



Project Name/Address: 206 N Spooner St

Application Type: PUBLIC HEARING
Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition and construction of garage and construction of addition to residence

Legistar File ID # [36002](#)

Prepared By: Amy L. Scanlon, Preservation Planner, Planning Division

Date Prepared: March 11, 2015

Summary

Project Applicant/Contact: Jeff Gaard

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting three Certificates of Appropriateness in the University Heights Historic District:

- Demolition of the existing garage
- Construction of a new garage
- Construction of a two story addition to main residence (under 100 square feet of additional footprint)

Background Information

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

Relevant Landmarks Ordinance Sections:

Related to the demolition of the existing garage

33.19(5)(c)3. Standards. (for Demolition)

In determining whether to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for any demolition, the Landmarks Commission shall consider and may give decisive weight to any or all of the following:

- Whether the building or structure is of such architectural or historic significance that its demolition would be detrimental to the public interest and contrary to the general welfare of the people of the City and the State;
- Whether the building or structure, although not itself a landmark building, contributes to the distinctive architectural or historic character of the District as a whole and therefore should be preserved for the benefit of the people of the City and the State;
- Whether demolition of the subject property would be contrary to the purpose and intent of this chapter as set forth in Sec. 33.19 and to the objectives of the historic preservation plan for the applicable district as duly adopted by the Common Council;
- Whether the building or structure is of such old and unusual or uncommon design, texture and/or material that it could not be reproduced or be reproduced only with great difficulty and/or expense;
- Whether retention of the building or 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;
- Whether the building or structure is in such a deteriorated condition that it is not structurally or economically feasible to preserve or restore it, provided that any hardship or difficulty claimed by the

owner which is self-created or which is the result of any failure to maintain the property in good repair cannot qualify as a basis for the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness;

- g. Whether any new structure proposed to be constructed or change in use proposed to be made is compatible with the buildings and environment of the district in which the subject property is located.

33.19(1) Purpose and Intent It is hereby declared a matter of public policy that the protection, enhancement, perpetuation and use of improvements of special character or special historical interest or value is a public necessity and is required in the interest of health, prosperity, safety and welfare of the people. The purpose of this section is to:

- (a) Effect and accomplish the protection, enhancement and perpetuation of such improvements and of districts which represent or reflect elements of the City's cultural, social, economic, political and architectural history.
- (b) Safeguard the City's historic and cultural heritage, as embodied and reflected in such landmarks and historic districts.
- (c) Stabilize and improve property values.
- (d) Foster civic pride in the beauty and noble accomplishments of the past.
- (e) Protect and enhance the City's attractions to residents, tourists and visitors, and serve as a support and stimulus to business and industry.
- (f) Strengthen the economy of the City.
- (g) Promote the use of historic districts and landmarks for the education, pleasure and welfare of the people of the City.

Related to the construction of a new garage addition and new addition

Please note: Because the garage is attached to the residence, Chapter 28 interprets the garage to be an addition by definition; therefore, 33.19(12)(d) Criteria for Additions is being used to review the construction of the garage instead of section 33.19 (12)(f)2. Accessory Buildings.

33.19(12)(d) Criteria for the Review of Additions, Exterior Alterations and Repairs in TR-C2 and TR-C3 and TR-C4 Zoning Districts.

- 1. Height. All additions shall be no higher than the existing building; however, if the existing building is already a nonconforming one, no addition shall be made thereto except in accordance with Section 28.192 of the Madison General Ordinances. Roof additions resulting in an increased building volume are prohibited unless they meet the standards in Section 33.19(12)(d)6. and are permitted under Chapter 28 of the Madison General Ordinances, or approved as a variance pursuant to Sections 28.08(2)(e) and 28.12(8)(d) or approved as a conditional use or as part of a planned residential development in accordance with Section 28.184.
- 2. Second Exit Platforms and Fire Escapes.
- 3. Repairs.
- 4. Restoration.
- 5. Re-Siding.
- 6. Additions Visible from the Street and Alterations to Street Facades. Additions visible from the street, including additions to the top of buildings or structures, and alterations to street facades shall be compatible with the existing building in architectural design, scale, color, texture, proportion of solids to voids and proportion of widths to heights of doors and windows. Materials used in such alterations and additions shall duplicate in texture and appearance, and architectural details used therein shall duplicate in design, the materials and details used in the original construction of the existing building or of other buildings in University Heights of similar materials, age and architectural style, unless the Landmarks Commission approves duplication of the texture and appearance of materials and the design of architectural details used in the existing building where the existing building materials and architectural details differ from the original. Additions and exterior alterations that exactly duplicate the original

materials in composition are encouraged. Additions or exterior alterations that destroy significant architectural features are prohibited. Side additions shall not detract from the design composition of the original facade.

