

October 6, 2021

Department of Planning and Development

Permit Review Committee

121 N. LaSalle, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor

Chicago, IL 60602

I am writing on behalf of Preservation Chicago to affirm our view that the proposed demolition and redevelopment of the Cenacle Retreat and Conference Center at 513 W. Fullerton in Lincoln Park will be, if permitted and carried out, an instantly regrettable action and one of the more egregious demolitions in our city's recent history. This campus of Modernist structures, rendered dazzlingly in detailed brickwork, is one of the most impressive collections of buildings of its type anywhere in the City of Chicago. That the center could be so easily reduced to rubble as a first option before exploring the myriad ways that it could be creatively reused speaks to how our definition of "historic" or "significant" cries out for redefining.

Many of the fail-safes intended to save, or at least prompt a discussion of saving, our most precious historic resources are undeniably outdated. The Chicago Historic Resources Survey, meant to be an all-encompassing guide to our city's vast array of notable structures, stops largely at 1940 with a handful of post-1940 structures added on. Our continued reliance on this document seems to imply that we are somehow content to accept that the past 81 years of Chicago's architectural and urban history are not worthy of our attention. We frequently celebrate the past eight decades of Chicago's accomplishments in music, arts, literature, film and television, and social justice. Why, then, do we not bestow the same honor on our world-famous and much-beloved built environment?

The official Landmark Report for the Mid North District in which the Cenacle Retreat sits has also been used to deny the Modernist campus a longer process of review and discussion that could result in preservation due to it falling outside of the district's period of significance. The report was published in 1974, nearly a half-century ago. Surely we can acknowledge that in that time, our city's built environment has evolved beyond the scope of the report. The report itself even advocates for a "flexible set of guidelines" and warns against "rigid rules" that "would only stifle the vitality of Mid North." Our city deserves better than adherence to these rigid rules; they are guidelines that, if left untouched and sans revision, will deny our city of decades of irreplaceable history, design, and craftsmanship. We are eroding our collective story a little bit more every day.

The redevelopment of the Cenacle Retreat is the perfect opportunity to stem the tide of unrestrained demolition in our city and to start taking steps toward solidifying our city as the forward-thinking vanguard it has always been. We strongly request that the determination of insignificance be reconsidered and that multiple options and creative alternatives be contemplated for this site. The new proposal would bring additional housing units to this site, a goal which we support enthusiastically and without hesitation. But new housing and adaptive reuse are not mutually exclusive—if anything, they are oftentimes complementary partners. That is the case here. In Chicago, we have successfully converted nearly every building typology into housing: warehouses, offices, hospitals, and even churches. The Cenacle Retreat is no different just because it has been determined by narrow frameworks to be unworthy of saving. We have only a limited amount of chances to protect our present-day built environment for future generations of Chicagoans. Let us take this crucial moment to reject the status quo and to forge

ahead with creativity, imagination, and resourcefulness for the betterment of our city.

Sincerely,

Max Chavez

Director of Research & Special Projects

Preservation Chicago

## 1407 NORTH HOYNE

### PERMIT REVIEW COMMITTEE PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT

In accordance with the requirements of the Chicago Municipal Code and pursuant to the Rules and Regulations of the Commission on Chicago Landmarks, the Permit Review Committee finds that the Applicant's request will not adversely affect any significant historical or architectural feature of the designated Chicago Landmark or of the Wicker Park Historic District and is in accord with the Standards for Rehabilitation set forth by the United States Secretary of the Interior at 36 C.F. R. 67, as amended from time to time, as well as the Rules and Regulations of the Commission on Chicago Landmarks, as follows:

#### A. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

1. *A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.*

The property was originally a large-scale single-family home with coach house in the rear. Over the years the primary residence was divided into apartments, the coach house modified, and the lot divided to create two separate properties.

This project proposes to return the property to its historic configuration and site orientation by recombining the lots and rehabilitating the original primary (west) façade of the coach house. The house will return to being a single-family home as it was when originally constructed.

