

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 4/30/18

TITLE: 138 S Franklin - Exterior Alteration in the
First Settlement Hist. Dist.; 6th Ald.
Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 5/3/18

ID NUMBER: 51428

Members present were: Anna V. Andrzejewski, David WJ McLean, Richard Arnesen, Marsha A. Rummel, and Katie Kaliszewski.

SUMMARY:

Bert Stitt, registering in opposition and wishing to speak.

Daniel Kornaus, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Staff provided a brief summary of previous approvals for the project and noted that Building Inspection has issued a stop work order after finding that the completed work did not match the plans previously approved by the Landmarks Commission.

The Applicant provided a brief summary of the various changes made to the previously approved plans, explaining that he did not think they were large enough changes to require Commission approval and apologizing for the mistake.

The Applicant noted that the roof form changed to what he thought was a more historic condition, the windows on the South elevation were repositioned to accommodate a staircase, and a window on the North elevation was removed because it conflicted with the 2nd floor kitchen layout. The chimney was removed because it was crumbling and a potential safety issue. The original front door location was infilled and moved because of interior room layouts. The Applicant was unaware of the specificity of the ordinance describing the appearance of windows, and didn't think that windows in the new addition would be held to the same standards as those in the older part of the residence.

Stitt stated that he appreciates the Applicant's investment in the community, but is concerned that the house no longer has any vestige of historic appearance. He noted that the previous owner of the house, Georgia Ramos, was an immigrant from Greece and an important historical figure in the First Settlement Historic District.

Stitt lamented the loss of the grape arbor in the rear yard as well as the two front stoops that he would like to see reconstructed. He also noted that installing a driveway is not appropriate in a Historic District. He pointed out the importance of this vernacular house to the fabric of the historic district and hopes that the developers will honor the historic essence of the residence.

Stitt then read a portion of the Applicant's original statement, which he doesn't feel the Applicant has honored. He stated that he is happy to see money invested in the First Settlement district, but would like to see the project carried out with more care and historic consideration.

Andrzejewski began discussion on the windows.

Staff noted that the ordinance is very clear on window treatment, so it was a shock to see the muntins located between the interior and exterior glass. McLean concurred with staff and referenced the ordinance, which states the design should duplicate the original appearance of the windows. Arnesen agreed and noted that it is a black and white issue.

Kaliszewski asked what the window surrounds will look like. The Applicant said they will be cream-colored vinyl trim, similar to those on the front of the house. Komaus said he thought they were planning on fiber cement trim. Staff pointed out the conflicting information on window trim material in the submitted plans.

Staff noted that one of the original conditions of approval was that trim not be picture-framed around the window so that it looks similar to historic trim. Komaus confirmed the trim shown in the elevation drawings reflects the intended design.

The Applicant confirmed that the Commission would prefer that he make the new windows similar in design to the front windows. Staff confirmed this, noting that rear and side window trim should be similar to the front window design, aside from the decorative head trim that is not required on new rear and side windows.

Kaliszewski pointed out that the full glass door shown in the submission photos does not match what is in the plans. Staff noted that the conditions of previous approval were that the Applicant work with staff on exterior doors and the full glass door was approved for the upper level, but the lower level requires a panel door at the front elevation.

Staff noted that the 2nd floor window on the North elevation is not of a similar height and width to other windows, as the ordinance states. Komaus pointed out that the window is smaller because it is above the kitchen sink. Staff also pointed out that a window and original door on the South elevation were removed. The Applicant pointed out that the door would now be in a closet because of the changed floor plan.

Arnesen asked staff if it would be acceptable to install a series of similar windows or one window to the left of the current window on the 2nd floor North elevation. Staff agreed that these options are more acceptable than the current single window.

McLean noted that the slider window on the 2nd floor North elevation is odd. Staff suggested that a casement window would be more appropriate. McLean asked about an awning window, and staff confirmed that would be acceptable as well.

The Applicant pointed out how close the neighboring houses are and that he was hesitant to add more windows that look out on the side of another house. McLean responded that houses are close together in historic districts, and that windows in historic homes are sometimes less about the view than the natural light and ventilation the window provides.

Andrzejewski referenced ordinance 41.18(d) and explained that walls without windows are not historically appropriate. Arnesen noted that it could be an easy change to add another window to the 1st floor North elevation. McLean said that a window at that location would provide some relief in the elevation.

