PLANNING DIVISION STAFF REPORT

May 3, 2021



PREPARED FOR THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION

Project Name & Address:	311 Forest Street
Application Type(s):	Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior alterations in the University Heights historic district
Legistar File ID #	<u>65073</u>
Prepared By:	Heather Bailey, Preservation Planner, Planning Division
Date Prepared:	April 27, 2021
Summary	
Project Applicant/Contact:	Joe Thompson, University Heights Condo Association
Requested Action:	The Applicant is requesting that the Landmarks Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the removal of faux stucco and half-timbering and installation of siding.

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) <u>Standards for the Review of Exterior Alterations and Repairs in TR-C2, TR-C3, and TR-C4, Zoning</u> <u>Districts.</u>
 - (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.
- (6) <u>Standards for the Review of Exterior Alterations and Repairs in the TR-VI, TR-V2, TR-U1, TR-U2,</u> <u>NMX, TSS and LMX Zoning Districts</u>.
 - Height. No alterations shall be higher than the existing structure; however, if the existing structure is already nonconforming, no alteration shall be made thereto except in accordance with Sec. 28.192, MGO. In addition, all alterations, including alterations to

the top of a structure, shall conform to the height restrictions for the zoning district in which the structure is located.

- (b) Alterations. Alterations shall be compatible in scale, materials and texture with the existing structure.
- (c) Repairs. Materials used in repairs shall harmonize with the existing materials in texture, color and architectural detail.
- Re-Siding. The standards for the review of re-siding are the same as the standards for review of re-siding in the TR-C2, TR-C3 and TR-C4 Zoning Districts set forth in Sec. 41.24(5)e.
- (e) Roof Shape. Roof alterations to provide additional windows, headroom or area are prohibited unless permitted under Chapter 28, or otherwise approved pursuant thereto as a variance or as part of a conditional use. In addition, all roof alterations shall be visually compatible with the architectural design of the structure.
- (f) Roof Materials. All repairs shall match in appearance the existing roofing materials; however, when a roof is covered or replaced, roofing materials shall duplicate as closely as practicable the appearance of the original materials. Thick wood shakes, French method, interlock and Dutch lap shingles are prohibited. Rolled roofing, tar and gravel and other similar roof materials are also prohibited except on flat or slightly sloped roofs which are not visible from the street.
- (g) Parking Lots. No new parking lots will be approved unless they are accessory to and on the same zoning lot as a commercial structure or multiple family dwelling.

Analysis and Conclusion

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove the faux stucco and half-timbering from the second and third levels of the building and replace with fiber cement board siding for a clapboard appearance. The existing structure was constructed in 1981 and is outside of the period of significance for the University Heights Historic District (1893-1928). It is currently a Tudor Revival style, which is a common style in the district for both historic resources and structures outside of the period of significance. The alteration to clapboard cladding on the upper stories with brick cladding on the ground level does follow a pattern found on some buildings in the district.

The applicant cites 2027 University Ave, which was constructed in 1926. It is predominantly a brick structure, which had the second floor balcony on the front of the building infilled with clapboard at a later date. While there may have been decorative features lost as part of enclosing the front balcony, what remains is a minimally decorative Prairie style residential building. 2130 Chamberlain Ave is a two-story brick, Colonial Revival residential structure with single-story clapboard additions on the side and rear. While the core of the structure was constructed in 1925, it is unclear when the additions were constructed, but they appear on the 1942 Sanborn map.

Of the buildings that began as a mix of brick on the first floor and clapboard on upper stories, they seem to be outside of the period of significance. 1802 Kendall Ave was constructed in 1965 and has a brick first floor with wide aluminum cladding on the second floor. This property would be classified as a New Traditional Colonial Revival, which was a popular form in the late 20th century. 2110 Kendall Ave was constructed in 1951 and has a brick first floor with wide wood clapboards on the second floor. It is transitional in its style with a foursquare form and New Traditional Colonial Revival elements on the front and a Modern corner window on the rear.

The shift from a Tudor Revival style to a New Traditional style is not contemplated by the historic district standards. The intent is to maintain the style of the existing structure, regardless of it being within the period of significance. If this had been a clapboard building, the standards require that the new clapboard be within 1" of

the historic exposure. Of the historic resources, they predominantly have a 4" clapboard reveal. The Landmarks Commission approved residing of 301 Forest St. with a 5" exposure, which would have kept the new siding within 1" of the historic 4" clapboard reveal. The applicant for this project is requesting a 6" exposure as being within 1" of 5" clapboard reveals now found in the district on other structures.

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</u> <u>Districts.</u>
 - (e) Re-Siding. This standard specifies that new clapboard must be within 1" of the original or historic clapboard of the existing structure, if the structure currently has or historically had clapboard. As this structure has faux stucco and half timbering panels, there is not a clapboard reference for this structure.
- (6) <u>Standards for the Review of Exterior Alterations and Repairs in the TR-VI, TR-V2, TR-U1, TR-U2,</u> <u>NMX, TSS and LMX Zoning Districts</u>.
 - (a) Height. No proposed changes in height.
 - (b) Alterations. Transitioning from faux stucco and half timbering to clapboard with be a change in materials and textures on the existing structure. However, the clapboard cladding could also be interpreted as being compatible with the existing structure. The Landmarks Commission has approved clapboard additions on other Tudor style structures in the district, but not removal of stucco and half timbering to be replaced by clapboards.
 - (c) Repairs. The existing structure has numerous failure points and needs to be replaced. The new clapboards could harmonize with the existing structure, but will significantly change the architectural detail.
 - Re-Siding. The standards for the review of re-siding are the same as the standards for review of re-siding in the TR-C2, TR-C3 and TR-C4 Zoning Districts set forth in Sec. 41.24(5)e. See discussion above.
 - (e) Roof Shape. No changes in roof shape.
 - (f) Roof Materials. No changes in roof materials.
 - (g) Parking Lots. N/A

Recommendation

Staff believes that the standards for granting a Certificate of Appropriateness could be met. The standards do not contemplate modifying the style of siding on a structure in the fashion proposed. However, this structure was constructed well outside the period of significance and if it were new construction, it would likely meet the standards for appropriate infill. If the Landmarks Commission approves the proposal, they should cite specific findings for how this project meets the University Heights standards.