2. *The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*

The project does not remove historic materials, and minimizes the alterations to features and spaces that characterize the property.

The primary space that characterizes the property is the front yard (adjacent to W. Schiller Street), which is maintained as an open area with no visible structures to impede the view of the main house, and to maintain the existing connection to W. Schiller Street.

The renovations to the coach house are dedicated to returning the structure to a condition and aesthetic much closer to its historical material condition, including the restoration of previously altered windows and doors. The work includes removal of an existing non-historic wood deck and non-historic wooden fence. The work also includes construction of a glass enclosure connecting the historic primary residence to the coach house. The glass enclosure is set back from the south elevation of the coach house to promote the visibility of the historic coach house maintain its character as a separate but related building.

The north façade was completely altered in the 2009 renovation, leaving only 3 historic openings and significantly altering the character of the historic building by constructing a stair tower with a new cornice matching the historic building, compromising the legibility of the historic massing of the building. The proposed northern additions call as little attention to themselves as possible, and conceal the 2009 stair tower addition, thereby clarifying the legibility of the historic massing. Additionally, the proposed design maintains the existing north (brick) façade and openings – becoming exposed elements within the interior of the new spaces within the addition – and preserving/highlighting this façade within the renovated spaces.

The addition to the north façade is built above, and supported by, the existing non-historic garage, thereby minimizing structural modifications to the historic home to support the addition. By utilizing existing footings of the non-historic garage, the new addition can be constructed in a manner that is independent of the original house and does not require significant modifications to the house (as some previously studied, but rejected, options that engage the house to the rear would require).

3. *Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.*

The proposed addition to the north façade is a harmonious addition to the historic property, clearly indicative of its time, place and use. Its height and lateral placement on an interior side yard, on a tertiary non-historic façade, and above an existing non-historic garage signal it is a non-historic addition that is subservient to the existing historic building. The use of the common brick and lighter color matching the brick used with the 2009 renovation further signal its subservience to the existing historic building. By concealing a non-historic stair tower addition that modified the historic roofline and added the conjectural cornice feature, the proposed north façade additions add clarity to the original structure and the legibility of its historic time, place and use.

The historic character of the coach house is being restored where historic openings are being restored and clarified. Historic photographs and consultation with City Landmarks staff have yielded the best understanding of the original design with the intent of recreating as much as possible in an honest way. The transparency of the glass connector and its placement set back from the south façade of the coach house clearly distinguish the historic from the non-historic in a way that provides visibility and legibility of significant historic features.

The proposed work utilizes below-grade spaces and features to further minimize impacts on visibility and legibility of significant historic features.

4. *Changes to a property that have acquired significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.*

Based on historic photographic evidence, it is not clear whether the W. Schiller Street entry and porch are original to the historic structure, but it has gained significant historic significance. The proposed work preserves the existing W. Schiller Street entry and porch and sidewalk connection.

5. *Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.*

On both the main house and the coach house the historic massing (corners), the red face brick of the south and west facades, the roof lines, brick detailing and cornice, mansard roofs and dormers, and entry porches and detailing have all been determined to be significant features that characterize the property and all are being preserved or restored with the proposed addition.

On the north façade, the proposed addition steps back from the historic façade of the building and stops short of the historic cornice and mansard roof in subservience to the main structure.

6. *Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*

The historic coach house is being repaired and previously modified historic conditions are being restored at the historic coach house, with original features substantiated through photographic and

physical evidence such as remnant lintels and masonry modifications. The 2009 renovations to the primary residence building addressed repair issues.

7. *Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.*

The proposed work does not include chemical or physical treatment of the primary residence building. Cleaning of the historic coach house is proposed, and the means and methods shall be subject to further review.

8. *Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.*

There are no such resources present or affected.

9. *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

Historic Materials that characterize the property are not being destroyed. The proposed north addition retreats from the main façade and is below the historic cornice and brick corbelling and does not affect the roofline, dormers, etc.

