# LANDMARKS COMMISSION APPLICATION

Complete all sections of this application, making sure to note the requirements on the accompanying checklist (reverse).

If you need an interpreter, translator, materials in alternate formats or other accommodations to access these forms, please call (608) 266-4635

1. LOCATION

2. PROJECT

Project Address:

**Project Title/Description:** 

City of Madison **Planning Division** 215 Martin Luther King Jr Blvd, Ste 017 PO Box 2985 Madison, WI 53701-2985 (608) 266-4635



Aldermanic District:

	heck all that apply)			Legistar #:	
District or Designated	eration/Addition in a Local Hist Landmark (specify)**:	oric		-	
□ Mansion Hill	Third Lake Ridge	First Settlement		DATE ST	AMP
University Heights	Marquette Bungalows	Landmark		DEWE	IWGN
□ Land Division/Combina or to Designated Landr □ Mansion Hill	ation in a Local Historic District mark Site (specify)**:	First Settlement	ANNC		
University Heights	Marquette Bungalows	🗆 Landmark	DPCED USE ONLY	7:28 a	
□ Demolition			DPCED		
□ Alteration/Addition to	a building adjacent to a Design	nated Landmark			
Variance from the Hist	oric Preservation Ordinance (C	hapter 41)			
<ul> <li>Landmark Nomination/Rescission or Historic District Nomination/Amendment (Please contact the Historic Preservation Planner for specific Submission Requirements.)</li> <li>Other (specify):</li> </ul>				Preliminary Zonir Zoning Staff Initial:	-
3. <u>APPLICANT</u>				Date: /	/
Applicant's Name:		Company:			
Address:					
	Street		City	State	Zip
Telephone:		Email:			
Property Owner (if not appl	icant):				
Address:					
	street		City	State	Zip

residential development of over 10 dwelling units, or if you are seeking assistance from the City with a value of \$10,000 (including grants, loans, TIF or similar assistance), then you likely are subject to Madison's lobbying ordinance (Sec. 2.40, MGO). You are required to register and report your lobbying. Please consult the City Clerk's Office for more information. Failure to comply with the lobbying ordinance may result in fines.

## 4. <u>APPLICATION SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS</u> (see checklist on reverse)

All applications must be filed by 12:00 pm on the submission date with the Preservation Planner. Applications submitted after the submission date or incomplete applications will be postponed to the next scheduled filing time. Submission deadlines can be viewed here: https://www.cityofmadison.com/dpced/planning/documents/LC Meeting Schedule Dates.pdf

### APPLICATION SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS CHECKLIST:

In order to be considered complete, every application submission shall include at least the following information unless otherwise waived by the Preservation Planner. **All application materials should be submitted electronically to** <u>landmarkscommission@cityofmadison.com</u>. Please note that an individual email cannot exceed 20 MB.

- □ Landmarks Commission Application w/signature of the property owner.
- Narrative Description/Letter of Intent addressed to the Landmarks Commission, describing the location of the property and the scope of the proposed project.
  - □ Photographs of existing conditions;
  - □ Photographs of existing context;
- □ Architectural drawings reduced to 11" x 17" or smaller pages which may include:
  - □ Dimensioned site plans showing siting of structures, grading, landscaping, pedestrian and vehicular access, lighting, signage, and other features;
  - □ Elevations of all sides showing exterior features and finishes, subsurface construction, floor and roof;
  - □ Floor Plan views of levels and roof;
  - □ For proposals of more than two (2) commercial or residential or combination thereof units, a minimum of two (2) accurate street-view normal perspectives shown from a viewpoint of no more than five (5) feet above existing grade.
- \*\*Landmarks Commission staff will preliminarily review projects related to the construction of additions and/or new construction with Zoning staff in order to determine the completeness of the submission materials. Applicants are encouraged to contact Zoning staff to discuss projects early in the process;
- □ Any other information requested by the Preservation Planner to convey the aspects of the project which may include:
  - □ Perspective drawing
  - □ Photographs of examples on another historic resource
  - □ Manufacturer's product information showing dimensions and materials;
  - Other

#### CONTACT THE PRESERVATION PLANNER:

Please contact the Preservation Planner with any questions.

City of Madison Planning Division 215 Martin Luther King Jr Blvd, Suite 017 PO Box 2985 (mailing address) Madison, WI 53701-2985 <u>landmarkscommission@cityofmadison.com</u> (608) 266-6552 Dear Landmarks Commission,

We are requesting an amendment to our previous application (#67670). We would like to use a composite material for the floorboards on the lower porch, the upper deck, and the railings on our property at 1245 Spaight Street in the Third Lake Ridge District.

We have asked for examples of options that have been approved in the historic district, and the Preservation Planner has not provided us with reasonable options. The only option provided was Aeratis which must be shipped from Alabama at considerable cost. Moreover, it is not clear to us that any houses in the district are actually using this product.

