

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 6/18/18

TITLE: 126 S Hancock St - Exterior Alteration to
a Designated Madison Landmark in
the First Settlement Hist. Dist.; 6th
Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 6/26/18

ID NUMBER: 51825

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

SUMMARY:

Chris Hacker, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Staff explained that this is a window replacement request, and the majority of windows in the house have been replaced previously. The applicant is also proposing to remove a side door on the rear kitchen addition and replace it with a window with infill brick below. Staff discussed the existing shutters that the applicant would like to remove, noting that shutters would have originally been on this building, but these shutters are not original, and the commission will need to determine whether they are a feature that needs to be preserved.

Andrzejewski asked if the existing side door has been replaced previously. Staff stated that it might have been replaced because it looks like an early door, but not old enough to be original to the house. Levitan asked if it is common to have shutters on the front of the house and not the sides. Staff replied yes, that it is not necessarily common, but it is heard of. Levitan asked if the shutters differ by floor, and Hacker stated that they were formerly the same color, but the second floor shutters are sun-beaten.

Hacker pointed out that they would like to remove the side door and install a window that would look similar to the existing window next to it, so the new window would be the same width as the door, but match the sill height of the existing window. Staff asked if they plan to keep the arch above the current door, and Hacker replied that there is no reason to remove the arch. Arnesen asked if they plan to move the door sill up to make the window sill or install a new sill. Hacker stated that they will install a new sill to have the sills remain intact.

Hacker referred to the submission materials and noted that the second floor rear door will be replaced with a smooth fiberglass door with simulated divided lights and muntins that sit on top of the glass. The new door will match the existing door's divided light schedule and size, with a single panel below.

Hacker noted that the homeowners' inspiration came from a nearby house on Proudfit Street, which inspired the wineberry-colored Marvin windows and the idea to not replace the shutters. Hacker stated that the paint color will differ slightly from the grey Proudfit house; it will be more of a copper-grey color and in lieu of the white brickmold, it will be a shade of red to match the windows. He noted that if they find that any details such as the dental brackets and blocks are rotted, they plan to replace them in kind.

Staff pointed out that the brickmold on the Proudfit house is not installed correctly, and wanted to confirm that the applicant was not using it as direct inspiration. She noted that there should not be a piece at the bottom; there should be a sill on top of the stone sill that is sloped so the jamb trim comes down and sits on top of it. Hacker pointed out that Marvin windows don't come with wooden sills, and staff stated that they will need to install one. As staff looked through images of the current windows, she noted that this may be an early residence where the masonry opening and masonry sill are behind the brickmold, which is odd; she told Hacker that if he finds that to be the typical condition, they can talk about it, but she doesn't think that going all the way around the window is the right thing to do with the brickmold.

Hacker referenced the drawing of the brickmold in the submission, which he found to be the most historically accurate on the house. He described the 45 degree angle with an elongated eased edge, noting it would never come down and then miter and turn; there would always be a square stock such as the wineberry metal or cedar, and the base would generally be proud of the brickmold. He stated they will custom mill this piece for each window. He mentioned that he doesn't know how it will attach in some cases if the window size is meant to sit on the stone, and staff stated that if they run into this issue, they can discuss it.

Rummel asked what year the building was built, and wanted confirmation that the Civil War-era Proudfit house being used for inspiration is from the same era as the subject building. Staff stated that the subject building was built in 1862.

Staff turned discussion to the shutters. Arnesen stated that he does not think they should require shutters. Kaliszewski noted that in 1862, the house would have had shutters, and stated that shutters make the building look balanced, as compared to the Proudfit house that is not balanced or historically accurate. Staff agreed to flesh out details of the window details with the applicant.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Arnesen, seconded by Rummel, to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the stipulations that the applicant work out window details with staff and the shutters may be removed and replacement is not required. The motion passed by voice vote.