New work is differentiated from the old, but is of similar materiality, massing, and scale. We are using Chicago Common brick with similar banding to the primary house, double hung wood windows (rather than aluminum) of similar proportions. The addition is shorter than the existing house, and does not extend to either end – maintaining visibility to the historic corners of the building.

The transparency, size, and placement of the glass connector differentiates it from the old and promotes visibility of the historic coach house façade. The pool and access to the pool have been designed to be built below grade, minimizing visibility of these changes and maintaining the existing open space on the property.

10. *New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

By constructing the addition along the north façade, the proposed addition is confined to the existing footprint of the non-historic garage addition. The interior configuration is maintained with minimal impact to the openings and structure of the primary residence. The exposed brick north façade is maintained as an interior wall and reusing historic window openings as new doorways into the addition such that if the new addition were to be removed, the historic north façade would be readily legible.

Similarly, the coach house is being restored to its original historic character. If the “connector” building were removed, the (restored) historical facades would be unimpaired.

**B. Criteria for Determining Adverse Effect:** The proposed work will not be contrary to any of the following criteria:

1. *The work will maintain the significant historical or architectural feature with no material change to that feature.*

The proposed work does not modify the historic features of the property and restores several previously modified historic features. The proposed north façade addition has been recessed laterally and vertically to avoid engaging with the existing historic building extents (corners), rooflines and cornices.

2. *The work will repair the significant historical or architectural feature with no material change to that feature.*

The proposed work includes removal of several non-historic conditions at the coach house and repairs of the coach house with no material changes to its historic features.

3. *The work will replace the significant historical or architectural feature where the original feature is deteriorated beyond reasonable methods of repair, and the replacement feature is in kind – that is, similar in design, construction, function, appearance, material, and other characteristics.*

Where the proposed work would replace or restore previously modified significant features, the replacement features are in kind.

4. *The work will restore the significant historical or architectural feature to its original character where the feature has been removed or altered and the alteration is not in itself significant in terms of its design, character, or material, and where the restoration is based upon documented evidence, such as photographs or drawings, of the original feature.*

A key feature of the proposed work is the restoration of the primary residence as a single family home and the restoration of the original lot configuration, including return of the coach house to serve the single-family home. Several clearly non-historic modifications will be removed, including a large wooden deck, wooden fence, and wood trellis, restoring the historic relationship of the coach house to the single-family home.

5. *The work will restore the significant historical or architectural feature to its original character where the feature has been removed or altered and the alteration is not in itself significant in terms of its design, character, or material, and where the restoration, lacking documentary evidence, is intended to restore the general historic character of the feature as evidenced by similar building features and types.*

A key feature of the proposed work is the restoration of the primary residence as a single family home and the restoration of the original lot configuration, including return of the coach house to serve the single-family home. Where documentary evidence is lacking, the proposed work will restore the general historic character in consultation and coordination with Landmarks staff.

6. *The work constitutes an addition of a feature where the new feature will not adversely alter, change, obscure, damage, or destroy any significant historical or architectural feature.*

The glass enclosure, including its transparency and its recess from the south façade, do not obscure significant features of the coach house.

The addition to the north façade is recessed from the east and west elevations, and is vertically recessed, to avoid altering and obscuring the historic roofline and to clearly set the addition apart from the historic structure. It will be clad in a Chicago Common brick, matching the existing non-historic elements of the north façade, to blend in with the prior non-historic changes. It will obscure a prior non-historic addition that inappropriately engages and replicates the historic roofline and cornice.

7. *The work constitutes new construction or an addition to a building or structure that meets the established criteria, standards, and guidelines of the Commission.*

The proposed work meets the following additional criteria for additions:

- a. *The new structure exhibits the general size, shape, and scale of the features associated with the property or district.*

The north façade addition is symmetrical and uniform, and recessed from both the east and west facades of the house. The height is also limited to avoid engaging with, and to promote visibility of, the existing historic roofline. It is also confined to the footprint of the existing non-historic garage. In these ways, the addition respects the general size, shape, and scale of the historic house.

