

From: [Rummel, Marsha](#)
To: [Scanlon, Amy](#)
Cc: stuartlevitan@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Landmarks 10/17/11
Date: Monday, October 17, 2011 1:42:38 AM

Plan Commission will be discussing the future of Garver Feed Mill so I am going to leave at 5:30 if we are not done at Landmarks. Plan Commission agenda should be short so I plan to attend Ald. Verveer's meeting on 100 blk State St.

Thank you for your staff report on 1112 Spaight. I appreciate your standard by standard review and I agree with your conclusions that the standards for demolition are not met. The applicants did all the correct things to have a meaningful process about their request to demolish this house. They conducted research and engaged a historically minded architect; contacted the alder early in the process; talked to nearby neighbors and neighborhood preservationists; attended the neighborhood association meeting; and held two open houses to tour the house. They were respectful and I felt sympathy for their quest. Most Orton Park neighbors supported them. But I was struck by one comment at the MNA meeting when the Board narrowly voted to oppose the demolition. A former Board member said he hoped the Sabatino's could find an existing Queen Anne in the neighborhood to purchase and love and he hoped someone else would buy 1112 Spaight, and appreciate it for what it is, a vernacular house that contributes to the historic district and give it the TLC it needs. I think that sums it up for me.

I found your explanation of roof pitch on item #2 and the fact that metal would not be installed on the main roof as reasons you believe the proposal meets the standard for CoA to be helpful, even persuasive. I am not aware of the use of metal roofs in TLRHD so I will be listening carefully to the Commission's discussion to help inform my final decision.

The Commission's recent discussion about reviewing our standards for vinyl siding has me questioning policy #3 under item #3: Residing with narrow gauge clapboard aluminum or vinyl to the extent mandated by the Landmarks Ordinance on the following conditions...[etc]. Perhaps the language covers future decisions we might make where not expressly permitted but I 'd like to wait until we have the joint review with UDC and either set this policy aside temporarily or remove the mention of vinyl and approve the rest.

If I have left before the demolition report comes up, I have no concerns with the demolition of 3210 Maple Grove Dr. On the question of the State St and W Mifflin St properties, I think we should report to Plan that Landmarks believes the buildings proposed for demolition at 120 and 122 W Mifflin are of interest and either are potentially eligible for local landmark or are in fact already landmarked and both would be contributing buildings for a State Street National Register Historic District if one were to be pursued. Partial demolition of 117, 121 and 127 State to restore facades to original condition would be a welcome investment in one of the most intact historic blocks of State St but facadomy is not a practice I support. The restoration of the terra cotta at 125 State, the Castle and Doyle building, sounds wonderful but again I would not support just restoring the facade and razing the back of the building. If it is appropriate, please urge the applicants to pursue the proposed facade improvements on the State St properties, if demolition is not permitted. This application is a great example of why the Commission needs photos that depict all sides of the building. We are not shown the rear of any of the buildings that front on State St.

See you later!

Marsha