3, TR-C4, MNX, TSS, and LMX Zoning Districts.
 - (a) Principal Structures.
 2. Materials. The proposed siding for the garage will replicate the style of wood clapboard that still exists within the enclosed front porch of the house.
 - (b) Accessory Structures. The new garage will be located in approximately the same location as the existing, in the rear yard of the property. It meets all other design requirements to be compatible with the existing historic structure and other accessory structures in the district.
- (6) Standards for the Review of Exterior Alterations and Repairs in the TR-VI, TR-V2, TR-U1, TR-U2, NMX, TSS and LMX Zoning Districts.
 - (a) Height. N/A

- (b) Alterations. The proposed alterations are compatible in scale, materials and texture with the existing structure.
- (c) Repairs. N/A
- (d) Re-Siding. The new siding will replace the existing aluminum siding and replicate the reveal on the wood clapboards that remain within the enclosed porch area.
- (e) Roof Shape. N/A
- (f) Roof Materials. N/A
- (g) Parking Lots. N/A

Recommendation

Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness are met and recommends that the Landmarks Commission approve the proposal with the following conditions:

1. Submit updated plans showing the front porch without the additional column
2. Submit final deck railing specifications to staff for approval