- b. *The site plan exhibits the general site characteristics associated with the property or district.*

The addition to the north façade avoids placing building mass in the area between the primary residence and the coach house, thereby maintaining the historic sense of building placement. It also avoids placing building mass in the south yard, which is over-sized, but is part of the original setting for the house. The below grade improvements are designed to maintain the historic setting as well.

- c. *The design respects the general historic and architectural characteristics associated with the property or district in general character, color, and texture.*

The addition to the north façade provides a symmetrical, uniform addition that respects the overall massing and shape of the historic primary residence. The proposed Chicago common brick is consistent with the tertiary nature of the north façade.

- d. *The materials are compatible with the existing structures in the district in general character, color, and texture.*

The use of Chicago common brick on the north façade will match the brick material used for the north façade changes in 2009. The use of Chicago common material further denotes the addition as a tertiary façade and differentiated from the red face brick of the primary and secondary facades.

- e. *In the case of additions, the addition is so connected to the property that it does not adversely alter, change, obscure, damage, or destroy any significant critical features.*

The north façade addition is recessed from the east elevation to promote visibility of the historic coach house and to maintain the original character of a primary residence with smaller coach house. The north façade addition is recessed from the west elevation to promote visibility of the historic west façade. Both recesses, and the limited height, coupled with the use of Chicago common brick matching the 2009 north façade changes, as well as the placement on the interior side lot line, over the non-historic garage, clearly sets the addition apart from the historic improvements, but in a way that minimizes the addition's visibility, conveys its subservience to the historic building, and maintains the original character of the historic residence.

The north façade addition will obscure visibility of the 2009 addition that inappropriately engaged, mimicked, and altered the historic roofline. In this way, the north façade will improve visibility of the historic elements.



- f. *In the case of minor alterations to non-contributing buildings, minor alterations compatible with the architectural character of the existing building shall be deemed to not have an adverse effect on the significant historical or architectural features of the landmark.*

The property does not include any non-contributing buildings.

8. *The work will alter a non-contributing building in a landmark district, meets the established criteria, standards, and guidelines of the Commission, and will not otherwise have an adverse effect on the significant historical or architectural features of the landmark district.*

The proposed work does not involve work to non-contributing buildings.

9. *The work otherwise meets the Commission's criteria, standards, and guidelines and will not have an adverse effect on the significant historical or architectural features.*

The Commission's other criteria, standards, and guidelines are addressed elsewhere in these findings, and the foregoing findings constitute the Permit Review Committee's finding that the proposed work will not have an adverse effect on the significant historical or architectural features.

### **C. Commission on Chicago Landmarks Guidelines for Alterations to Historic Buildings and New Construction**

1. *ADAPTIVE REUSE. The Secretary of the Interior's Standard Number One states: "A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics [that is, significant historical or architectural features] of the building and its site and environment." Adapting the use of a building from retail to residential or vice versa, for instance to meet new needs has played a significant role in preserving historic structures. The Commission has no jurisdiction over the use of a property; land use is regulated by the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Chicago. However, the rehabilitation of a property to accommodate a new use does fall within the Commission's purview of seeking to preserve and enhance its significant features. As an example, in adapting a storefront structure to residential use, a significant architectural feature, namely the configuration, design and material of the storefront, must be retained despite the new residential use. Design solutions for adapting buildings to different uses must provide for the retention and rehabilitation of significant features.*

The proposed work will restore the historic use of the property as a single-family residence.