Staff pointed out a discrepancy between the number of windows in the plans versus the elevations. The Applicant stated that it would have been the third window in the bedroom, so he decided not to move forward with it. The Commission discussed having three windows in a bedroom, and didn't find it to be an issue.

The Applicant asked what size the new window on the North elevation in the historic portion should be. McLean suggested single, double-hung. Andrzejewski referenced ordinance 41.26(5)(d), which states that new windows in locations where no window previously existed must be a similar size to other windows on the home and be trimmed and finished to match the other windows.

Arnesen suggested another window be added to the 2nd floor North elevation next to the small kitchen window. The Applicant asked about the size of the window. Arnesen suggested double to match the one below and Kaliszewski agreed. McLean said that as long as the two windows are centered, it could be single to match the front façade (single over double) or double.

Kaliszewski pointed out that the 1st and 2nd floor windows on the South elevation of the historic building are not aligned in the photos submitted by the Applicant. Arnesen advised that they should be aligned and one of the windows needs to be moved. Staff noted that the head height seems very high on the 1st floor window.

McLean found an inconsistency in window dimensions listed on the plans, with some recorded as 72" in height and others as 62". The Applicant said this was likely an error and 72" was probably correct. Kornaus surmised that the window size may have been drawn shorter in order to adjust for floor thickness, stating that the flooring in the new addition is thicker than the original flooring. Kaliszewski stated that windows should remain the same dimensions no matter the thickness of flooring.

The Applicant asked how he should adjust the 1st floor window on the South elevation. McLean stated that door height dictates window head height. The window needs to be aligned with the door above and head height lowered to match the others on the 1st floor.

Andrzejewski asked the Applicant what material will be used for the roof shingles. The Applicant said they are using asphalt shingles.

Andrzejewski prompted the group to consider the change in roof form and resulting height of building. She referenced the staff report, which indicates the current building is 4' taller than the previously approved plans specified. Staff noted that the building does look better now, but it is not what was approved. Andrzejewski agreed that the appearance is improved, but potentially out of scale. Arnesen also commented that he likes the current roof form better.

Kaliszewski asked if the ordinance contained any language that would direct the Commission to deny approval of the change in roof form and building height. Arnesen questioned whether Building Inspection would have an opinion on it. Andrzejewski read a portion of 41.26(5)(j), noting that alterations should be compatible with roof shape and historic features and should not extend above the ridge line of the structure. Staff stated that Building Inspection does not have an opinion on the roof shape and that the Commission discussed the addition extending above the original ridge during its first discussion.

Andrzejewski inquired about the chimney removal. McLean commented that tuckpointing would have been a less destructive option. Kornaus pointed out that the entire chimney was pulling away from the house, and the Applicant stated that it also had two large cracks in it.

Staff noted that she had seen a photo of the bowed chimney with transite siding going behind the chimney, meaning it was likely built post-1930s. The Applicant indicated that he has no plans to rebuild the chimney, as there is currently no use for it.

Rummel questioned the doors on the front elevation. Staff noted that she was previously directed by the Commission to work with the applicant regarding the doors and they have met expectations.

Andrzejewski shifted discussion to siding exposure. The Applicant intends to use LP SmartSide for siding. Staff noted that drawings show a 5" exposure, which seems consistent with original siding exposure.

Arnesen asked if the window sashes in the previously installed windows can be replaced. McLean said he had the same question and asked what kind of windows were installed. The Applicant did not know the type or brand of windows. Staff noted that the same manufacturer may not offer a sash with muntin on the exterior.

The Applicant asked if the windows on the original home require muntins on the interior and exterior. Staff explained that the front windows, paired window at the first floor and single window at the second floor, will be restored keeping the original wood sash, and none of the other windows are acceptable and should be removed. The Applicant said he is fine with changing the windows.

Staff noted that the property is still under a stop work order. It is not within the Commission's scope to lift a stop work order, but the Commission was agreeable to having staff discuss lifting the stop work order with Building Inspection related to any interior work only.

Arnesen noted that the Applicant should revise his drawings to reflect the changes discussed by the Commission. He summarized the primary concerns, including specifying the type of roof shingle, relocating windows, installing windows in previously approved locations, specifying the new window materials including trim and muntins, which should be interior and exterior applied. The 2nd floor window on the North elevation should be changed from a slider to a casement.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Arnesen and seconded by Rummel to refer the item to a future meeting. The motion passed by voice vote.