PREPARED FOR THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

Project Name & Address: 41 N Roby Road

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

historic district

Legistar File ID # 63581

Prepared By: Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner, Planning Division

Date Prepared: January 5, 2021

Summary

Project Applicant/Contact: James Stangel

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

of Appropriateness for the extension of the front porch roof and installation of

columns.

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:

- **41.18 STANDARDS FOR GRANTING A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS.** A certificate of appropriateness shall be granted only if the proposed project complies with this chapter, including all of the following standards that apply.
 - (1) <u>New construction or exterior alteration</u>. The Landmarks Commission shall approve a certificate of appropriateness for exterior alteration or construction only if:
 - (a) In the case of exterior alteration to a designated landmark, the proposed work would meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.
 - (b) In the case of exterior alteration or construction of a structure on a landmark site, the proposed work would meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.
 - (c) In the case of exterior alteration or construction on any property located in a historic district, the proposed exterior alteration or construction meets the adopted standards and guidelines for that district.
 - (d) In the case of any exterior alteration or construction for which a certificate of appropriateness is required, the proposed work will not frustrate the public interest expressed in this ordinance for protecting, promoting, conserving, and using the City's historic resources.

41.24 UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT.

- (5) <u>Standards for the Review of Exterior Alterations and Repairs in TR-C2, TR-C3, and TR-C4, Zoning Districts.</u>
 - (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.
 - (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

Legistar File ID #63581 41 N Roby Road January 11, 2021 Page **3** of **4**

- 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.
- (i) Roof Material.
 - 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.
 - 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 extend the front porch roof and install columns. The building is located on an oddly shaped lot where streets wrap around three sides. The 1915 building prominently features stucco with minimal decorative accents, such as corbelling under projecting bays, quoin work around the windows and as accents on the top corners of the building. The survey form simply identifies the building as Arts & Crafts in style, but there are elements that evoke a Mission style.

The entrance in question has a shed roof above the door that is supported by decorative brackets. At some point the stoop was expanded and a retaining wall installed to create a porch area. However, the retaining wall's location was in line with the drainage off of the stoop's roof. So the roof line was elongated. This change in load has possibly caused the stoop roof to detach from the building.

Staff had recommended exploring the interior connection for how the brackets were structurally supporting the current roof and address the structural failure from that direction. The applicant would like to expand the roof overhang, extend the brackets, and install simple square pillars that terminate on the retaining wall.

Legistar File ID #63581 41 N Roby Road January 11, 2021 Page **4** of **4**

While it is unclear when the retaining wall was added to the entryway, it appears that is recently had the stucco removed. Staff would recommend that as part of the work on the porch that it should be clad again in stucco in order to again blend with the character of the principal structure.

The Landmarks Commission will need to decide of the continued evolution of this entrance remains in character with the style of the structure.

A discussion of the relevant ordinance sections follows:

41.24 UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS HISTORIC DISTRICT.

- (5) <u>Standards for the Review of Exterior Alterations and Repairs in TR-C2, TR-C3, and TR-C4, Zoning Districts.</u>
 - (a) Height. N/A
 - (b) Second Exit Platforms and Fire Escapes. N/A
 - (c) Repairs. The retaining wall in front of the stoop has recently undergone repairs, but the stucco has not been reinstalled. In order to be in compliance with this standard, the exterior repair needs to duplicate the previous materials.
 - (d) Restoration. N/A
 - (e) Re-Siding. N/A
 - (f) Alterations Visible from the Street and Alterations to Street Facades. This alteration will be visible from both of the streets that frame this parcel. The simple columns could be compatible with the character of the structure and are in keeping with the character of the sleeping porch addition on the rear/side of the structure. The extension to the existing decorative bracket and wood columns would match the materials that exist on the structure. It is unclear from the detail in the submission if the columns are proposed to be square or rounded. The style of the building would lend itself to square columns rather than the more Classical rounded form of a Tuscan column. The proposed extension of the bracket would retain the existing historic material and add onto it, but does change the overall form.
 - (g) Additions and Exterior Alterations Not Visible from the Street. N/A
 - (h) Roof Shape. While the roof will again be extended, the shape of the stoop's roof will remain the same.
 - (i) Roof Material.
 - 1. N/A
 - 2. The existing roof is asphalt shingles and a similar shingle style would be recommended.
 - 3. N/A

Recommendation

Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness could be met. The Landmarks Commission should evaluate if the proposed alteration to the entryway meets the standards or if the cantilever should be maintained by introducing additional support to the interior.