2. *ADDITIONS. Working within the existing envelope of an historic structure in order to accommodate space needs is always preferable to building an addition. Additions will be allowed only if they do not alter, change, obscure, damage, or destroy any significant features of the landmark or district. Of particular concern are the effects of an addition on a building's historic relationship to its site; on a building's size, shape, and roof line; and on individual design details, elements, or materials which constitute all or part of a building's significant features. If an addition is appropriate, its design will be guided by the criteria for new construction (see "New Construction").*

The proposed additions are necessary to accommodate the homeowner's large family. The proposed additions will not alter, change, obscure, damage, or destroy any significant features. The addition to the north facade is recessed from the east and west facades, and is limited in height, to maintain visibility of the historic features, including the historic roofline. The north facade addition is confined to the footprint of the non-historic garage, and is placed along an interior side lot line. The placement, size, and recesses of the north facade addition, combined with the use of Chicago common brick matching the 2009 non-historic changes, maintain the building's historic relationship to the Hoyne and Schiller frontages, and to the historic coach house. The north facade addition will promote visibility of

historic features by obscuring the 2009 addition that engaged, modified, and mimicked the historic roofline.

3. *AWNINGS AND CANOPIES. Traditionally, awnings and canopies have been used to shelter people and buildings from the summer sun and inclement weather. They are two elements of a larger passive system, which includes blinds, shutters, interior transoms, and even trees and shrubs, which provided relief from excessive weather prior to the introduction of mechanical -6- ventilation and air-conditioning. Awnings and canopies are allowed on historic structures when they are appropriate to the building, employed for traditional reasons (shelter), and use traditional shapes, forms and materials. The overall size, shape, and projection from the building must be in proper proportion and scale to the building and be contained within the window or door opening that they shelter. They must not obscure or spread out over adjacent wall surfaces. In most instances, the only acceptable material for awnings and canopies is canvas; exceptions will be considered if appropriate for historic reasons. Signs or lettering should be kept to a minimum, most appropriately a street number on canopies. The addition of logos or names for business identification will be considered on a case-by-case basis, but in no case will they dominate the visual character of the awning or canopy to which they are attached. Awnings and canopies used for the sole purpose of advertising and unrelated to their functional purpose are not acceptable (see "Signs").*

The proposed work does not involve the installation of awnings or canopies.

4. *CLAPBOARDS. Many historic frame buildings are covered by newer, supposedly maintenance-free, synthetic siding. Hidden beneath asphalt or asbestos shingles and, more recently, aluminum or vinyl siding are often the original wood clapboards or shingles, corner boards, and accompanying trim that are critical features of frame construction. Often this original material is in good-to-excellent condition, although in need of paint. Original siding must be retained and repaired rather than replaced with new material where restoration is feasible. Where original elements have been removed and replacement is necessary, the size and proportions of the missing elements must be duplicated. The outlines of missing pieces can often be deduced from the markings these materials have left on the underlying sheathing boards, from old photographs, or from similar structures in the area which have retained their original materials. When restoring recently uncovered wood, it is important to allow the old wood to weather somewhat before refinishing. Three or four months of exposure prior to painting will allow for much greater adhesion of paint to the wood surface and reduce the potential for paint failure. Aluminum, vinyl, or other non-traditional siding materials are not appropriate for historic structures. Aside from aesthetic and historical reasons, synthetic sidings, because they are impermeable, can foster beneath their surfaces serious material and structural decay, which being out of sight, goes uncorrected. This unchecked damage can have serious and expensive consequences (see "Millwork").*

The project does not have any original siding to be maintained nor does it propose the use of any synthetic or non-traditional material cladding or conceal any original wood cladding elements. As the design is finalized, we will continue to work with City Landmarks to ensure that all materials are appropriate.

5. *CURB CUTS. Accommodating cars in historic districts presents a serious threat in maintaining the ambience of such neighborhoods. Most city blocks, however, were built with alleys which allow for access to the rear of the lot where barns or coach houses were built; now garages can be located there. New curb cuts along street frontages to allow for parking in the front of the property, or driveways leading to the side or rear yard, are not acceptable in historic districts where curb cuts are not characteristic of the original development. Such cuts erode the historic pedestrian scale and character of districts. In addition, they exacerbate the parking problem by removing curb side parking spaces.*

The proposed work does not propose any new curb cuts along street frontages. New vehicular access to the property will be provided to the coach house via the adjacent public alley.

