

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: 12/9/19

TITLE: 417 Cantwell Ct - Construction of an
addition and a new garage structure
in the Third Lake Ridge Hist. Dist.;
6th Ald. Dist.

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: 12/11/19

ID NUMBER: 58350

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

SUMMARY:

Seth Statz, registering in support and wishing to speak

Bailey described the proposed work to construct a rear addition and new garage, noting that the demolition of the existing garage was approved by the Landmarks Commission on December 17, 2018. She said that the proposed garage is in keeping with the style of garages seen on this street. Regarding the pedestrian door on the garage, she said that in the plans, it appears to be a double door with a single doorknob. Statz confirmed there would be double doors with one door fixed in place. Bailey said that the applicants propose a garage door that is modeled to look like a carriage door and has an arch element, and pointed out that none of the garages on that street would have ever had carriage doors. She mentioned that the existing garage has six-over-six windows on the side, and the applicants are proposing simple double-hung windows for the new garage. She said that commissioners should consider whether they want the garage windows to look like the existing windows or a simple style of double-hung windows like those on the house. She said that the existing garage door and other nearby garage doors on the street have a more colonial look with embossed panels, specifically pointing out the garage door at 429 Cantwell Court. She said that the manufacturer the applicants have selected does make a garage door similar to that at 429 Cantwell, but it still has a divided rail in the middle. She explained that the rear addition has a slight stepback on the northwest corner, so the historic house and new addition will be separated. She pointed out that the house has vinyl siding in two different widths that are divided by the beltband, and the addition is proposing to mimic those widths. She mentioned that the applicant was proposing to use a style of composite shingle that is not allowed. She discussed the applicable standards, and said that she recommended approval with the conditions that final garage pedestrian door specifications, door and side light specifications for the addition, and roofing specifications for the garage and addition be approved by staff.

Andrzejewski opened the public hearing.

Statz said that the homeowners are flexible in terms of the windows on the garage, and were trying to match the style of window on the house. He explained that they plan to reuse the existing back door to serve the new addition. Andrzejewski asked Bailey if she was okay with the double pedestrian door on the garage. Bailey said that it is on the side of the garage that faces the interior of the lot, so it will not be visible from either street. She pointed out that it is a new building, and the doors would make the space more functional. She said that the doors should be a simple design, but that she does not have concerns about the double doors. Kaliszewski

asked if Statz had any concerns about the conditions in the staff report to provide staff with product specifications for final approval. Statz said that was fine. He mentioned that they had already picked out different shingles that don't have a shadow. Andrzejewski said that she would like the windows on the garage to match the house, and Kaliszewski agreed. Statz said that style of window would be more functional to the space in terms of ventilation. Andrzejewski said that she was glad that the garage reads as a new building rather than matching the house too much.

Andrzejewski pointed out that the standards for exterior alterations call out a comparison with properties within 200 feet, as well as what is visible from the street. Statz said the setback on the addition does not need to be there, but they were trying to address the transition in siding as cleanly as possible. He said they could add vertical bandboard to make it flush, but they were trying to simplify. Bailey said she was in favor of a slight stepback because it differentiates the old from the new as opposed to creating a continuous wall. Statz said the homeowners were interested in putting a band of brick on the bottom of the addition to tie in to the rest of the house. He mentioned that it was the same brick used on the front pillars of the house. Bailey said that there were brick piers and sidewalls for the front porch and stairs, but she did not see an existing course of brick on the house itself, and it appeared that the siding went down to the ground. Statz confirmed there was no brick on the house itself. McLean asked what transition material was used between grade and the siding. Statz said it is a concrete foundation. Bailey asked how far up they intended to use the brick. Statz said less than three feet, and mentioned that it was used brick that the owners must have pulled from somewhere on the house, so they don't have a lot of it. Kaliszewski said that she did not have concerns about it because it wasn't visible. McLean said that there is nothing behind the house other than the garage, so it will be seen from the street façade. Bailey said there would be limited visibility from the street behind the house. McLean asked if the new garage was the same size as the existing garage, and Statz said that it was two feet bigger in all dimensions. Andrzejewski said that she did not care that much, and did not think using the brick would create a false sense of history. Bailey said that the addition is stepped back in a way that it looks like a new addition, and by including brick, it will tie in with the materials on the front of the house while reading as a contemporary addition.

