

TEMPORARY HISTORIC DESIGNATION STUDY REPORT
LORENTZ / HARRIS PHARMACY BUILDING
2635-2637 WEST GREENFIELD AVENUE
MAY, 2018

I. NAME

Historic: LORENTZ / HARRIS PHARMACY BUILDING

Common Name:

II. LOCATION: 2635-2637 West Greenfield Avenue (also 1406 South Layton Boulevard)

Legal Description Tax Key No. 4591202000
MARK TYSON'S SUBD OF A PART OF LOT 1 ETC IN NW ¼ SEC 6-6-22 BLOCK 1
W 31.05' ON N LINE X W 31.37' ON S LINE LOT 3

III. CLASSIFICATION: Site

IV. OWNER: Notre Dame Middle School Inc.
1418 South Layton Boulevard
Milwaukee, WI 53215

ALDERMAN: Ald. Robert Donovan 8th Aldermanic District

NOMINATOR: John Sterr

V. YEAR BUILT: 1896 (Permit Records dated April 21, 1896)
Remodeled into current form 1931 (Permit Records dated July 16, 1931)

ARCHITECT: Charles L. Fiedler (1896)
Madson, Christenson, and Ingbretson (builders 1931)

NOTE: The building is a contributing property in the Layton Boulevard National Register Historic District listed April 24, 1996. Notre Dame Middle School's application for demolition prompted this nomination for Temporary Designation.

VI. PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION

THE AREA

The Lorentz / Harris Pharmacy Building is located at the busy traffic intersection of West Greenfield Avenue and South Layton Boulevard. Layton Boulevard is predominantly residential in character with single family houses and duplexes dating from the late 1880s through the 1920s. Residential design represents all the major architectural styles from Queen Anne to Prairie. In addition to the residences, there are four church complexes and a large convent for a religious order as well as a former hospital

associated with the convent complex. These institutions present a contrast to the low scale of the residential properties, and their steeples/towers are hallmarks along the boulevard.

Section lines used to divide property were always reserved for public thoroughfares and West Greenfield Avenue was no exception. It also had the distinction of forming the south city limits for many years in the 19th century. It became a major traffic arterial that later experienced significant commercial development. By 1890, a streetcar track had been laid along Greenfield Avenue to what was then the city limits at Layton Boulevard. At Greenfield's intersection with Layton Boulevard, there are commercial properties on both the northeast and southeast corners. West of Layton Boulevard, Greenfield becomes almost exclusively residential for many blocks.

Close to 20 different subdivisions comprise Layton Boulevard with the result that setbacks, building types, and lot sizes vary from block to block. Some blocks feature 45-foot wide lots while others are 30 foot wide. Some properties feature rear houses, generally a characteristic of the 1890s. The national park Subdivision, located between National Avenue and Greenfield Avenue along the west side of Layton Boulevard, appears to have been the only subdivision with consistent setbacks and other requirements imposed through deed restrictions.

For purposes of clarity, the large divided north/south boulevard that borders the west side of the nominated property will be referred to as Layton Boulevard in this text, the name by which it is known today. It originated as the Chicago and Green Bay Trail in the late eighteenth century, following a Native American footpath. It traversed the south side, plunged into the Menomonee Valley in the vicinity of Layton Boulevard and Mitchell Park then proceeded north to Green Bay. Other Indian trails from Mukwonago, Muskego, Prairieville (Waukesha) and Fond du Lac converged in this area as well, and at this strategic location fur trader Jacques Vieau set up one of the area's earliest trading posts and lived there part of each year from 1875 to the early 1800s. The cabin was already in ruins when the earliest permanent white settlers arrived in 1827 but the Vieau cabin site was commemorated by a replica cabin (now also gone) in Mitchell Park. It is now marked with a historical marker. During much of the 19th century Layton Boulevard was known as Washington Avenue and /or 22nd Avenue and formed the western city limits of Milwaukee. Annexation of land west of Layton Boulevard, the completion of the 27th Street viaduct across the Menomonee Valley and the efforts by the Milwaukee Board of Park Commissioners all came together to enable the long-awaited improvements to the thoroughfare. The City ordinance 118 officially changed the name of the thoroughfare to Layton Boulevard on December 6, 1909 following successful lobbying on the part of the South Division Civic Association. Frederick Layton had been an influential benefactor to the city and had held land on the south side. The boulevard designation extended from the viaduct to Lincoln Avenue. The viaduct opened to traffic on January 27, 1910. The plan to link Mitchell Park to the Kinnickinnic River Parkway to the south, below Lincoln Avenue did not materialize. But the resulting boulevard designation did much to attract a higher caliber of residential design as well as some significant religious institutions.

