PREPARED FOR THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

Project Name & Address: 2011 Van Hise Avenue

Application Type(s): Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations in the University Heights

historic district

Legistar File ID # 56386

Prepared By: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner, Planning Division

Date Prepared: July 1, 2019

Summary

Project Applicant/Contact: Melissa Destree – Destree Architecture and Design

Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting that the Landmarks Commission approve a Certificate

of Appropriateness to relocate and add an addition to a garage.

Background Information

Parcel Location/Information: The subject site is located in the University Heights Historic District.

Relevant State Statute Section:

Wisc SS 62.23(7)(em)2m. In the repair or replacement of a property that is designated as a historic landmark or included within a historic district or neighborhood conservation district under this paragraph, a city shall allow an owner to use materials that are similar in design, color, scale, architectural appearance, and other visual qualities.

Relevant Ordinance Sections:

41.24 UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT.

- (5) Standards for the Review of Exterior Alterations and Repairs in TR-C2, TR-C3, and TR-C4, Zoning Districts.
 - (a) Height. No alterations shall be higher than the existing structure; however, if the existing structure is already a nonconforming one, alteration shall be made thereto except in accordance with Section 28.192. Roof alterations resulting in an increased structure volume are prohibited unless they meet the requirements in Sec. 41.24(4)(a)5. and are permitted under Chapter 28, or approved as a variance pursuant to Sec. 28.184 or approved as a conditional use or as part of a planned residential development.
 - (b) Second Exit Platforms and Fire Escapes. Second exit platforms and fire escapes shall be invisible from the street, wherever possible, and shall be of a plain and unobtrusive design in all cases. In instances where an automatic combustion products detection and alarm system is permitted as an alternative to second exits, use of such a system shall be mandatory.
 - (c) Repairs. Materials used in exterior repairs shall duplicate the original building materials in texture and appearance, unless the Landmarks Commission approves duplication of the existing building materials where the existing building materials differ from the original. Repairs using materials that exactly duplicate the original in composition are encouraged.

Legistar File ID #56386 2011 Van Hise Ave July 08, 2019 Page **2** of **4**

(i)

Roof Material.

- (d) Restoration. Projects that will restore the appearance of a structure to its original appearance are encouraged and will be approved by the Landmarks Commission if such projects are documented by photographs, architectural or archeological research or other suitable evidence.
- (e) Re-Siding. Re-siding with aluminum or vinyl that replaces or covers clapboards or nonoriginal siding on structures originally sided with clapboards will be approved by the Landmarks Commission provided that the new siding imitates the width of the original clapboard siding to within one (1) inch and provided further that all architectural details including, but not limited to, window trim, wood cornices and ornament either remain uncovered or are duplicated exactly in appearance. Where more than one layer of siding exists on the structure, all layers except the first must be removed before new siding is applied. If insulation is applied under the new siding, all trim must be built up so that it projects from the new siding to the same extent it did with the original siding.
- (f) Alterations Visible from the Street and Alterations to Street Facades. Alterations visible from the street, including alterations to the top of structures, and alterations to street facades shall be compatible with the existing structure in architectural design, scale, color, texture, proportion and rhythm of solids to voids and proportion of widths to heights of doors and windows. Materials used in such alterations shall duplicate in texture and appearance, and architectural details used therein shall duplicate in design, the materials and details used in the original construction of the existing structure or of other structures in University Heights of similar materials, age and architectural style, unless the Landmarks Commission approves duplication of the texture and appearance of materials and the design of architectural details used in the existing structure where the existing building materials and architectural details differ from the original. Alterations that exactly duplicate the original materials in composition are encouraged. Alterations that destroy significant architectural features are prohibited. Side alterations shall not detract from the design composition of the original facade.
- (g) Additions and Exterior Alterations Not Visible from the Street. Additions and exterior alterations that are not visible from any streets contiguous to the lot lines upon which the structure is located will be approved by the Landmarks Commission if their design is compatible with the scale of the existing structure and, further, if the materials used are compatible with the existing materials in texture, color and architectural details. Additions and alterations shall harmonize with the architectural design of the structure rather than contrast with it.
- (h) Roof Shape. The roof shape of the front of a structure shall not be altered except to restore it to the original documentable appearance or to add a dormer or dormers in a location and shape compatible with the architectural design of the structure and similar in location and shape to original dormers on structures of the same vintage and style within the district. Alterations of the roof shape of the sides or back of a structure shall be visually compatible with the architectural design of the existing structure.
 - 1. If the existing roof is tile, slate or other material that is original to the structure and/or contributes to its historic character, all repairs thereto shall be made using the same materials. In addition, in all cases any such roof must be repaired rather than replaced, unless the documented cost of repair exceeds the documented cost of reroofing with a substitute material that approximates the appearance of the original roofing material as closely as possible, in which case re-roofing with a material that approximates the appearance of the original roofing material as closely as possible will be approved by the Landmarks Commission.