6. *DEMOLITION. The purpose of designating landmark districts is to conserve the historic building stock and encourage maintenance, repair, and restoration. Demolition is not a means toward this end. The Commission recognizes that in a few RARE situations demolition may be acceptable when a structure does not contribute to the landmark qualities and character of a district or is an intrusion on that character. Also, a building may be damaged beyond any reasonable means of repair. The criteria established to evaluate demolition applications are included in the Commission's Rules and Regulations, as are criteria for considerations of economic hardship.*

The proposed work does not involve demolition of contributing structures.

7. *ENTRANCES. Houses in Chicago's older inner city districts typically were set on high bases. Often a full story above grade, the entrance to the main floor was reached by a broad staircase. This main floor is often considered the second floor today, the staircase having been removed and the entrance relocated to street level. Removing staircases to relocate the entrance is not appropriate. When planning rehabilitation work on houses where this significant feature has been removed, consideration should be given to restoring the main floor entrance and staircase (see "Millwork" and "Stairs").*

The proposed work retains the existing entrances and entrance stairs.

8. *EXCAVATIONS. Owners are sometimes prompted to excavate front yards in order to provide additional light, ventilation, or patio space for ground floor/basement apartments. These excavations are inappropriate and destroy the historic relationship of a building to its site and the street. Front yard excavations are not permitted in historic districts. However, where original light wells or service courts exist and are significant features of the original design, they must be retained.*

The proposed work involves excavation to create below grade spaces and a terrace in front of the new glass connector. These excavations retain the existing layout of the yard spaces, do not change the historic relationship of the buildings to the site, and will be minimally visible.

9. *FENCES. In most of Chicago's historic districts, front yard fences were used for ornamental effect rather than security. Often no more than a low stone curb edged the front yard along the sidewalk, demarcating private from public property. Fences were generally composed of ornamental iron pickets between cast-iron posts, seldom more than three feet high. Most of these fences no longer survive; where they do, it is important to repair and maintain them. New fences should be designed to complement the character of the property to be enclosed. In most cases, they should be three feet or less in height and of simple design. Solid walls of masonry or wood and tall metal fences are almost always inappropriate and will not be approved.*

No new fencing is proposed for the project. The original, historic metal fence was significantly restored as part of the 2009 project and will be maintained.

10. *INAPPROPRIATE CHANGES MADE IN THE PAST. Many buildings have been altered over time; often these alterations represent inappropriate changes. When rehabilitation work is being undertaken, consideration should be given to removing inappropriate additions and changes, restoring the building to its original design and character. Existing situations that are inappropriate may be maintained if no substantial work is to be undertaken on them. However, existing changes that are inappropriate may not be retained if they are to be rebuilt or substantially altered.*

The addition to the north façade constructed in 2009 inappropriately engages, modifies, and mimics the historic roofline. It is impractical to remove this alteration. However, the proposed north façade addition will obscure the 2009 addition and, thereby, promote visibility of the historic features.

11. *MILLWORK. The manufacture of doors, sashes, moldings, and other wood products (millwork) relied almost exclusively on solid lumber prior to World War II. Using tools and -8- techniques developed by woodworkers over hundreds of years, a seemingly endless variety of moldings, paneling, and trim evolved. Anyone who has ever tried to match a molding or a paneled door is all too aware of the choices. Intricate millwork can be found on even the simplest nineteenth-century cottage, and millwork design and craftsmanship is often the most significant architectural feature of a house. Every effort should be made to maintain and repair original millwork: stripping off successive layers of paint to reveal detail; regluing panels and frames; consolidating deteriorated wood; replacing worn parts, such as an overabundance of holes left by previous door locks and handles, by splicing in new wood (a "dutchman"); and properly finishing with a protective coat of paint or varnish can restore unique but seemingly irretrievable millwork to most houses (see "Clapboards").*

Where existing historic doors, sashes, moldings exist all efforts to restore and reuse them will be made. Where items are replaced, they will be done so in a historically-sensitive manner to maintain the historical look and feel of these elements.