Since portions the west side of the boulevard were annexed between 1900 and 1903 and later, it remained an area characterized by agricultural use (significant celery fields) as well as private recreational parks. Greenfield Park, located at the southwest corner of Greenfield Avenue and Layton Boulevard was in operation from 1874 through 1886 when the School Sisters of St. Francis purchased the site to erect their convent complex, still extant today. National Park was located along the west side of Layton Boulevard between National Avenue and Greenfield and operated from 1883 to 1902. The presence of National Park in particular, could likely account for the commercial activity that was generated along Greenfield Avenue as it neared what would become Layton Boulevard.

BUILDING DESCRIPTION

The Lorentz / Harris Pharmacy Building is located at the southeast corner of West Greenfield Avenue and South Layton Boulevard. It is located to its lot line on both the front (north) elevation and west (Layton) elevation. To the east a school playground comes right up to the building. To the south or rear, there is a 10-foot area once designated for an alley. There are no plantings around the building.

The building is rectangular in shape and has an asphalt gabled roof with pan vents. It is clad in brick, the result of a 1931 remodeling that veneered over an existing frame building constructed in 1896.

The front elevation faces Greenfield Avenue and is 2 ½ stories tall with a storefront on the first story, three windows on the second and a Palladian window in the gable end, a survivor from the original building. The storefront retains its original center entrance but instead of being recessed, it is pulled out to the front wall of the building. The windows to either side now have three vertical panes of glass in each opening. The openings themselves have thin twisted colonettes that form the transition between the glass and the pilasters. The storefront wraps around the corner of Layton Boulevard. At each end of the storefront are fluted stone or cast stone pilasters with rectangular capitals that feature heraldic shield forms. Between the pilasters is decorative stone in the shape of a curvilinear arch with bold moldings and shield forms that are surrounded by scrolled foliate forms.

On the second story of the front elevation are three window openings each topped with stone lintels and marked with center keystones. The center opening is shorter than the other two and features diamond paned leaded glass casement windows. The flanking windows have taller casements also with diamond paned leaded glass. Each of the three windows sports a shallow iron balconet. The attic story features a Palladian window enframed with stone or cast stone. It is a holdover from the building's original design. The shaped, stone capped parapet features scrolls and stepped forms and rises to hide the gabled roof behind.

Set back from the front elevation is a shallow addition that features an arched entry at the first story, an arched window at the story and a tiled pent roof above that. Above the pent roof is a parapet wall rising to the height of the main building. The second story windows features diamond paned leaded glass and also has an ornamental iron balconet. This was built in 1931, as the rest of the remodel was occurring, to fill in the space between the Harris Pharmacy and the Rock-owned commercial building next door. It provided another set of stairs to the upper portion of the building. Permission was given by the H. J. Rock Agency to anchor the stair stringers to their building.

The west elevation fronting Layton is simpler in design. There are no window openings on the first story. The highlight is a three-sided bay or oriel window at the second story, another carryover from the original building. The bay features narrow one-over-one sash, paired in the larger center opening, singles in the sides. Recessed panels below each window opening have stucco. To the north is located an opening featuring one-over-one sash. To the south is one short window as well as a pair of windows. All windows have stone lintels with keystones and the paired windows feature a small iron balconet. A satellite dish is attached to the building adjacent to this balconet.

The rear of the building has a tall, slender exterior chimney that rises above the apex of the gabled roof. The first story to the right or east of the chimney has a rectangular entrance opening at the first story, a rectangular window with stone sill to its left, and two rectangular windows at the east corner of the building, one at grade and the other elevated above it midway between the first and second story. To the right of the chimney is a porch at the second story, supported on two-by-fours and featuring one over one sash and vinyl siding. The porch has a sloped roof. Hugging the chimney at the attic story is a small narrow window. All windows have stone sills. To the left of the chimney at the first story is an arched window with leaded glass featuring heraldic motifs. At the second story level are paired windows with one-over-one sash. To the left of this pair is a smaller window now filled in with glass block. At the attic story, is a small narrow window matching the one to the right of the chimney.

The east elevation has no features or openings. The surviving wall was once part of the adjacent Rock building and after the Rock Building's demolition, the surface was parged over.

From permit records as well as physical condition, the building has had very little change since 1931. The storefront glass has been replaced in 1979 and the rear second story porch was rebuilt in 1949.

