



**Request for City Council Committee Action
From the Department of Community Planning & Economic Development**

Date: February 23, 2005

To: Council Member Gary Schiff, Chair of Zoning and Planning Committee

Prepared by: Greg Mathis, Senior Planner, CPED-Planning (612) 673-2439

Presenter(s) in Committee: Greg Mathis

Approved by: Steve Poor, Zoning Administrator _____

Subject: Appeal by Scott Walters Construction and Robert Wengler of a decision of the Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission

Previous Directives: At a public hearing on February 8, 2005, the Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC) voted to deny a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace an historic porch with a new porch of a non-historic design

Financial Impact (Check those that apply)

No financial impact

Community Impact

Ward: 6

Neighborhood Notification: Stevens Square

City Goals: Consistent with "Preserve and enhance our natural and historic environment and promote a clean, sustainable Minneapolis."

Comprehensive Plan: Consistent

Zoning Code: Section 599.120 authorizes the Heritage Preservation Commission to hear and decide applications for certificate of appropriateness" and Section 599.350 requires "the commission make findings that the alteration will not materially impair the integrity of the landmark, historic district."

Background/Supporting Information:

Scott Walters Construction and Robert Wengler, the property owner, has filed an appeal of the decision of the HPC. At a public hearing on February 8, 2005, the HPC denied a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace an historic porch with a new porch of a non-historic design.

Attached are copies of the original staff report and draft minutes from the February 8, 2005, Heritage Preservation Commission meeting are respectfully submitted for the consideration of your Committee.

RECOMMENDATION: To adopt the Heritage Preservation Commission findings and deny the appeal to allow an historic porch to be replaced by a new porch with a non-historic design.

Attachments

1. Appeal of the decision of the HPC application form
2. Excerpts from the draft minutes from the February 8, 2005 HPC meeting
3. Staff report for 1700 Third Avenue South, dated February 2, 2005
4. Original Certificate of Appropriateness application form

ATTACHMENT 2

EXCERPTS FROM THE DRAFT FEBRUARY 8, 2005 HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

PERMIT REVIEW/PUBLIC HEARING

Item for Public Hearing

- 1. 1700 Third Avenue South, Amos B. Coe House, Individual Landmark, by Scott Walters Construction, for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter a side porch. (Staff, Greg Mathis)**

Mr. Mathis presented the staff report recommending that the HPC adopt staff findings, deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work and direct the applicant to comply with the Certificate of No Change that was approved by staff on August 1, 2004.

Commissioner Neiswander asked why the applicant was coming before the HPC now. Mr. Mathis explained that staff approved repairing the porch in-kind, which meant that they should have kept the 28" guard rail and the turned spindle balustrade, replicating the existing appearance as it was before. Instead, they changed the appearance by installing taller, solid wood panels that changed the proportions of the porch, and staff cannot sign off on that type of change. Staff can only sign off on repairs that are in-kind.

Commissioner Anderson questioned the height standards required on private property for railings. Mr. Mathis explained that the current code calls for a minimum height of 36", but there is an historic preservation building code that allows them to repair or replace in kind. Building something new would require bringing it up to code, but there is an historic exception that allows you to do something shorter.

Commissioner Larsen inquired as to the why the front porch was allowed to be constructed in a similar manner with the tongue and groove paneling. He asked if it was not that way at some prior time and if it was better to have things that match or things that do not. Mr. Mathis explained that there were numerous revisions made to the front porch over time. The original front porch had a hip roof design with the projected gable entry, swooping handrails, which he thought were 17" to 20" inches tall. At some time in the 1910s it was converted to a new design with a new roof line, the handrails changed to a consistent height all the way across the porch. It was changed again and he showed a picture prior to when they started work on it in 2003. It had been revised again the turned columns were replaced with square columns and the solid spandrels with screens behind were added. When he looked at it in 2003, he thought it probably could not go back to a 17" high railing because there would be some safety issues and since there was a precedent for doing a solid spandrel design on the front porch, the Commission allowed it again on the front porch.