McLean asked if there were concerns about the different roof pitch and style, as well as the beltboards not aligning, and pointed out that it looks like it was added on. Bailey said that it will look like it was added on, and the beltband on the house is not going to be at the same level as the beltband on the addition. She said that where the addition is, if they bumped it up higher so the bands aligned, they would have to chop off part of the historic roof or make it a lower pitch. McLean said that it would be similar to the dormer that is there, which is the kind of language that is on the back of the house. Bailey asked if he was suggesting a shed roof dormer off the back, and McLean said that is what he would do. Arnesen asked if that was to try and get it below the beltband. Statz said that they could get the bands to line up if they used a shed roof. McLean said they could bring it up to get the beltbands to align or do a shed roof, eliminate the beltband on the addition, and have the shed roof come around where the roof meets the house, but he wasn't sure where that falls in the ordinance. Bailey said there is language in the ordinance about roof forms, and pointed out that this is a side-gabled building, and the addition would have a gable facing a different direction. She said that a shed roof on the addition would be in keeping with the projections currently coming off the building. McLean said that it would be in keeping with the proportions as well. McLean said the pitch going toward the half-moon window seems problematic because water could run past the gutters and rot it out. Statz said the designer drew the roof both ways, with a gable and a shed roof; he and the designer had agreed the shed roof looked better, but the owner liked the gable. McLean said that he would expect the pitch on the front dormer is different from the pitch on the back with the gable, and he thought the shed roof was the right track. Arnesen said that a shed roof would obscure the banding. McLean said they could use the banding to hide the flashing of the roof. Statz asked for clarification on the roof placement being suggested, and McLean said the top of the roof would be placed at the bottom of the bandboard. Statz asked if there would be enough pitch there. He said that he was thinking of tucking it up under the existing eave on the side wall and running bandboard on the sides of the shed roof, which would terminate where the shed and outside vertical wall met. McLean said that he was thinking the first floor volume would be retained within the first floor expression of the house on the outside. Arnesen said the pitch would be next to nothing, and McLean said that it would be enough for low-slope roofing. Andrzejewski referenced the standards, and suggested that the Commission ask staff to work with the applicant on the

appropriate roofline for the addition and to see if there is a possible shed roof solution. McLean said that he feels the back of the house is visible from the street, and pointed out that the drawings don't show how they plan on flashing the roof at the pitch. Statz said the step flashing will be behind the siding and would not be exposed. McLean said that his other concern was the potential rot of the half-moon window. Statz said they reworked the roof design in order to save the half-moon window, and McLean agreed it was a unique piece they wouldn't want to lose. McLean asked if there was a side light with the back door, or if it was just a door. Bailey said the drawings show a door and side light. Statz said they are using the existing door and there is no side light.

Andrzejewski closed the public hearing.

Kaliszewski asked what commissioners thought about the carriage-style garage door. McLean said he would prefer a simple door because there is no detail on the back of the house that expresses a similar arc. He said a multi-panel door similar to that at 429 Cantwell would be appropriate, and pointed out that seems to be the language on that side of the street. Andrzejewski said that ideally, they would use a door without an arch. Bailey asked if commissioners were asking to get rid of the arch or were suggesting a colonial-style embossed door like the other garages on the street. She said that she found a door from the same manufacturer that has square panels like the other garages, but has a vertical rail down the middle. McLean said that seems appropriate. Taylor asked about the garage door the applicants had proposed. Andrzejewski said that the curve at the top doesn't match anything on the back of the house or in the neighborhood, pointing out that the ordinance references properties within 200 feet. Taylor asked if the door Bailey suggested was available in the same color and material that the applicants had proposed, and Bailey said that it was.

ACTION:

A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Arnesen, to approve the request for the Certificate of Appropriateness with the conditions that the final garage door and garage pedestrian door specifications be approved by staff and that the applicant look into a different roof type for the rear addition with the final design to be approved by staff. The motion passed by voice vote/other.