HISTORY OF 2635-2637 WEST GREENFIELD

The subdivision in which the nominated building is located, Mark Tyson's Subdivision (platted in 1881) is bounded by Greenfield Avenue, West Orchard Street, South 23rd Street and South Layton Boulevard. It consisted of four blocks of mostly small lots, typically 30 feet wide by 140 feet deep. The block adjacent to South Layton Boulevard was different. It featured 3 very large lots fronting Layton each approximately 139/140 feet deep by 100 feet wide. There were 50 foot lots fronting Greenfield Avenue. The developer's intention seemed to be to reserve the Layton Boulevard frontage for large homes or perhaps institutions like churches. Likewise, the larger Greenfield Avenue lots were also bigger to attract commercial development. On June 24, 1883 a "Grand Auction Sale" of sixty lots in the subdivision, to take place on June 30th 1883, was advertised in the Milwaukee Sentinel. Sales were steady over the years. (Milwaukee Sentinel 1883, June 24 page 5)

As it turned out, a newly formed St. Lawrence Parish, established in the spring of 1888 with about 40-50 German Catholic families, would come to own and occupy the major portion of the block bounded by Layton Boulevard, West Greenfield Avenue, South 26th Street and West Orchard Street. Six lots were acquired on February 27, 1888, all located between Greenfield and Orchard. A church was built, dedicated on October 21, 1888, a rectory built in 1889 (Henry Messmer architect, later replaced in 1949), and a building repurposed from the St. Joseph Convent grounds was used as a school, enlarged with a two story addition in 1890. This early school fronted Greenfield Avenue and has been demolished. On January 1, 1903 St. Lawrence parish purchased two of the three large parcels fronting on Layton Boulevard. There had been 10 very modest cottages built on these parcels. When the original church was destroyed by fire on October 29, 1904, efforts were underway to construct an even larger church building, one fronting on Layton Boulevard. That new church resulted in the demolition of most of the small cottages. It was designed by E. Brielmaier & Sons and was dedicated on August 12, 1906. In 1911, a new 12-room school was built next door to the north (H. C. Hensel architect). (South Layton Boulevard National Register Nomination, Prepared by Carlen Hatala and Les Vollmert, listed in the National Register April 24, 1996; St. Lawrence Parish, St Lawrence 100 Years Community-Church-Christ [1888-1988]. No publisher, 1988)

The only parcel on the block not used by St. Lawrence Parish was the spacious Lot 3, located at the southeast corner of Greenfield and Layton Boulevard. It is the parcel in which our nominated building is located.

At some point after the Mark S. Tyson Subdivision was platted, Gerhard D. Basse acquired Lot 3. Deed research will be needed to pinpoint the exact date of purchase. Gerhard D. Basse (1844/1846 sources varied -1929) lived on South 5th Street and ran a real estate and insurance business, with partner Anton Grueninger as Basse & Grueninger. Their offices were also on South 5th Street. The business was later known as Basse & Co. with partners George Y. Porter and Victor Schuette.

Basse's family consisted of wife Dorothea and children Bertha, Leona, Gerhard A., Luella, Antoinette, Flora L., Carl J, and Fred W. The family home at 1513 South Fifth Street remained occupied by some of Gerhard's children into the 1950s.

In October of 1891 Basse sold the east most one-fifth of Lot 3 to Elizabeth Lauer for \$1,000. (Milwaukee Journal, 1891 October 19 page 5; Milwaukee Sentinel 1891 October 20 page 7) we know that shortly thereafter a frame building was constructed on the parcel. It was addressed as 1035 Greenfield. An H. Smith placed an ad in the papers looking for agents to represent the Acedick Remedy Company. His address was 1035 Greenfield. (Milwaukee Journal 1893 August 23 page 7) That same year, we know a William Lorentz was also an occupant in the building as he received his registered pharmacist license from the city at that address as reported in the Milwaukee Sentinel on December 12, 1893. He had moved here from a location on Muskego Avenue. (Milwaukee Sentinel 1893 December 12 page 3) So the building apparently had a pharmacy and offices on the premises as its earliest tenants. The Sanborn Fire Insurance Map of 1894 confirms this two-story frame building as housing a pharmacy as well. (Sanborn Fire Insurance Map 1894 Volume 3 Sheet 278)

It is not known at this time why the prime location at the southeast corner of Greenfield Avenue and Layton Boulevard had not sold earlier. Perhaps the price was not right. Perhaps Basse was holding out for something significant. Basse and his wife did eventually sell the west two fifths of Lot 3, at the corner, to Carl (Charles) L. Fiedler in 1895 for \$3,835, a high price reflecting its important location and larger size. (Milwaukee Journal 1895 August 15 page 3)

A building permit was subsequently taken out on April 21, 1896 to build a two-story wood frame store for \$2,500 at the corner. It would be addressed at 1053 Greenfield. The building had a post foundation and the architect and owner were both cited as C. L. Fiedler. William Weis was the builder. Interestingly, we know little about Fiedler. He is consistently listed as a clerk or bookkeeper in the city directories in the 1880s and is last shown in 1897. He apparently had no architectural background. He never occupied the building. Perhaps he was sold the property to facilitate its development and return it to Gerhard Basse.