Commissioner Larsen asked what the reasoning was not have them (porches) match. Mr. Mathis explained that the whole intent of the design guidelines is typically to try to maintain the historic character of the building whenever possible and to allow for changes that are needed as long as they are consistent with the character of the building. What happened here is that there was a side porch that did have historic character and the applicant wanted to go ahead and change it to match the front porch, which is a non-historic feature, so it was a matter from going from an historic character to trying to match something that is clearly a modern interpretation of the front porch.

The public hearing was then opened.

Scott Walters, the applicant, said that when he became involved one of the first things he had to do was to call for a framing inspection of the east facing porch, the one that was approved. The inspector told him that the permit had been revoked because of the length of time between when it was issued and also because he was a new contractor. The north facing porch was already demolished, nothing was there. There were 2 x 10's holding up the roof at the time. There was no other indication of a porch other than the start of some digging for some footings. Knowing that he would be repairing or replacing both porches his application was for both applications at that time. The drawings for both porches had the foot print of the porches and the description of the baluster system, the post, the ladder rails and everything else as it pertains to the east facing porch, the one that was approved. Both footprints for the north and the east are on the print. The only stamp that he could go off of said to replace in-kind, but he had nothing in kind out there. His assumption was that since the architect designed the east porch as a Queen Anne style porch with lots of detail that replacement in-kind meant that the north porch would also be replicated like the east porch. He called that an error on his part. Not knowing that they were supposed to duplicate something he had never seen before, nor had anything to go off of. The porch is completed in a Queen Anne style and he thought it looked fabulous and went well with the other porch. HE said Mr. Mathis was figuring that each porch had to be done differently, but the east porch is completed. There is a smaller porch between the east and the north facing porch that he replicated in-kind to what was there because they found the parts and it has a swooping hand rail. The north and the east are visually obscured from each other, they are not on the same visual plane to a large degree, but at the right angle you can see them both. There will be a fourth porch on the back that will be entirely different and have the lower hand rail and everything else. At the time of construction with permits stamped to replace in-kind is the only thing he had to go off of.

Commissioner Messenger asked Mr. Walters if he had talked with the owner about the porch since the property owner should have been aware that there was a different design for the north porch than there was for the front porch. Mr. Walters said he assumed that they were the same. There was a conversation because the turned posts that are there take months to get in and cost hundreds of dollars, so he had to let the owner know what he was ordering at the time. They ordered the materials for the east facing porch first, the second porch later. The billing would come for what is ordered. Mr. Walters explained that he never stated that he was assembling the north porch in the same manner as he was assembling the front porch.

He did not directly state that to him, but it was assumed with the blue prints he had available to him.

Commissioner Messenger inquired if Mr. Walters ever saw the staff reports or any of the photographs that were in the staff report and the application. Mr. Walters stated that he never saw a photograph of the north facing porch, but he had seen photographs of the east facing porch. Never one specific to the north porch before it was demolished.

Robert Wangler, the owner of the house, stated that the history of the house goes back a long way. The house was condemned in the 1980's and a gentleman by the name of Carl Lundschaft who was a voice at WCCO saved the house from the wrecking ball back in the 1980's and began the historic restoration. Mr. Lundschaft thought he would be with WCCO forever and unfortunately he was not when New Yorkers bought WCCO. He bought the house from Mr. Lundschaft in 1990 and did a historical restoration on the carriage house which was the property in the back of the house. He began restoration on the main house about four years ago. On the outside, the main house was a disaster, the porches were falling. The house is on the corner of 17th Street and 3rd Avenue which is the cornerstone of Avenue of the Arts. As you come across the new bridge, this is the first property that you see. It is going to be a beautiful spot when people go up to the Art Institute and the first house that they see is a restored mansion. Mr. Walters is the second contractor, the first person was a reputable contractor/historical developer and he spoke a good line. They were in front of the HPC a year ago December, at which time all this was approved. He thought every thing was copasetic. The manager for the previous contractor had a nervous break down and he left the project, then the owner of the company just left. He had a bad time finding the papers and getting everything together. He finally got a hold of Mr. Walters, who was very gracious and kind to pick up the pieces and start working on this thing. The north porch was falling off. He did not know how anybody had a clear idea on what this porch was to look like, it was in a state of disrepair, it was falling off, rotting wood, etc. The character of the porch has not changed contrary to what staff has said. It is not a closed porch, it remains an open porch; it always has been an open porch and Mr. Walters did a beautiful job putting this thing back together. It is sturdy and safe for the people that are living upstairs. These are works of art. It has all been done by hand and fabricated, if there are some changes with respect to the historical nature of this place. He is not a developer and his resources are limited. He has spent a lot of money on this house and the restoration and it is still not done. He cannot see himself taking the porch apart and putting it back together to meet what he thought were whimsical changes in the historical character of the house. People in the neighborhood say it is beautiful and have applauded him and they have come up and congratulated him and Mr. Walters. They are still in the process of redoing the brick and retuckpointing the whole house, making it a real piece of art. He is asking for a break and not make him tear down the porch. He already has a half million dollars into the restoration of just the main house alone.