7. Additions and Exterior Alterations Not Visible from the Street. Additions and exterior alterations that are not visible from any streets contiguous to the lot lines upon which the building or structure is located will be approved by the Landmarks Commission if their design is compatible with the scale of the existing building and, further, if the materials used are compatible with the existing materials in texture, color and architectural details. Additions and alterations shall harmonize with the architectural design of the building rather than contrast with it. (Renum. by ORD-08-00122, 11-22-08)
8. Roof Shape. The roof shape of the front of a building or structure shall not be altered except to restore it to the original documentable appearance or to add a dormer or dormers in a location and shape compatible with the architectural design of the building and similar in location and shape to original dormers on buildings of the same vintage and style within the district. Alterations of the roof shape of the sides or back of a building or structure shall be visually compatible with the architectural design of the existing building.
9. Roof Material.
 - a. If the existing roof of a building or structure is tile, slate or other material that is original to the building or structure and/or contributes to its historic character all repairs thereto shall be made using the same materials. In addition, in all cases any such roof must be repaired rather than replaced, unless the documented cost of repair exceeds the documented cost of re-roofing with a substitute material that approximates the appearance of the original roofing material as closely as possible, in which case re-roofing with a material that approximates the appearance of the original roofing material as closely as possible will be approved by the Landmarks Commission.
 - b. If the existing roofing material is asphalt shingles, sawn wood shingles or a nonhistoric material such as fiberglass, all repairs shall match in appearance the existing roof material; however, if any such roof is covered or replaced, re-roofing must be done using rectangular sawn wood shingles or rectangular shingles that are similar in width, thickness and apparent length to sawn wood shingles, for example, 3-in-1 tab asphalt shingles. Modern style shingles, such as thick wood shakes, Dutch lap, French method and interlock shingles, that are incompatible with the historic character of the district are prohibited.
 - c. Rolled roofing, tar and gravel and other similar roofing materials are prohibited except that such materials may be used on flat or slightly sloped roofs which are not visible from the ground.

Analysis and Conclusion

Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the existing garage

A discussion of the demolition standards 33.19(5)(c)3. follows:

- a. The existing garage is a frame structure which is compatible with the existing building, but is not of any architectural or historic significance, and its demolition would not be detrimental to the public interest and not contrary to the general welfare of the people of the City and the State;
- b. The existing garage does not contribute to the distinctive architectural or historic character of the District as a whole; however, the rhythm of residence and garage is fairly consistent in this area and a garage structure should be retained in this location as part of the character.
- c. The existing garage is not a cultural resource. The demolition of the existing garage would allow for the construction of a new garage.
- d. While the existing garage is old, its uniqueness is not related to its character as a cultural resource which is what the language of this standard is referencing.

- e. The retention of the existing garage would not 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;
- f. The applicant is not claiming a hardship based on the condition of the garage.
- g. The new garage proposed to be constructed in this location is compatible with the existing building and environment of the district.

Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of the proposed garage

A brief discussion of the related sections of 33.19(12)(d) follows:

- 1. The proposed garage addition is not taller than the existing building.
- 2. Not applicable.
- 3. Not applicable.
- 4. Not applicable.
- 5. Not applicable.
- 6. The proposed garage addition is compatible with the existing building in architectural design, scale, color, texture, and proportion of widths to heights of doors and windows. The exception is with the proportion of solids to voids where a blank wall faces the side and the rear. To the side there is a neighboring garage one foot away from the property line. The rear elevation is visible from other properties. More information is needed to review the swinging garage doors. The covered passage connecting the existing porch to the proposed garage seems compatible with the design of the existing residence; however, the design would be simplified by the removal of the columns.
- 7. Not applicable.
- 8. The proposed addition roof is hipped to match the hip roof of the existing building.
- 9. The shingles used on the addition roof shall be similar to those on the existing roof of the main building.

Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of the bay addition to the residence

A brief discussion of the related sections of 33.19(12)(d) follows:

- 1. The proposed bay addition is not taller than the existing building.
- 2. Not applicable.
- 3. Not applicable.
- 4. Not applicable.
- 5. Not applicable.
- 6. Not applicable.
- 7. The design of the bay addition is compatible with the scale, materials and architectural details of the existing building. The submission materials explain that the siding, roof shingles and rafter tails will match those existing elements of the house. The windows of the second story bay addition have a different glass configuration and proportion than the windows on the first floor of the bay and the other adjacent existing windows. In constructing the bay addition, the existing window of the rear wall will be removed to make the internal connection. The existing window appears to have been a modification and is a non-original element.
- 8. The proposed bay addition roof is a modified hip to match the hip roof of the existing building.
- 9. The shingles used on the addition roof shall be similar to those on the existing roof of the main building.

This proposal received a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA).

Recommendation

Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the existing garage are met and recommends approval by the Landmarks Commission.

Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of the new garage addition are met and recommends approval by the Landmarks Commission with the following conditions of approval:

1. The Applicant shall consider the installation of a window on the rear elevation of the garage.
2. The Applicant shall provide more manufacturer cut sheet information about the swinging garage doors related to material, panel profile, window configuration, and muntins. The muntins should project past the plane of the glass and not have a "tape-like" appearance.
3. The Applicant shall explain the changes that must occur to the design if the proposed columns are removed. For example, the beam between the porch column and the garage wall may increase in depth and/or the porch column may not be capable of carrying the additional load.

Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of the new bay addition are met and recommends approval by the Landmarks Commission with the following condition of approval:

1. The second story window proportions shall be similar to the existing adjacent window proportions which may mean that the area of the second floor bay addition may increase or decrease to accommodate the appropriately sized window widths.