The front gable Queen Anne style building that was constructed fronted on Greenfield Avenue, had a large storefront with recessed center entrance and three windows on the second story. A shallow shingled pent roof extended over the group of windows, marked by a center pediment. Above them at the attic story was a prominent Palladian window. A finial extended above the apex of the roof gable end. The first and second story are demarcated by a band of ornamental shingles that wrap around to the Layton Boulevard side and form the base of the second story oriel window. On the Layton Boulevard side the second story three-sided oriel window featured a gabled roof with lunette window in the gable end. Other windows are located at the second story. On the first story of the Layton Boulevard side is a small window and an entrance with awning. This entry likely led to the upper floor. A chimney pierced the roof near the rear of this west elevation. The historic postcard view showing the building would have been photographed after the current St. Lawrence church building was completed in 1906 and before the St. Lawrence School was built in 1911 in between the church and the corner building.

City directories and permits show that the building had a long history as a pharmacy, from the time of its completion to 1969 / 1970. Historically, pharmacies tended to be stable retail establishments with licensed proprietors who often ran their business at one location for many decades. Unlike saloons or other types of retail that had a lot of turnover in proprietorship, pharmacies were respected and became increasingly necessary businesses as the pharmaceutical industry grew and medicine found more cures and palliatives for various illnesses and diseases. They were a welcomed addition in a neighborhood. The fact that the subject building remains in excellent condition today speaks to its importance to the neighborhood and the careful stewardship of the property over time due to its consistent occupancy/ownership.

William Lorentz, the pharmacist who earlier occupied the building at the east end of Lot 3 moved his business to the new corner building at 1053 Greenfield in 1897. He remained there through 1906 and had lived upstairs from the pharmacy. Lorentz was a native of Germany, born in 1862, who came to the

US about 1885. His family consisted of his wife Carolina and son Irving. (US Census information 1910, Ancestry.com for William Lorenz, accessed on line May 11 and 14, 2018)

Lorentz moved to a new location a few blocks east at 509 19th Avenue (South 24th Street), at the corner of Greenfield Avenue in 1907.

In 1908 a new druggist is shown on the premises of 1035 Greenfield. His name was Albert Schellinger. He was a short term occupant and moved in 1909. He might have been the Albert Schellinger that received a pharmacist license in California in 1909. (Ancestry.com) That same year Frank A. Harris moved into the building, also operating a pharmacy. He would be the force behind the building we see today.

Like his predecessors at this location, Harris lived upstairs from the pharmacy.

Ownership of the building after its opening will have to be confirmed with deed research. Although we know the early occupants, the permit records show Charles Basse (son of Gerhard) as owner in 1902 (when William Lorentz was in the building) and underpinning the two-story building with a brick basement at a cost of \$600. John (Johann) Grzewski was the builder. (Permit records April 13, 1902) Basse may have sold the building to one of the later pharmacists, Schellinger or more likely, Frank A. Harris.

The Harris family is still being researched. Harris had ownership in 1931 when he petitioned the Board of Zoning Appeals to allow for the construction of a new three-story building that would feature a first story store, two second floor offices and two apartments and three apartments on the third. The size of the building exceeded the city's limits on lot coverage. The Board of Zoning Appeals held a hearing on May 5, 1931 and denied the variance. In their letter of May 11, 1931, BOZA indicated that the proposed building would cover 87% of the lot. Other information included in Harris's appeal indicated that the new building was designed by Schneider & Kuehnel, engineers.

Just two months after his denial for a new building, Harris took out a permit to remodel his existing pharmacy building. The permit, dated July 16, 1931, indicated that the building was five inches over the lot line and would be pulled back. The entire building would be brick veneered. An additional stairway would go at the rear. Inspector's notes indicate that the brick veneer was going up in August, the front was being worked on in September and that the building was considered complete on December 23, 1931. The project cost \$8,000. No architect was listed on the permit. Could it have been the Schneider & Kuehnel firm that had designed the proposed three story new building? Research is ongoing on this point. The prominent contracting firm of Madson, Christenson and Ingbretson are listed as the contractors for the remodel. Unfortunately, the City Records Center has no architectural plans surviving from the remodel. There are a few other avenues of research that are being followed and will continue should the Historic Preservation Commission grant temporary designation to the property.