No one wished to speak for or against the application. The public hearing was then closed and Commissioner comments taken.

Commissioner Herman said she felt the porch looked perfectly fine the way it was constructed. It might not be perfect from the standing point of what was in place prior, but she would speak to allowing the porch to remain, and denying the staff findings in terms of changes that they might be calling for.

Commissioner Koski asked if she was making a motion. Commissioner Herman replied that it could be a motion. Commissioner Koski then asked for a point of clarity from staff on if the HPC did want to allow the existing porch to remain, what kind of a motion would be needed. He wanted to know if there was an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Mathis explained that the HPC would need to adopt findings to support the action and make a motion to adopt findings supporting what it was the Commission wanted to do.

Commissioner Herman offered the following findings: 1) Despite the fact the HPC had approved an initial design, given what had happened to create a porch that was in keeping with the historical character of the building. 2) The applicant had created a porch that was historically complimentary to the property. 3) It was not necessary to remove the porch and reconstruct it based on the Commission's original findings.

Commissioner Herman then commented that the porch as it has been built should be approved by the committee.

MOTION by Commissioner Herman to **adopt** her findings and **approve** a Certificate of Appropriateness for the alterations to the side porch. **SECOND** by Commissioner Neiswander.

Commissioner Messenger stated that she would not be able to support the motion, but she would support the staff recommendation. She thought the applicant had a significant amount of time to look at the recommendations by the staff. It seemed that there were many miscommunications, but coming back after the porch is built was frustrating. Additionally, she thought the porch that was built was in fact inappropriate for the house.

Commissioner Grover said he agreed with Commissioner Messenger's non-support for the motion. He stated that the changes that were made to the porch, when compared to the historic photo, were not whimsical, rather he thought they were very drastic. The character was changed to an enclosed porch by having a 36" tall wall. The historic balusters were much lower than what is there now. The porch was a porch you could see through, it was very open. The images of the new porch are very enclosed, it destroys the character of what the image of the house is, especially being that it is a gateway to the Avenue of the Arts. There are certain aspects that can be reworked with the current porch, but having it enclosed with the solid panels was very inappropriate.

Commissioner Larsen said he was concerned about which way to go. What bothered him was that the front porch was approved by the Commission and essentially that is what they recreated not only on the front porch but also on the north porch. In some ways he thought they were setting a second standard and wanted to know what was being gained or what the benefits were from removing one porch that matches another porch that was approved and

having two porches that did not look complementary. Commissioner Grover responded by pointing out that the owner had taken special care with the rest of the house. On the side porch on the second story, they did a careful restoration and kept the swooping balcony. When the applicant originally came to the HPC they stated that they would replace the north porch in-kind at that time. They understood the character of what they had to do. He thought that coming back and changing that, even though there was miscommunication, it was still understood it would be replaced in-kind. In response to the matching porches, he pointed out that there has been history over time on this building. He noted that the front porch had evolved, but that was before HPC had any purview over the property. By adding something that was never on this porch, this new character, this new feeling, it may match on the front porch, but it is very antithetical to what *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards* called for, which are what the Commission's guidelines for the City are based on. They are also used for National Register properties and historic properties across the country. They saying that the replacement of something with something that was never there is not appropriate.

