

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 3 April, 2017

TITLE: 103 Langdon St. – Exterior Alteration,
Mansion Hill, 2nd Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

CONTACT: Nate Yahn, JH Findorff

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 18 April, 2017

ID NUMBER: 46635

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

SUMMARY:

Linda Maier, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Nate Yahn, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Yahn explained that Hellenbrand did a conditional assessment a few years ago. Since then, a few condition issues have come up. It seems the best option is to replace the windows rather than repair them.

Maier explained that the leaded glass windows in the Landmark annex building were restored for \$105,000. The fire department volunteers will no longer clean the windows because they believe the windows are too dangerous, as they contain lead paint and asbestos. Delta Gamma has looked for ways to replace the windows with those of a similar appearance. They found windows via Marvin Historic that have been approved by the National Parks Service. These were used recently when the bathroom windows were approved for replacement. Those windows will last 100 years. Maier passed out Marvin's sales materials.

The arched windows (facing the rear of the building; not visible from the street) in the dining room that have leaded glass cannot be restored. The Commission will need more information about the curved windows in the dining room.

Maier stated that the House Corporation/s are responsible for keeping the residents of the building safe and the condition and hazardous materials are a concern

Arnesen asked whether the Applicant was only planning on replacing the third floor windows because third floor replacement is the only thing they can currently afford. Maier responded in the affirmative,

and noted that the third floor windows need the most work. Arnesen asked whether all the windows on the third floor contained lead. Maier indicated that they do; all have the same paint, and some are painted shut.

Arnesen asked if there is an estimate for repair. Maier responded that there is not. The contractor was not interested in doing repair work. She went on to say that there was a break-in last summer. The rear French door was broken. They would like to install an alarm system as well.

Andrzejewski asked how much the condition of the windows has changed since the condition assessment report. Maier responded that maintenance staff has done the best they can to keep the glass in the frames from the inside. Most of the outsides have been painted. Maier went on to say that most of the need was with the Carroll Street house (Landmark annex). The main house report leaves questions about its condition because some of the windows do not open, and the report does not address that issue.

Gehrig thanked the Applicants for being stewards of these great houses. She went on to say that, in looking at the report spreadsheet, she noticed no notation of replacement. Maier explained that lead paint and asbestos issues are a concern and that the windows need to be egress compliant. She is concerned that they may not operate correctly once repaired. The Hellenbrand team that prepared the condition assessment is no longer employed there, so Delta Gamma had to use a different contractor.

Gehrig asked the Applicants to discuss the use of tax credits. Maier indicated that they spoke with The State Preservation Architect and got information on the tax credit program. Delta Gamma has to provide a deed to partner for Federal credit and the corporation is not interested in relinquishing ownership of the property for the tax credit.

Arnesen commented that sometimes windows deteriorate past the point of allowing acceptance of paint. The National Parks Service allows replacement of windows beyond the capability of repair.

There was general discussion about tax credit, lead/asbestos issues, and replacement costs.

Maier said the removal and repair of windows would not be completed over a summer, and questioned whether the residents would be safe.

Gehrig indicated that she would prefer that the 91 year-old windows remain with the 91 year-old house. Andrzejewski said that loss of historic fabric is an issue because it continues; sometimes historic fabric is lost with approval and sometimes without. The Landmarks Commission needs to balance many issues. Andrzejewski asked what staff would like to see to better explain the current window conditions (such as an updated survey).

Staff explained an updated condition assessment and repair costs from a reputable contractor would be most helpful and additional photos would aid in understanding the condition.

Maier said that another report would cost \$4,000, and does not feel each window was reviewed individually. Delta Gamma cannot ask Hellenbrand for clarification because the team is no longer employed there.

There was general discussion about different perspectives related to providing a reputable assessment.

Maier indicated that Delta Gamma would like replacement windows that would last for another 100 years.

McLean indicated that he was excited to see an assessment report showing repair and stabilization. He understands the lead paint issues. Lead paint can be abated. It's best to remove asbestos glazing putty, which would be part of the maintenance and repair method. It is possible to strip down the windows to the bare wood and repair the wood that is deteriorated.

Maier questioned whether the retention of existing windows would contribute to heat loss and hinder the house's ability to keep warm.

There was discussion regarding storm windows, energy efficiency, and condensation issues.

Arnesen referenced the consideration of the original configuration instead of the storm appearance. McLean indicated that the house likely had wooden storm windows originally. The new windows would need new storm/screen windows also.

Levitan questioned if one walks down Langdon, would they notice the fact that the new windows are different? Andrzejewski referenced the color of the glass in a replacement window as not being historic fabric. McLean referenced the color as well as the reflection and concave appearance of the glass. He also explained that the muntin bars are wider than what currently exists and have a shallower surface. Additionally, old growth wood will have a longer life than new growth wood. The new windows may not last another 100 years.

Per Maier, when windows are stripped, the deteriorated areas are epoxy repaired, and so much replacement would make them less able to last 100 years.

Arnesen would like to hear other expert opinions due to conflicting information. Yahn responded that an independent expert is not possible to find. Gehrig explained that State Historic Preservation architects can provide names for them.

McLean asked for a cost estimate to show repair costs. Maier said that the previous estimate for both houses was \$250,000 with \$110,000 of that for the landmark building. They need someone to do it well.

Gehrig indicated that the Commission needs more information, including the cost of replacement/repair, the feasibility of repair, and an updated condition assessment report for those windows requested for replacement. Gehrig also asked about replacement of the six windows by administrative approval. Staff explained that six bathroom windows were requested to be replaced last year. In the email communication related to this approval, the architect at Epstein When reiterated that all other windows in the upper stories would be retained.

Maier explained the repair work must occur May to August.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Arnesen and seconded by Rummel to refer the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness until more information is provided. The motion passed by a voice vote.