An interesting note is that the H. J. Rock Agency, owner of the building next door to the east, built in 1924, gave permission for Harris to build a covered stair between their buildings and tie in the stair stringers to the Rock building. Permission for the parapet or top of the wall for this stairway to rise to the second story was given under the condition that the work be done in a neat and mechanical manner and that precautions be taken so that there would be proper roof drainage.

Plumbing permits for this project show that there would be one added sink and the location for two sinks would be changed; that there would be an additional water closet with two others changing location; that there would be one bath tub added with a change in the location of two others and that one wash basin would be added with a location change for one older one.

Over time some additional work was done on the building. On June 14, 1949 a permit was issued to remove the rear second story porch and replace it with a new enclosed porch. Today's porch appears to be this one referenced.

Other permits just show the addition of signage for the Harris Pharmacy including one advertising Coca Cola in 1949. The storefront awning was recovered in 1954.

The Harris Pharmacy closed in 1969/1970. In 1969 George Webb Corporation made an application to occupy the building but cancelled their application. The building owner at the time was Orville Harris, one of Frank's sons.

The Rock Building next door to the east was demolished in 1976 after St. Lawrence Parish acquired the property. The shared wall between the Rock Building and the Harris Pharmacy was parged over after the Rock Building came down.

Later occupants of the old Harris Pharmacy included Continental Tax Service (1971) which received temporary occupancy through May 1, 1972; Sir Speedy which provided copying and duplicating services (1973); and Kung Fu Academy/Sharon Heyden (1974). In recent years a beauty salon was on the premises (1985).

Notre Dame Middle School Inc. purchased the building on December 2, 2015. They plan to demolish the building and replace it with green space/landscaping and signage. Their application for a demolition permit resulted in the nomination being filed for Temporary Historic Designation.

VII. SIGNIFICANCE

The Lorentz / Harris Building is significant for being an excellent example of the Mediterranean Revival Style. It features all the hallmarks of the Mediterranean style including a shaped parapet, arched windows, leaded glass, a tile pent roof, stone trim and iron balconets. Art Deco touches appear in the fluted pilasters which are simplified forms of classical columns. This type of simplification was commonly seen in the late 1920s and early 1930s and sometimes combined with the more streamlined forms most often associated with Art Deco and Art Moderne. The building tells a story of a 1890s Queen Anne structure that was in continual use as a pharmacy from the time of its construction until 1969 / 1970. The location was very desirable, at a high traffic location, in a commercial strip that by 1930 has seen almost complete development. When a new larger building was turned down for code reasons, Mr. Harris decided to retain his building and bring it up to a more "modern" appearance by cladding it with brick, putting in expensive windows, trimming the whole with stone and adding balconets to main windows. The result is a masterful re-working of the original building. By far it is the most impressive commercial building for many blocks and would hold its own against commercial buildings in any other neighborhood commercial district.

VIII. THE ARCHITECT

Permit records indicate that C. (Charles) L. Fiedler was the architect for the Queen Anne style frame building that was originally constructed on this property. Fiedler is consistently listed as a clerk/entry clerk/bookkeeper in the city directories. He does not seem to have had an architectural career. He is last listed in the directory in 1897. A newspaper citation indicates that Gerhard D. Basse sold our subject property (described as the west 2-5, probably 2/5ths) to Carl L. Fiedler for \$3,835 on August 15, 1895. (Milwaukee Journal 1895 August 15) Interestingly, Fiedler did not occupy the new building.

The major remodel of the building as we see it today occurred in 1931. Contractors are listed as Madson, Christenson and Ingbretson but no architect is listed for the project. It is possible that they had an in-house

designer in their office. There is the slight possibility that the firm of Schneider & Kuehnel, engineers, designed the remodel. Schneider & Kuehnel had designed a three story building to replace Harris's Queen Anne pharmacy but the Board of Zoning Appeals denied the project because the proposed new building exceeded lot coverage, taking up 87% of the lot. Kuehnel did design residences and commercial buildings both before and after this time period. (Permit records May 11, 1931, July 16, 1931)

SOURCES

Ancestry.com. On line information including census records, death dates, links to Find a Grave, obituaries, and other information.

Milwaukee City Building Permits.

Milwaukee City Directories.

Milwaukee Journal.

Milwaukee Sentinel.

