

Staff Report and Comments

Exhibits presented to and considered by the Commission:

Exhibit A – project description from the application

Select interior modification concentrated on maintaining existing character of home while providing adequate division for a new code compliant multi-family residential R-1 use. All existing exterior finishes to remain. Two new exterior windows are being proposed on the basement level; one in an infilled opening on the rear masonry stair which was once open, and a second adjacent to the existing basement access door located on the east side of the building, behind the existing covered side entry to the first floor level.

Exhibit B – map

Exhibit C - proposed scope, plans, and photographs

Based upon the information presented in the application, staff offers the following **suggested findings of fact**:

- A. The proposed development of Unit 0.1 as shown in Exhibit C is not incongruous according to STANDARDS 2 and 9.
 - 1* Development of Unit 0.1 does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property.
 - 2* Re-opening of the existing bricked in window does not destroy features, finishes, or construction techniques that characterize the property. It is reversing a non-historic alteration. The new window is proposed to match existing windows.
 - 3* The new 3x3 window and adjacent awning at the exterior entry door does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property and is compatible with the existing massing, size, scale, and architectural features. The window's square proportions match the proportions of the square attic windows in the uppermost reaches of the gambrel-roofed façades. The foundation masonry is painted common brick and not character-defining in ornamentation or material.

B. The proposed development of Unit 1.1 as shown in Exhibit C is not incongruous according to STANDARDS 2, 9, and 10.

1* Note #12 of drawing A1.1/02 does not appear to be correctly placed. There is no freestanding sink at this location.

2* Development of Unit 1.1 does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The conversion of the window opening on the porch elevation into a doorway with two leaves preserves the stained-glass transom. The brick to be removed below is painted common brick. The interior wall proposed for demolition is not original.

3* No information is provided in Exhibit C whether the window removed from Unit 1.1 at demolition note #A will be retained and stored on site.

4* Proposed changes including the reconfigured walls and the removal of a window and brick could easily be reversed in the future. The new wall identified at note #04 is designed to match the distinctive hallway trim.

C. The proposed development of Unit 1.2 Studio as shown in Exhibit C is not incongruous according to STANDARDS 2, 9, and 10.

1* Development of Unit 1.2 does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The current windows and door that open onto the entrance foyer will remain and be visible from the foyer.

2* Proposal to construct a wall with light framing and gypsum wallboard to block the windows and door from Unit 1.2 could easily be reversed in the future.

D. The proposed development of Units 1.3 and 1.4 as shown in Exhibit C are not incongruous according to STANDARDS 2, 9, and 10.

1* Development of Units 1.3 and 1.4 does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. Historic trim and fireplace surrounds are being retained. One existing historic door (note #E) is being relocated (note #G).

2* The toilet rooms are non-historic alterations with modern fixtures and finishes.

3* The decorative arch in unit 1.4 proposed to be altered is non-historic.

4* Changes to walls and doors shown in Exhibit C could easily be reversed in the future.

E. The proposed development of Unit 2.1 as shown in Exhibit C are not incongruous according to STANDARDS 2, 9, and 10.

1* Development of Unit 2.1 does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The walls to be demolished are not original or historic.

2* The proposal to construct a wall to block the door that adjoins Unit 2.2 could easily be reversed in the future.

F. The proposed development of Units 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 as shown in Exhibit C are not incongruous according to STANDARDS 2, 9, and 10

1* Development of Units 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The sections of walls to be demolished are not character defining to the property.

2* The proposed changes to the bathrooms and closets could be reversed in the future.

Staff suggests that the Commission approve the application with the following conditions:

1. All work shall be in accordance with attached drawings and plans.
2. Staff shall review and approve manufacturer cut sheets or other descriptive material for all new exterior window units, interior lighting, and plumbing fixtures prior to permit issuance.
2. All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.
3. All doors, windows, and interior trim proposed to be removed and/or saved shall be securely preserved on the property and appropriately labeled as to their original location with a metal tag, or some other permanent, durable label.
4. All historic bathroom fixtures proposed for removal shall be securely preserved on the property and appropriately labeled as to their original location with a metal tag, or some other permanent, durable label.

5. Staff shall review and approve steel-framed glass smoke separation wall for Unit 2.4
(note # 6)