Commissioner Anderson stated that she was not going to be able to support this motion. She noted that it was a handsome porch, but the Commission's responsibility is to keep the historical integrity of the building, not to determine if it was a good looking porch.

Commissioner Koski questioned the applicant and the evidence stated that there was no existing porch fabric to work off of since there were photographs of it in the packet. He wanted to know if there were any other architectural drawings or more recent photographs. Mr. Mathis stated that the 1990 photos were the most current photos that he could find. When the previous contractor disassembled every thing they put a lot of it into storage, so it was a matter of figuring out what went where when the contractor left the project and the new contractor came on board. He cannot say how much was still there since he cannot go out and look at a project every day. Commissioner Koski asked that if the current motion failed and another one was put forward and the staff recommendation was approved, what information did the applicant have to work from to recreate the historic character of this porch. Mr. Mathis indicated that he was not sure how much material was still on site. When he went to look at the rear porch in December, there were still pieces in the basement from the original porch that they used to guide the reconstruction work. He was not sure how much they can figure out, it depends on what is left of the north porch. The bigger question would be is it okay to go with the taller railing and maybe go with a balustrade as an acceptable alternative or is it okay to go with what they was proposed.

Commissioner Koski then asked if it was simply the guard rail that was being discussed. Mr. Mathis explained that all three porches on the house had a different design to them. The columns that have gone in already match the front porch. Biggest concern he has as staff is that they are going from this low balustrade that maintains the proportions of the porch and its open air character, to a much higher railing which throws the proportions off and creates a semi-enclosed private space versus the open, translucent space that it would have if it had a balustrade. He thought a compromise might be to do the balustrade versus the wood spandrels.

Commissioner Koski called a vote for the motion. **MOTION FAILED** by a vote of 3 – 5 with no abstentions.

MOTION by Commissioner Messenger to **adopt** staff findings, **deny** the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work, and direct the applicant to comply with the Certificate of No Change that was approved by staff last August. **SECOND** by Commissioner Anderson. **MOTION APPROVED** by a vote of 6 –2 with no abstentions.

Commissioner Nordstrom stated that it sounded like the primary concern was the balustrade and the hand rail. The height of the hand rail, the openings where the spandrels are now and making them spindles instead of spandrels. Mr. Mathis responded that these were the biggest visual changes.

Commissioner Herman said she needed a clearer sense of what was involved with reworking the porch to make the Commission happy, since the Commission denied the motion to leave it as it was. She also wanted to know how much expense was involved in doing that before she would agree to it. She understood that the Commission wanted to uphold the guidelines, but also felt that given the circumstances, that the porch that was constructed was well done, the materials are well rendered, she had a problem with it if it was going to be extremely expensive, given the amount of effort that the property owner and contractor have gone to. She wanted to know approximate costs. Mr. Walters responded that when discussing remodeling, consideration also must be made for the demolition of what is there. There are the turned posts which are a finished product and they would have to take them with care. The new spindles or balusters, they did not even know what they look like, he had never seen a picture of it. He did not know how to duplicate it, but he could reference the balusters that he did put on and those were quite expensive because they had to be turned on a lathe. The expense as far as what they were going to be seeing, he did not know the spacing of them. Code states that a 4” sphere cannot pass through at any given point, but code did not apply here. He had never seen a picture, so it is hard to put a cost on it. Any time they remodel something or reorder something and then the quantities of them and then the handrail profile which he cannot assume what it would be and did not think it can be told what it should be. The cost to do something like that is usually prohibitive if it did not have to be done, it is very expensive. It was duplicated to the best of his ability from the picture they had to go off of. He did not know what else he was supposed to do with the information provided.

Commissioner Larsen then asked Mr. Walters about the photograph that showed openings in the balustrade along the porch line. Mr. Walters said he had seen photograph, it was the photograph he had to go off of. On the north porch they duplicated the open handrail ascending up to the deck, it is open on the two sides to the top of the deck and then it is tongue and groove such as the East facing porch is. He said could not tell that it was open from the photograph.