St. Lawrence Parish. St Lawrence 100 Years Community-Church-Christ [1888-1988]. No publisher, 1988.

Sanborn Insurance Maps of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. New York: Sanborn-Perris Map Co., 1894, 1910.

South Layton Boulevard National Register Nomination. Prepared by Carlen Hatala and Les Vollmert. Listed in the National Register of Historic Places April 24, 1996

IX. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Lorentz / Harris Pharmacy Building be given temporary historic designation as a City of Milwaukee Historic Site as a result of its fulfillment of criteria e-5 and e-9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance, Section 320-21(3) of the Milwaukee Code of Ordinances.

e-5 Its embodiment of the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or specimen.

The Lorentz / Harris Pharmacy Building is an excellent example of the Mediterranean Revival style that also has a touch of Art Deco in its design. Examples of Mediterranean Revival commercial buildings can be found around the city where commercial strips were developing or renewing themselves in the 1920s. Locations include Burleigh Street and West Center Street among other scattered examples. Features of the Mediterranean Revival include use of stone, brick and stucco, twisted columns or colonnettes, tile inserts, iron balconets, tile roofs, and shaped parapets. It's popularity peaked in the mid-to-late 1920s and carried on into the very early 1930s before Art Deco supplanted it in popularity for commercial buildings. The onset of the Great Depression halted most construction activity for the rest of the decade. The Lorentz / Harris Pharmacy Building features many of the key elements of Mediterranean Revival including a rich tapestry colored brick, flourishes of stucco, a pent roof with tiles, iron balconets, arched windows, decorative stone or cast stone, leaded glass and a shaped parapet.

The touches of Art Deco we can see in the building are concentrated at the storefront area with the fluted pilasters that are a nod to classicism but with inventive heraldic plaques serving as stand-ins for traditional capitals.

The Lorentz / Harris Pharmacy Building is even more remarkable in that the building we see today was the result of a major remodel done in 1931. Remodeling can often diminish a building's appearance when poorly conceived and executed; just look at the many examples east of this building on Greenfield Avenue. In this instance, a masterful remodel was carried out that brought the building up to date for its era, an era that did not value late 19th century design like we do today. Only the front gable Palladian window and the side oriel remain as hints of the building's original DNA.

- e-9 Its unique location as a singular physical characteristic which represents an established and familiar visual feature if a neighborhood, community or the city.

Sited at a prominent corner of two busy traffic arterials, the Lorentz / Harris Building has been a stand out since its original construction. The early postcard view dating between 1906 and 1911 show it to have had bold Queen Anne features and it had a strong presence that was not diminished by the church steeples and religious buildings nearby. Since its remodeling in 1931 it was and remains easily the most prominent commercial building for many blocks where the integrity of commercial buildings has been diminished by poorly conceived rehabs. The building anchors the corner of Greenfield Avenue and Layton Boulevard and helps define the street wall of the Layton Boulevard Historic District.

Preservation Guidelines
For the
Lorentz / Harris Pharmacy Building

The following preservation guidelines represent the principal concerns of the Historic Preservation Commission regarding the temporary historic designation of the Lorentz / Harris Pharmacy Building. The intent of the commission is to preserve the historic, existing exterior features of the building and guide any changes and restorations that might be done on the exterior.

Building maintenance and restoration must follow accepted preservation practices as outlined below. Any exterior changes including repair/restoration of masonry walls, windows, roof, and other details but exclusive of routine painting will require a certificate of appropriateness. Most certificates are issued on a staff-approved basis and only major new construction or alteration requests typically will go before the Historic Preservation Commission. The Commission reserves the right to make final decisions based upon particular design submissions.

A. Roofs

Retain the roof shape. No changes can be made to the roof shape which would alter the building height, the roofline or its pitch. No changes are to be made to the shaped front parapet as this is a significant feature of the building's transformation into a Mediterranean Revival style building. No rooftop construction, addition, or construction of additional stories is allowed, as this would have a negative impact on the historic character and proportions of the building. Re-roofing requires consultation with historic preservation staff and a Certificate of Appropriateness to ensure appropriate materials and installation. Locate mechanical systems and vents on portions of the roof not visible at all from the public right of way and paint them out to minimize impact. Telecommunications and electronic and energy efficiency equipment (satellite dishes, cell antenna equipment, solar panels, solar shingles, etc.) all require review and approval by the Historic Preservation Commission.