12. *NEW CONSTRUCTION. Some historic districts provide an opportunity for new construction. Dealing sensitively with the district's historic resources is of critical importance when designing infill buildings. The Commission encourages good contemporary design that respects the district's existing architectural and historic qualities, but does not necessarily replicate historic designs. Of particular concern are the issues of siting, size, shape, scale, proportion, materials, and the relationship of these to the prevalent character of the immediate neighbors and the district. Replication of original designs may be appropriate in some cases, for example, in replacing a missing unit in a group of row houses.*

The proposed work constitutes work to contributing buildings. Therefore, this standard does not apply.

13. *PAINT. Because a permit is not required, painting and paint color do not fall within the Commission's jurisdiction. However, paint can have a profound effect upon the appearance of a building and an impact on neighboring buildings. A few words of caution: masonry buildings should not be painted. Aside from the fact that historically they were rarely painted, painting a masonry building creates a continuing maintenance problem. Painting seals an otherwise porous material, trapping moisture in the masonry; once painted, periodic repainting is required. On the other hand, wood and metals other than lead and copper should be well protected by a good coat of paint. What color to paint a building is a more subjective matter. Many paint manufacturers today market appropriate period colors. It is also possible through paint analysis to determine the original colors used on a building. Duplicating the original colors through analysis is the preferred choice. The Commission's staff can assist property owners in determining original colors.*

The project does not propose to paint the historical brick. New exterior paints and colors will match the existing historically appropriate colors that exist on the house today.

14. *PORCHES. Front porches range in design from the common stoop to elaborate three-dimensional constructions, distinguished by their architectural style and craftsmanship. Original porches should be preserved through vigilant maintenance and repair because they are, more often than not, built of materials and in shapes and forms more susceptible to weathering than the buildings to which they are attached. Also, porches are decorative rather than strictly functional features and were never enclosed. They did not function as storm vestibules; most nineteenth-century houses have entrance foyers which serve this function. Front porches should not be enclosed. Erecting a new porch may or may not be appropriate depending on the design and character of the house. New porches, where appropriate, should be designed to be complementary, replicating the size, shape, and forms of the original porch.*

The proposed work retains existing historic porches.

15. *RAISING STRUCTURES. Enlarging buildings by raising them and adding a new first floor was common at one time. Many of the cottages in the Old Town Triangle District, for example, were originally one and one-half stories high and set on wood pilings which were later replaced by masonry ground floor foundations, thus making them two and one-half stories high. Despite the historic precedents, raising structures in historic districts today is no longer appropriate because their existing condition is the historic one which the landmark designation seeks to conserve.*

The proposed work does not involve raising structures.

16. *ROOFS. Roofs and roof lines are major elements which give buildings their picturesque silhouettes and characterize many of the building types and architectural styles of the late nineteenth-century. The gable roof of the frame cottages with which Chicago was rebuilt immediately after the fire of 1871 gives to them their characteristic shape. Alterations to historic roofs and roof lines are inappropriate. Additions to roofs that change characteristic roof shapes and lines will not be approved (see "Additions"). City houses, because they are not freestanding in a landscape, tend to have simplified roof lines; however, even the flat roof of the typical city house can be a most telltale feature. Its street face, the ubiquitous cornice of brackets, rosettes, and dentils, identifies its architectural style even if all other design elements are nondescript. A variety of gables, dormers, turrets, mansards, and more elaborate roof forms are found in the city. Roof shapes and materials are highly exposed to the elements. Good maintenance and repair are essential, particularly since many historic materials are today very expensive or more difficult to obtain. Materials such as copper and slate have extremely long life-spans when properly maintained: their use is often decorative, with the bulk of the roof not being visible and made of less expensive materials. If these materials deteriorate beyond repair, they must be replaced. Man-made products that approximate the texture, scale, and color of natural materials are available to a limited extent, but it is always better to replace with the original materials.*

As the new north addition will be held below the roof and cornice line of the house, it is not anticipated that any new roofing of the primary house will be required.

