City of Madison, Wisconsin

PRESENTED: 11/15/21
REFERRED:
REREFERRED:
REPORTED BACK:
ADOPTED: POF:
ID NUMBER: 67970

Members present were: Anna Andrzejewski, Richard Arnesen, Katie Kaliszewski, David McLean, and Maurice Taylor. Excused was Arvina Martin.

SUMMARY:

Daniel Scott, registering in support and available to answer questions Bryan Skwirut, did not register and wishing to speak

Bailey discussed the proposed project to construct a 12-foot-wide dormer on the east side of the house and complete reroofing. She discussed surrounding historic resources, including 1114 Williamson that has a cross-gabled roof rather than a dormer, which is how the roof appeared historically. She said that the Landmarks Commission has typically approved smaller dormers with one window that are stepped back from the front façade. She mentioned other nearby examples of small dormers and discussed the standards, specifically 41.23(9)(d), "alterations of the roof of any existing structure shall retain its existing historical appearance." She said that adding the proposed dormer to this structure would change the gable-front roof to a cross-gabled roof, which would change the overall roof form from its historical appearance. She said that she thinks there could be a viable project here and recommended that the commission refer the item to allow the applicant to redesign for a single four-foot-wide dormer or four-foot-wide dormers on each side of the roof. She mentioned the possibility of constructing an addition on the back of the house as well, but the proposed 12-foot-wide dormer does not meet the standards.

Taylor asked if the proposed dormer wouldn't work structurally or wouldn't meet the standards. Bailey said that it does not meet the standards because the roof on the structure is front-gabled and always has been, and the standards say that historic roof forms shall be retained. Andrzejewski said that the proposed project looks like a cross gable, and Bailey agreed.

Andrzejewski asked if the applicant was amenable to a referral to address the items in the staff report. Scott said that the homeowner asked that they try to proceed with the 12-foot-wide dormer proposal in order to have extra space, but they could discuss the concerns raised by staff and the commission. Andrzejewski referenced the standards regarding the original roofline and said the commission isn't saying no to a project here, just to this iteration because it doesn't fit with the historic roofline of the building.

Skwirut asked questions about preserving the roof form of the house. Bailey suggested that an addition off the back of the house would be an option, as well as smaller dormers that accommodate a single window. Skwirut asked if they could add a second story. Bailey said that would change the roof form, so popping the top on the existing structure would not be an option. Skwirut asked if the rear addition could be higher than the existing roof. Bailey said there are possibilities for the addition that they could meet and discuss.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Kaliszewski, to refer the item to a future Landmarks Commission meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.