B. Materials

1. Masonry

- a. Unpainted brick or stone must not be painted or covered. Painting masonry is historically incorrect and could cause irreversible damage if it was decided to remove the paint at a later date. Covering masonry with other materials (wood, sheet metal, vinyl siding, etc.) is not allowed.
- b. Re-point defective mortar by duplicating the original in color, hardness, texture, joint finish and joint width. See the masonry chapters in the books, As Good As New or Good For Business for explanations on why the use of a proper mortar mix is crucial to making lasting repairs that will not contribute to new deterioration of the masonry. Using much harder, contemporary Portland cement mortar will not make a lasting repair and can damage the historic brick and stone. Replaced mortar joints should be tooled to match the style of the original. Do not use mortar colors and pointing styles that were unavailable or were not used when the building was constructed. Consultation with historic preservation staff and a Certificate of Appropriateness is required before starting any re-pointing.
- c. In the future should masonry cleaning be necessary it should be done only

with the gentlest method possible. Sandblasting or high pressure water blasting or the use of other abrasive materials (baking soda, nut shells, dry ice, etc.) on limestone or brick or cast stone surfaces is prohibited. This method of cleaning erodes the surface of the material and accelerates deterioration. The use of accepted chemical products to clean masonry is allowed and a test panel is required before general commencement of the work. Work should be done by experienced individuals as the chemical cleaning process can have a negative impact on the masonry.

- d. Repair or replace deteriorated masonry with new material that duplicates the old as closely as possible. The use of EIFS (exterior insulation and finish systems) which is synthetic stucco is not permitted. Covering over the stucco panels with substitute material like vinyl, aluminum, wood panels, cement board panels and other such material is not permitted. Consultation with historic preservation staff and a Certificate of Appropriateness is required before attempting work on the masonry.

2. Wood/Metal

- a. Retain original material, whenever possible. Do not remove architectural features that are essential to maintaining the building's character and appearance. Iron appears on the building in the form of balconets. If there is slight to moderate deterioration, repair can be done. In the event of severe deterioration, replacement balconets must match the originals. Complete removal is not permitted. Copper gutters are to remain and can be repaired if needed.
- b. Retain or replace deteriorated material with new material that duplicates the appearance of the old as closely as possible. Covering wood or metal with aluminum or vinyl or other substitute material is not permitted. No trim is to be removed from the building. Spot replacement or spot repair of any deteriorated elements is encouraged rather than complete removal and replication. Structural wood epoxies are suggested for the lasting repair of damaged or decayed areas of wood and wood trim. Any new elements must replicate the pattern, dimension, spacing and material of the originals, including the species of wood.

C. Windows and Doors

- 1. Retain existing window and door openings and original doors and windows within those openings. Windows on this building have expensive diamond paned leaded glass casements or leaded glass double-hung sash. Some feature heraldic shield designs. These are to remain.

Retain the existing configuration of panes, sash, surrounds and sills, except as necessary to restore them to the original condition. Do not make additional openings. Do not remove, cover over or block down existing openings. Do not make changes in existing original fenestration or entrances by enlarging or reducing window or door openings to fit new stock window sash or new stock door sizes. Do not change the size or configuration of the original window panes or sash. Use wood storm windows or protective glazing which have glazing configurations similar to the prime windows and which obscure the prime

windows as little as possible. The use of structural wood epoxies is strongly encouraged to repair any minor damage or decay to wood windows.

The 1931 storefront window glazing was removed in 1979 and replaced with smaller glazed panels. It also appears that the transoms were covered at the same time. These windows can stay if no alterations are made to them. Should the glazing be changed, the windows should be returned to the larger panes of glass they originally had.

2. In the event any windows need to be replaced, consultation with Historic Preservation staff is required to determine appropriate glazing patterns. New glass must match the size of the historic glass. New windows must be made of wood. Do not fill in or cover openings with inappropriate materials such as glass block or concrete block. Do not use modern style window units, such as horizontal sliding sash or casements, in place of double-hung sash or the substitution of units with glazing configurations not appropriate to the style of the building. Any changes or replacements or restoration will require a Certificate of Appropriateness and appropriate wood windows.

Any original windows on the building must be retained and repaired if at all possible. Vinyl, vinyl clad, metal, and metal-clad or fiberglass or other non-wood material prime window units are not permitted. Any replacement doors must be appropriate to the historic period of the building. Any changes to doors and windows, including installation of new doors and windows, require consultation with Historic Preservation staff and a Certificate of Appropriateness.

3. Steel bar security doors and window guards are not allowed in the windows that front the street. On other doors and windows they are generally not allowed where they are visible from the street. Some security screens are located at some of the windows today. They can remain. If security bars are permitted, the doors or grates must be of the simplest design and installed so as to be as unobtrusive as possible. A Certificate of Appropriateness is required for this type of installation.

