

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 3/11/19

TITLE: 1229 Jenifer St - Exterior Alteration in the
Third Lake Ridge Hist. Dist.; 6th
Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 3/14/19

ID NUMBER: 54857

Members present were: Stuart Levitan, Richard Arnesen, Katie Kaliszewski, David McLean, and Marsha Rummel. Excused was Anna Andrzejewski.

SUMMARY:

Kurt Hartjes, registering in support and wishing to speak

Bailey explained that the applicants are proposing replacement of 20 windows, 10 on each of two floors. She referenced a 2017 memo regarding windows from the City Attorney's Office, which states that replacement rather than repair would frustrate the public interest. She said that staff has previously informed the applicant that any distinctive windows should remain in place, and they need to make a case that the other windows are beyond repair. She mentioned that she also needs more information about the profile and dimensions of the window frame in terms of what is currently there and what is being proposed as a replacement.

Levitan asked Hartjes to respond to the staff report recommendations. Hartjes said that the existing windows are in rough shape due to rotting. He explained that they plan to repair the rot in the sills, and they are open to other options for the windows such as installing an insert window that would keep the appearance of the exterior and maintain the fluted trim on the interior. He said that the existing windows are leaking air, and he doesn't think that reglazing or adding storm windows will solve the issue.

Hartjes said that the property owner is willing to replace the existing aluminum siding with LP siding that would be more historically accurate if she could get approval for the window replacements. He said the windows they are proposing are Renewal by Andersen wood composite windows that will not adversely affect the appearance of the exterior of the house. Bailey said that Renewal by Andersen windows have previously been approved by the Commission, and agreed that they are good windows.

Kaliszewski asked how the proposed windows compare with what is currently there, and explained that according to state statute, they should not approve windows that are of different dimensions than the existing windows. Hartjes said that all windows will be replaced at the same dimensions and there will be no alteration to the outside of the window. Arnesen requested confirmation that they are sash replacements, and Hartjes said they are. Arnesen asked if the property owner got bids to repair the existing windows, and Hartjes said he did not know. Arnesen asked if any testing for lead paint was completed, and Hartjes said he did not know.

Levitan said that the windows don't look to be in as bad of shape as others the Commission has reviewed. McLean agreed and pointed out that the joinery appears tight and the sash is not separating like one might see

in rotted windows. He said that they look like they need a good scrape and new paint, along with glazing compound on the outside and potential sill replacements if there is rotting on the outside.

Hartjes said the two proposed picture windows will have full divided light grilles, and the attic window will not be touched. McLean asked if the attic window has muntin bars, and Hartjes confirmed that it has lead muntin bars.

McLean asked what the applicant is lacking to meet the standards. Bailey said that there are two levels, the first of which is the window memo and determination if replacement will frustrate the public interest. If they decide that it does not, then she said they may require specifications of each window, including the dimensions of the existing sash and that of the replacements to determine whether they will look the same.

Rummel asked the applicant if there is a hierarchy of damage or if the overall condition is relatively similar among the windows. Hartjes said that all of the windows are damaged. Rummel said that perhaps the best option is to refer the item so the applicant can provide more information. Arnesen said that it would be helpful to know if the property owner was able to find someone to repair the windows, as well as the potential cost of those repairs. Levitan explained that the Commission's presumption is that the windows should not be replaced, so the applicant will need to convince them why that isn't a possibility. Rummel suggested that perhaps some of the windows could be repaired, and the more they can repair, the better. Arnesen said that the picture windows should be easier to repair. McLean agreed, and said that he was hoping to see a cross section of the windows to see the crossrail dimensions. Hartjes said it is 2". Kaliszewski said that they would need to see proof that the replacement windows are as similar as possible to the existing windows.

Hartjes said that they also need to consider efficiency. Kaliszewski said that the greenest part of a building is something you can reuse, and pointed out that repairing windows is more sustainable and will give the house better efficiency. Arnesen agreed that repair will help with efficiency. Hartjes argued that the wood composite replacement window would provide more efficiency and is a sustainable product because it will never rot and has a longer life than wood sash windows.

Rummel said that if there is a hierarchy of disrepair for the existing windows, the applicant needs to provide more detailed information. Levitan encouraged the applicant to continue discussions with staff about the additional information that is needed, which includes estimates for repair, lead paint testing, and more photos and details of the deterioration of each window.

Arnesen suggested that the Commission address the property owner's offer to replace the aluminum siding. Kaliszewski said that it would not impact her decision regarding the windows because it is a totally separate issue. McLean said that they are concerned about the loss of historic fabric that a window replacement would cause, which doesn't resolve itself with new siding.

ACTION:

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