After speaking with several contractors, the preferred composite material seems to be TimberTech, which is easily sourced in Madison at a reasonable cost. Within the TimberTech line, the product we would prefer is Azek, which is a non-PVC composite product, the top of the TimberTech line, and a Gold Member of the Green Building Council.

We feel it is critical that composite materials are available, and encouraged, for use in the historic district because climate change is only going to make Wisconsin wetter. Wood will not fare well in wetter conditions. We already see the ramifications of the changing climate with our own porch and neighbors' porches – peeling paint, rotting wood, etc. A recent thesis from the University of Exeter (see attached abstract) finds that composites are the "right choice to protect the planet and to reduce environmental destruction."

We like the TimberTech option because this product diverts hundreds of millions of pounds of waste and scrap from landfills each year. TimberTech re-uses approximately 99% of the internal scrap generated from their process and recycles up to 97% of the water used in their largest facilities. There are not many options for recycled plastic, and we want to support one of the options as it is the best thing for the environment and our neighborhood.

While we understand that a faux wood grain is undesirable, we ask that the committee not prioritize aesthetics over doing what is right for the planet. We think it is imperative that composite materials are approved and encouraged for use throughout the district to fall in line with the City of Madison's sustainability plan. Sustainability is not just for one department, but for all of us to implement in every decision we make.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter,

mily Reynoldy

Emily Reynolds

Abre rannel

Paul Creswell

1245 Spaight Street Madison, WI 53703

Use this UR	L to cite or li	ink to this recor	d in EThOS:	ht
-------------	-----------------	-------------------	-------------	----

https://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?uin=uk.bl.ethos.835140

		EXETER			
Title:	The impact of Environmental Product Declarations (EPDs) on green bio-composite strategic marketing				
Author:	Abu Kassim, M.		ISNI: 0000 0005 0671 1396		
Awarding Body:	University of Exeter				
Current Institution:	University of Exeter				
Date of Award:	2021				
Availability of Full Text:	Access from EThOS:	<b>i</b> Full text unavailable from EThOS. Thesis embargoed until 31 Aug 2022			
	Access from Institution:	ttp://hdl.handle.net/10871/126771			

#### Abstract:

More attention is being paid to sustainable, eco-friendly materials and contemporary alternatives to oil-based products. It is often assumed that materials like wood are preferable to oil-based products, but if the source is not sustainable then this potential advantage is illusory. Deck board materials were used and collected from a number of industrial suppliers in the sector as an example of a potentially sustainable material. The deck boards were deliberately sourced from suppliers of wood, wood-plastic composite (WPC) and fully plastic products to capture a range of materials. In life cycle assessment (LCA) study, the impact indicator values were totaled at the three life cycle stages which cover the production process, utilization process and disposal for all decking samples. Suppliers were surveyed to reveal industry perceptions of the important characteristics for deck boards. The results of this survey are then linked to the mechanical performance of deck boards made using these materials, to understand if properties could be altered in order to meet environmental credentials, thereby influencing industrial manufacturing and marketing processes. Tensile, three-point bending, and fatigue mechanical tests were conducted to determine the ultimate tensile strength, bending strength, modulus of elasticity and fatigue strength of the boards. The mechanical properties of wood deck boards were found to be superior to that of the plastic and WPC deck boards. The comparison of damage assessment for three different materials showed that composites decking life cycle remained in between wood and plastic decking on all impact of human health, ecosystem, and resources depletion. The most crucial attributes of deck board production, as indicated by the respondents to the survey, were the product's performance, design and finish, the durability and also legal and environmental certification. It was found that the respondent industries paid less concern to high technology production methods followed by complementary accessories of the deck board. Environmental Product Declarations (EPDs) are ecolabels that reveal the environmental performance of products and services based on an environmental LCA data. EPDs are a recent development and are being promoted to improve the quality, credibility, and transparency of environmental impact information available to consumers and businesses. Finally, the use of composites is suggested as the right choice to protect the planet and to reduce environmental destruction. However, it should be from green, recycled and environmentally friendly sources. Industries could also customize the composite to meet the required performance by controlling the combination and the ratio of the raw materials used during production. So that, environmental and mechanical performance can be integrated into industrial preferences for materials use, through traditional utilitarian business and marketing planning for sustainable materials.

Supervisor:	Eichhorn, S.	Sponsor:	Not available
Qualification Name:	Thesis (Ph.D.)	Qualification Level:	Doctoral
EThOS ID:	uk.bl.ethos.835140	DOI:	Not available
Keywords:	Bio-composite ; EPD ; LCA		
Share:	<b>f</b> Share <b>Y</b> Tweet	t 🕥 Share 🗹 Em	ail < Share

Terms and Conditions | Notice and Takedown Policy | Privacy Policy | Sitemap | Accessibility | Contact us

Copyright © The British Library Board