As part of the dormer and cornice restoration of the coach house, new roofing will be required here. The intent of the project is to restore the roofline, cornice, and roof materials to the largest extent possible, to their historic configurations and using historically contextual materials and profiles.

17. *SANDBLASTING. The use of sandblasting or other abrasive and/or corrosive methods to clean buildings of paint or accumulated grime is not allowed. These methods destroy materials by eroding their hard exterior surfaces, exposing their softer interiors which are then subject to accelerated deterioration. There are acceptable alternatives to sandblasting for cleaning masonry, such as chemicals or water.*

The proposed work does not involve sandblasting. Cleaning methods will be subject to further review and approval.

18. *SIGNS. The Commission recognizes the need for commercial establishments to advertise. Such advertising has a long and rich history in America, one that has at times elevated the sign board to an art form. Conversely, signs on landmarks or in landmark districts can be a source of visual clutter when the effectiveness of the sign is equated with its size and flashiness, rather than its compatibility to the historic architectural character of the landmark or district. A sign's location, size, material, and means of illumination are areas of concern. Storefront structures often were designed to accommodate signs. The appropriate location in these cases is the one originally intended: typically for nineteenth-century buildings, this is the horizontal band above the storefront windows and below the second-story windows. In cases where the original sign location is not evident, the best location, and most likely the intended one, is within the glazed -10- area of the storefront window so that the*

*building frames the storefront without being obscured. Signs should be mounted parallel to and flush with the plane of the storefront. Signs projecting over the sidewalk, perpendicular to the storefront, will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Bigger is not better when it comes to the size of the sign. The sign should be of a size appropriate and proportional to the storefront and building on which it is located. Traditional materials wood, metal, paint are preferred materials. Historically, most business signs were silver- or gold-leafed, or painted letters on glass. Lighting for signs should be external; signs should not be light boxes. Lighting elements such as neon tubing and exposed bulbs will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Awnings and canopies are not appropriate places for advertising (see "Awnings").*

The proposed work involves a residential use. This criterion is not applicable.

19. *STAIRS. As previously stated under "Entrances," many Chicago houses are set on high bases and are reached by broad, tall staircases that are a characteristic feature of their design. Although some houses, particularly more elaborate ones, have stone stairs, most have stairs built of wood treads with closed wood risers. The staircase may or may not be enclosed below to provide basement access and storage. Because wood is readily subject to deterioration, proper maintenance is important in prolonging the life of wood elements. Replacing wood stairs with concrete or other materials is inappropriate. Replacement must be in kind. Stair railings typically were bent pipe rails with cast-iron newels and balusters. These features must be retained where they survive. New railings, if needed, should match the original rail system in design.*

The proposed project does not alter any of the exterior stairs or entrances into the primary house nor the doorway and stoop on the south façade into the coach house.

20. *WINDOWS. Windows are frequently the most difficult aspect of any rehabilitation project. The first and best answer to the question of how to treat windows is not to replace them but rather to retain and repair the existing sash and frames. Where this is not possible, replacing only deteriorated parts of a new sill or a sash for instance is preferable to total replacement. If total replacement is unavoidable, the replacement windows must match the historic windows in design and operation, material, glass size, muntin arrangements, profiles, and trim such as brick mold and sill. Seemingly minor changes in these elements can greatly alter the appearance of an historic building.*

*Often, window replacement is dictated by concerns for energy conservation, particularly replacing single-glazed sash with double-glazed sash. A wide variety of double-glazed units are available, some designed especially for historic buildings. However, properly weather-stripped, single-glazed sash can greatly reduce or eliminate air infiltration between sash and frame where most energy is lost. The cost of weather stripping is nominal compared to the price of replacement windows, yet the effect can be considerable.*

All windows subject for replacement are existing non-historical additions to the structures. All new windows – within the north addition and the coach house – will match historic profiles, design, operation, and materiality.