D. Trim and Ornamentation

There should be no changes to the existing historic trim or ornamentation except as necessary to restore the building to its original condition. A replacement feature must match the original member in terms of scale, design, color, appearance and material to the extent possible. Existing historic trim must not be removed unless it is for the purpose of repair. Spot repair is preferable to wholesale replacement of details. Wood epoxy repair is often highly desirable for permanently repairing smaller areas of decay or damage to wood elements. Stone / cast stone can be repaired by professionals if needed and is not be removed or covered over or painted. Consultation with Historic Preservation staff is required before any changes or repairs are made to the building.

E. Additions

Additions to the front elevation and Layton Boulevard elevation and east elevation would not be possible as the building is constructed up to its lot lines. Other additions (as at the rear or south) are not encouraged as all elevations are visible from the public rights of way. Any proposed addition or additions must be smaller and shorter than the original building and not obscure the historic building and its details. If considered they must be

set back from Greenfield Avenue and Layton Boulevard and not change the overall footprint of the building.

F. Signs/Exterior Lighting

The installation of any permanent exterior sign or light fixture will require the approval of the Commission. Approval will be based on the compatibility of the proposed sign or light with the historic and architectural character of the building. Consultation with Historic Preservation staff is required to assist in the selection of exterior fixtures. Plastic internally illuminated box signs with a completely acrylic face are not permitted.

G. Site Features

As the building has no “buffer property” along the east, north and west sides of the building, it is doubtful that any site changes will be proposed for those areas. There is some property at the rear or south of the building. New plant materials, paving, or fencing at this area shall be compatible with the historic architectural character of the building. Should a fence be considered in the future examples of appropriate fencing can be found in As Good As New and Living With History. Consultation with Historic Preservation staff is required before starting any work that would involve the landscape features, parking, walkways, driveway, outdoor seating, and so on and will require a Certificate of Appropriateness.

H. Guidelines for New Construction

It is important that new construction be designed to be as sympathetic as possible with the character of the structure. Small-scale accessory structures, like a gazebo, garage/parking pad or fountain, may be permitted depending on their size, scale and form and the property’s ability to accommodate such a structure. Any request to construct free standing structures as a new garage would be subject to review for code compliance and appropriate design and would require a Certificate of Appropriateness.

1. Site work

New construction must respect the historic site and location of the building. It should be accomplished so as to maintain the appearance of the building from the street as a freestanding structure.

2. Scale

Overall building height and bulk, the expression of major building divisions including foundation, body and roof, and individual building components, such as overhangs and fenestration that are in close proximity to the historic building must be compatible to and sympathetic with the design of the building. New construction is to be smaller in size and shorter in height than the historic building. New construction will not extend over the top of the current historic building. . Any new construction must scale details, bays, roofs and so on to be compatible with the historic building.

3. Form

The massing of the new construction must be compatible with the goal of maintaining the integrity of the historic building as a freestanding structure

4. Materials

The building materials which are visible from the public right-of-way and in close proximity to the historic building (in this case all elevations are visible from the public rights-of-way) should be compatible with the colors, textures, proportions, and combinations of cladding materials used on the historic building. Faux wood grained panels, artificial wood panels, cementitious panels, panels constructed of pressed wood, metal panels or corrugated metal, or concrete block or other non-traditional materials would be inappropriate for new construction

I. Guidelines for Demolition

Although demolition is not encouraged and is generally not permissible, there may be instances when demolition may be acceptable if approved by the Historic Preservation Commission. The following guidelines, with those found in subsection 11(h) of the ordinance, shall be taken into consideration by the Commission when reviewing demolition requests.

1. Condition

Demolition requests may be granted when it can be clearly demonstrated that the condition of a building or a portion thereof is such that it constitutes an immediate threat to health and safety and is beyond hope of repair. This would generally be in case of a major fire or a natural catastrophe.

2. Importance

Consideration will be given to whether or not the building is of historical or architectural significance or displays a quality of material and craftsmanship that does not exist in other structures in the area.

3. Location

Consideration will be given to whether or not the building or a portion of it contributes to the neighborhood and the general street appearance and has a positive effect on other buildings in the area.

4. Potential for Restoration

Consideration will be given to whether or not the building is beyond economically feasible repair.

5. Additions

Consideration will be given to whether or not the proposed demolition is a later addition that is not in keeping with the original design of the structure or does not contribute to its character. There are no portions of this building, with the

possible exception of the rear second story porch from 1949 that would be considered a non-essential addition to the 1931 structure.







