

## AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

**REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION**                      **PRESENTED: May 11, 2015**

**TITLE:**            117 North Prospect – University Heights Historic District – Replace siding and roofing; and build a rear addition which will include a porch.  
5<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. Contact: Kyle Dumbleton; Midwest Modern, LLC

**REFERRED:**  
**REREFERRED:**  
**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Amy Scanlon, Secretary                      **ADOPTED:**                      **POF:**

**DATED:** May 11, 2015                      **ID NUMBER:** 38096

---

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Erica Fox Gehrig, Vice Chair; Christina Slattery, Jason Fowler, David McLean, and Marsha Rummel.

### **SUMMARY:**

Kyle Dumbleton, AIA, registering in support, wishing to speak and available to answer questions.

Anne Wadsack, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Peter Wadsack, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Dumbleton briefly described the proposed project. He explained that the existing siding would be removed and replaced with new siding and insulation as submitted. And that the existing trim would be removed and reused where suitable to retain existing detail.

Levitan asked staff to address how the staff report was structured. Scanlon explained that the project was broken into manageable pieces which recommend approving the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the addition and referring the COA for the exterior alterations.

Levitan asked the Applicant to address the comments in the staff report. Dumbleton explained that they were not planning to do work on the existing windows or the front porch. he window work only involves the replacement of the storm windows.

Gehrig asked for clarification about the window repair work. Staff explained that in looking at the window condition in the submission materials, the existing wood sash require some repair. Dumbleton asked for clarification on the type of documentation required for this condition of approval. Staff explained that photographs and a letter of intent describing the repair work would be necessary for the record. Gehrig asked if the property owners were applying for tax credits from the Wisconsin Historical Society. There was general discussion about the tax credit program.

Levitan asked Dumbleton to further explain the conditions of approval for the rear addition. Dumbleton explained that the siding will not have faux wood grain, the windows will have traditional sill and trim and that the stair will meet building code requirements.

Slattery explained that wood siding is preferred on the rear addition, but it is a non-visible rear addition and the proposed material does meet the ordinance standards.

Levitan asked staff to address the conditions for the exterior alterations. Scanlon explained that the drawings did not show the increase in width and height and that with the increase, there is concern that existing details will not translate.

McLean explained that he shares the concerns of the staff report and is concerned about the increased cavity space at the window and the increased roof height at the existing dormer sills. Dumbleton directed McLean to the window detail in the submission materials.

Levitan asked the Applicant to address the conditions for the exterior alterations. Dumbleton explained that he can provide additional drawings, that the detail drawings and photographs could be provided, and the window documentation can be provided. Dumbleton explained that 5d language allows for variation. Can that variation be applied to the details also if the intent is to duplicate the details in new material?

There was general discussion that the documentation of details and revised drawings are needed for complete review.

**ACTION:**

**A motion was made by Gehrig, seconded by Slattery, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed rear addition with the conditions of approval in the staff report. Motion passed by voice vote.**

**A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Gehrig, to refer the review of the Certificate of Appropriateness to a future meeting. Motion passed by voice vote.**