Legistar File ID #56386 2011 Van Hise Ave July 08, 2019 Page **3** of **4**

- 2. If the existing roofing material is asphalt shingles, sawn wood shingles or a nonhistoric material such as fiberglass, all repairs shall match in appearance the existing roof material; however, if any such roof is covered or replaced, re-roofing must be done using rectangular sawn wood shingles or rectangular shingles that are similar in width, thickness and apparent length to sawn wood shingles, for example, 3-in-1 tab asphalt shingles. Modern style shingles, such as thick wood shakes, Dutch lap, French method and interlock shingles, that are incompatible with the historic character of the district are prohibited.
- 3. Rolled roofing, tar and gravel and other similar roofing materials are prohibited except that such materials may be used on flat or slightly sloped roofs which are not visible from the ground.

Analysis and Conclusion

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to relocate the existing single-car garage to be 4 feet closer to the street (shifting it further north than its current location) and constructing an addition to the side (east), which will preserve some of the elements of the historic garage, but differentiate the newer construction.

The proposal will preserve the gable roof front of the historic garage and retain the west side while adding 3.5 feet to the rear (south) end of that wall. An entirely new rear wall will be constructed on the south and east. The second garage entry, located on the east of the façade, is set back from the historic entry. The addition will have a hipped roof and the original front-facing gable is preserved. The new exterior walls retain the bay patterns, but do not have the decorative trim of the historic portion. This allows the wing to utilize the same architectural vocabulary without creating a false sense of history.

A discussion of the relevant ordinance of Chapter 41.24 follows:

41.24 UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT.

- (5) Standards for the Review of Exterior Alterations and Repairs in TR-C2, TR-C3, and TR-C4, Zoning Districts.
 - (a) Height. The new wing is slightly shorter than the historic garage.
 - (b) Second Exit Platforms and Fire Escapes. N/A.
 - (c) Repairs. N/A.
 - (d) Restoration. N/A.
 - (e) Re-Siding. N/A.
 - (f) Alterations Visible from the Street and Alterations to Street Facades. The alteration of the garage will be minimally visible from the street. Most of what will be visible will be the historic portion of the garage, which will retain the historic character of this property.
 - (g) Additions and Exterior Alterations Not Visible from the Street. The materials for the addition harmonize with the existing historic garage. The historic walls are covered in stucco and the addition will also have stucco walls. The historic windows from the rear and east side will be reincorporated into the rear elevation of the garage. The contrast is subtle, which allows the garage to retain its character without creating a false sense of history.
 - (h) Roof Shape. The historic portion of the garage will retain its roof shape. The addition is stepped back from the front of the historic garage, which locates most of the roof changes to the east side and back of the garage.
 - (i) Roof Material.
 - 1. N/A.

Legistar File ID #56386 2011 Van Hise Ave July 08, 2019 Page **4** of **4**

- 2. The existing roof is rectangular sawn wood shingles and the new roof will be the same material.
- 3. N/A.

Recommendation

Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness have been met and recommends the Landmarks Commission approve the project as proposed.