

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 10/28/19

TITLE: 1717 Regent St - Exterior Alteration in the
University Heights Hist. Dist. -
Replacement of windows; 5th Ald.
Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 11/1/19

ID NUMBER: 57656

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

SUMMARY:

Bob Kaiser, registering in support and wishing to speak

Erica Fox Gehrig, registering in opposition and wishing to speak

Bailey described the project, and said the applicant proposes replacement of eight attic-level windows, with one bank of four windows on the front and another on the back of the house. She thanked the applicant for the amount of detail in the application, and pointed out comparisons between the existing and proposed replacement windows, including detailed sections regarding the various components. She said that because they are banks of windows, the applicant is proposing to replace much of the window frames as well. She pointed out photos showing areas of rot and noted areas of significant deterioration of the window sill. She said that the frames appear to have loose paint and less rot than the sills, but the mullions look pretty beat up, some to the point where it is surprising the glass is still in place. She discussed the applicable standards and said that in University Heights, there are different requirements for areas visible from the street and those that are not visible. She said that her recommendation is that they refer the item to a future meeting so the applicant can provide an estimate from a contractor who completes repair to determine if it is feasible to repair the existing windows. She mentioned that some windows might be beyond repair and have significant damage, as shown in the submitted photos. Kaliszewski asked if staff recommends repair for the front bank or all the windows. Bailey said that she left it open for the Commission to discuss because both banks of windows are original to the house, but the University Heights standards are looser for the back than the front of the house.

Kaiser said that the storm windows were not removed for the photos, so one can't see the entirety of the damage on the exterior of the windows, which have pretty substantial rot. He said that they kept the original windows on the rest of the house and replaced those storm windows, but the attic windows are not as high of quality. He said that the attic windows seem cheap and no longer seal or lock. He said that the wood has been eaten away somehow, and the windows were like that when they purchased the house. He said that now they are working to remodel the attic, and did not get an estimate for window repair because every contractor who looked at the project agreed that the attic windows have to go and are not worth saving. He said that the contractor on the project would be the one doing the repairs if it could be done, but the contractor said that he doesn't see how they could be saved. The contractor got as close a match as possible in material and size from Marvin, as well as going to Brunzell with material samples from the exterior to have them make exact replicas so there is no change to the exterior appearance. Kaliszewski asked if the windows are total wood or composite. Kaiser said they are total wood. Kaliszewski asked if there was aluminum or a storm window on the

exterior. Bailey said the product sheet says wood interior and clad exterior, which she assumes is aluminum. Kaiser said the exterior will still match the other storm windows on the house. Kaliszewski asked for confirmation that there were no storm windows, and Kaiser confirmed there will be no storm windows. Bailey said that staff is not concerned about the proposed replacement; the type of window and details provided regarding the dimensions make this a more than adequate replacement of the existing windows.

Kaliszewski asked if all of the windows are terrible, or just a few. She suggested that if there were four windows that were repairable, they could go on the front. Kaiser said there is not one window that is really intact; there might be pieces of different ones, but they are in rough shape. Andrzejewski asked which windows are missing the top sash, and Kaiser said there are one or two in front and two or three in the back.

Gehrig said that she formerly served on the Landmarks Commission, and agreed that the applicant's submission was very thorough. She pointed out that this house won a Madison Trust for Historic Preservation award in 2009, so she knew the applicant cares for it. She said that she was on the fence about this project because she went in thinking that some windows could be repaired. She pointed out that if the attic was uninsulated in the beginning, the windows have probably deteriorated from extreme temperatures. She said that she liked Kaliszewski's suggestion to come up with four windows that could be repaired for the front of the house.

Kaliszewski said she is typically not supportive of window replacements, and for precedence, she understands requesting information on window repair, but in this case she could be swayed. She said the applicant has done the work they were supposed to for the submission and some of the windows look really bad. She said that the applicant is also using products the Commission would ask for in replacements. Arnesen said that he agreed, and understood the need for consistency and precedence, but felt like the applicant already did it. Bailey said the Commission typically requests that information when it is not provided by the applicant, but Kaiser provided those details already. McLean said that he was interested in the idea of whether four out of the eight windows could be collected to go on the front. He said that the house is fantastic and award-winning, so if there was a chance to get four original windows on the front, it would go a long way. He said that aluminum-clad windows are nice, but it will have a different sheen than the other windows on the house and it would be nice to have a consistency of sheen, texture, and materials. He said that if there is no way to find four repairable windows, he would rather see four new windows than a combination of two old and two new windows. Andrzejewski suggested the applicant ask his contractor about repairing four windows.

ACTION:

A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Arnesen, to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness to replace four rear windows as submitted with the condition that the applicant investigate the feasibility of the repair of four windows to be installed on the front of the house and submit findings to staff for approval. If the repair is not feasible, staff can approve replacement of all eight windows as proposed. The motion passed by voice vote/other.