

**From:** [David Mc Lean](#)  
**To:** [Bailey, Heather](#); [Heiser-Ertel, Lauren](#)  
**Subject:** July 26th LMC meeting: comments for Legistar 66291 101 N Hamilton St.  
**Date:** Monday, July 26, 2021 4:43:57 PM

---

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

To the Landmarks Commission,

Sorry I cannot attend this evening's meeting. Thanks in my absence, please accept this email as comments to the proposed alterations to 101 N. Hamilton St. Also, apologies for any typos or grammar, as I am trying to compose this on a phone while on the road. Thank you for including my comments into tonight's meeting records.

Per the applicants design proposal, at this point in time I would refer the applicant to a future date, per city staff report Analysis and Conclusion and Recommendations. In addition, I have additional comments to reiterate some of items noted in the city report.

Windows on the second floor should not be as large or larger than the first floor storefront windows. This is not a period appropriate design. The rhythm of solids to voids will be disproportionate to the original building design. Additionally, as the Mifflin St. facade has never been the primary facade, it should be treated as a secondary facade and not be as heavily fenestrated as the historically primary facade.

Paint on a sandstone building is never a good idea. Exterior sandstone walls from this time period were of mass wall construction, and not in any way similar to contemporary rain-screen assemblies. The masonry mass walls from the past would naturally take on water as they became saturated, and would also then wick out the water as they dried. With the exterior surface being covered in paint (a material that is supposed to protect surfaces from moisture), any moisture that finds its way past the painted surface (gap in sealant, chipped paint, crack in mortar, bad flashing detail, etc.) will be trapped behind the paint and will exacerbate, and potentially accelerate, the deterioration of the sandstone facade. As I realize the facade is already painted, please take note that the current paint color is similar to sandstone. I guess the reason for the current paint color is because there is continuous chipping and spalling of the facade which then pops off the paint. As sandstone stone is not an ideal substrate for paint to begin with, when applied to an exterior sandstone that will take on water, the dark paint will pop off and leave blotches of sandstone, or the previous paint color, exposed.

The proposed higher base, along Mifflin St., is not appropriate to this building. The existing base is positioned on the elevation because it demarcates the ground floor level. As Hamilton slopes away from the first floor entrance, it may have the appearance of a high base, but it still demarcates the first floor elevation. "Turning the corner" with a detail that has significance to the building's composition, into a new detail that is placed arbitrarily along the Mifflin St. elevation, takes away from the architectural language that is read from the building's exterior.

Along with the comments within this email, I also fully support Staff comments and direction given within the report.

Hope all goes well tonight. Look forward to seeing this project in a revised proposal in the near future.

Sincerely,  
David WJ Mc Lean