Commissioner Anderson stated that the cost of all of this is not the Commission’s responsibility. She reminded the applicant that there was an appeal process and that HPC is only a commission that advises the City Council.

ATTACHMENT 3

CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

FILE NAME: 1700 Third Avenue South
DATE OF APPLICATION: January 7, 2005
APPLICANT: Scott Walters Construction
DATE OF HEARING: February 8, 2005
HPC SITE/DISTRICT: Amos B. Coe House, Individual Designation
CATEGORY: Contributing
CLASSIFICATION: Certificate of Appropriateness
STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Greg Mathis
DATE: February 2, 2005

A. SITE DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND:

The Amos B. Coe House is a 2½-story, Queen Anne style brick residence built in 1884 on the corner of Third Avenue South and East 17th Street. Constructed for Minneapolis real estate developer Amos B. Coe, the house features a multi-gable roof, limestone trim, decorative brickwork and one-over-one windows. The main entrance (east) is set in a large front porch with a hip roof. A small, second story balcony is located above the main entrance. A rectangular tower anchors the northeast corner of the house, facing the intersection. An Eastlake balcony is located next to the tower on the north elevation, along with a polygonal bay and a large side porch. The south elevation is defined by a massive chimney and a rectangular bay. A two-story, brick carriage house is located behind the house.

The front (east) porch has been altered several times over the past 120 years. This porch originally had a hip roof with a flat section surrounded by a balustrade, a projected gable entry, and guard rails that swooped down between turned columns. In the 1920s or 1930s the front porch was substantially rebuilt with a new roof line, straight (horizontal) guardrails and concrete steps flanked by knee walls. At a later date, the turned columns and spindle work balustrade were replaced by square columns and tongue and groove spandrels. On September 25, 2002, staff approved a Certificate of No Change (CNC), to allow a previous contractor to repair the front porch in-kind. As the contractor started to disassemble the porch, they determined that complete replacement was needed. On December 9, 2003, the Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC) approved a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow the front porch to be rebuilt in a manner that was similar to the original 1884 design, but with straight guardrails and tongue and groove spandrels in lieu of the original swooped guardrails and spindle work balustrade.

Unlike the front porch, the north side porch has remained relatively intact over time. In the summer of 2003, as the previous contractor started work on the front porch, the contractor

disassembled the north side porch. This work was done without HPC approval. When this contractor was replaced by the applicant in 2004, the north porch was still disassembled. On August 1, 2004, staff approved a CNC to allow the applicant to repair/rebuild this porch in-kind (see Attachment 1. However, instead of being rebuilt in-kind, with 28" tall guardrails and a spindle work balustrade, the porch was rebuild with 36" tall guardrails and the spindle work balustrade was replaced with solid tongue and groove spandrel panels that are similar to the front porch.

B. PROPOSED CHANGES:

The applicant is applying for a Certificate of Appropriateness for work that is partially completed. The proposal calls for rebuilding the north side porch to match the front porch. As proposed, the distinctive turned columns on the porch will be replaced with turned columns that match the columns that were used on the new front porch. The applicant is also proposing replace the 28" tall guardrails and the turned spindle balustrade with 36" tall guardrails with wood, tongue and groove spandrel panels that match the new front porch. The roof and spindle work frieze will be repaired/rebuilt in-kind as needed.

C. GUIDELINE CITATIONS:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION (1990)

Wood: *Clapboard, weather-board, shingles, and other wooden siding and decorative elements* **Recommended:**

-Identifying, retaining, and preserving wood features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as siding, cornices, brackets, window architraves, and doorway pediments; and their paints, finishes, and colors.

-Repainting with colors that are appropriate to the historic building and district.

Not Recommended:

-Using new colors that are inappropriate to the historic buildings or district.

-Using substitute materials for the replacement part that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the wood feature or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

Roofs

Recommended:

-Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs - and their functional and decorative features - that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. This includes the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features such as cupolas, cresting, chimneys, and weathervanes; and roofing material such as slate, wood, clay tile, and metal, as well as its size, color, and patterning.

-Replacing in kind an entire feature of the roof that is too deteriorated to repair - if the overall form and detailing are still evidence - using the physical evidence to guide the new work. Examples can include a large section of roofing, or a dormer or chimney. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

-Designing and constructing a new feature when the historic feature is completely missing, such as a chimney or cupola. It may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.

Not Recommended:

-Radically changing, damaging, or destroying roofs which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

-Changing the configuration of a roof by adding new features such as dormer windows, vents, or skylights so that the historic character is diminished.

-Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced feature is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.

Entrances and Porches

Recommended:

-Identifying, retaining, and preserving entrances - and their functional and decorative features - that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as doors, fanlights, sidelights, pilasters, entablatures, columns, balustrades, and stairs.

-Protecting and maintaining the masonry, wood, and architectural metal that comprise entrances and porches through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and re-application of protective coating systems.

-Evaluating the overall condition of materials to determine whether more than protection and maintenance are required, that is, if repairs to entrance and porch features will be necessary.

-Repairing entrances and porches by reinforcing the historic materials. Repair will also generally include the limited replacement in kind - or with compatible substitute material - of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of repeated features where there are surviving prototypes such as balustrades, cornices, entablatures, columns, sidelights, and stairs.

-Replacing in kind an entire entrance or porch that is too deteriorated to repair - if the form and detailing are still evident - using the physical evidence to guide the new work. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

-Designing and constructing a new entrance or porch if the historic entrance or porch is completely missing. It may be a restoration based on historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building.

Not Recommended:

-Removing or radically changing entrances and porches which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

-Stripping entrances and porches of historic material such as wood, iron, cast iron, terra cotta, tile and brick.

-Failing to provide adequate protection to materials on a cyclical basis so that deterioration of entrances and porches results.

-Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of historic entrances and porches.

-Replacing an entire entrance or porch when the repair of materials and limited replacement of parts are appropriate.

-Using a substitute material for the replacement parts that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the entrance and porch or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

-Removing an entrance or porch that is unrepairable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new entrance or porch that does not convey the same visual appearance.

-Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced entrance or porch is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.

-Introducing a new entrance or porch that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.

D. FINDINGS:

1. The Amos B. Coe House is an individually designated landmark property.
2. The north side porch is a character defining feature of the house.
3. The north side porch, as it existed at the start of 2003, had rotted wood that was deteriorated and in need of repair or replacement.
4. A previous contractor disassembled the north side porch in 2003 without HPC approval. Prior to its disassembly in 2003, the porch retained its historic design and appearance.
5. On August 1, 2004 the HPC staff approved a Certificate of No Change to allow the applicant to repair the north porch in-kind. However, the porch was not repaired in-kind, as approved by the Certificate of No Change.

6. The proposed work does not comply with the *Standard* that recommends “repairing entrances and porches by reinforcing the historic materials. Repair will also generally include the limited replacement in kind - or with compatible substitute material - of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of repeated features where there are surviving prototypes such as balustrades, cornices, entablatures, columns, sidelights, and stairs.” Additionally, the proposed work does not comply with the *Standard* that recommends “replacing in kind an entire entrance or porch that is too deteriorated to repair.”
7. The proposed work does not comply with the *Standard* that recommends against “removing or radically changing entrances and porches which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.”
8. The replacing a turned spindle balustrade with a tongue and groove spandrel panel does not comply with the *Standard* that recommends against “using a substitute material for the replacement parts that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the entrance and porch or that is physically or chemically incompatible.”
9. The proposed work and the new porch design will compromise the historic integrity and the architectural character of the property, and will convert the one-air porch into a semi-enclosed space. Moreover, the proposed design does not comply with the *Standards* that recommend against “removing an entrance or porch that is unrepairable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new entrance or porch that does not convey the same visual appearance” and against “creating a false historical appearance because the replaced entrance or porch is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.”

E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the HPC adopt staff findings, deny a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work and direct the applicant to comply with the Certificate of No Change that was approved by staff on August 1, 2004.