

**MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**TUESDAY, 28 MAY 2013
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP
Rudy D'Alessandro
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

Caroline Boyce, Preservation Alliance
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance
Jonathan Broh, JKR Partners
Steven Sergi, JKR Partners
Stuart Rosenberg, SGRD
Doug Jordan, Alterra Property Group
Chris Carter, John Milner Architects
Hercules Grigos, Esq., Obermayer
Lee Dennis
Sam Olshin, AOS Architects
Dan Rosin
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Co.
Evan Linnett
Ian Cope, Cope Linder
Michael Kowalchick, MKC
Leonard F. Reuter, Esq., The Reuter Law Firm, LLC

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Ms. Stein and Messrs. Cluver, D'Alessandro, and McCoubrey joined her.

ADDRESS: 1 BANK ST

Project: Construct four residential buildings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Pinerolo Properties LLC

Applicant: Jose Hernandez, JKR Partners Architects & Designers LLC

History: buildings lost in fire, 2/3/2007; vacant lots

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Contributing, 12/12/2003

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: The buildings that stood on this site, which dated to about 1830 and were individually designated, were lost in a fire in 2007. The applicant recently acquired the lots and proposes to construct four townhouses on the site. The historic buildings were each two bays wide with three-bay storefronts. The new structures will have two-bay storefronts and three-bay upper floors. The new buildings are faced in brick and approximately the same height as the historic buildings.

The proposed buildings are generally compatible with the district. However, the window designs should be revised. The single-light windows should be replaced with double-hung windows and the large sliding windows should be reduced in size and scale, perhaps with coupled double-hung windows. The application materials does not include elevations of the decks with pilot houses and railings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the windows are revised to be compatible, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Jonathan Broh and Steven Sergi represented the application.

Mr. Broh responded to the staff recommendation, which suggests that the windows should be revised to be compatible. He said that he substitute double-hung windows but would prefer two-over-two or six-over-six windows. At the second floor, the applicants propose large windows to maximize light, but would be willing to substitute double-hung windows. The Committee members commented that they would prefer double-hung windows on the second floor in smaller, punched openings. At the storefronts, the Committee members suggested either removing the single wide pier or adding a second pier per unit with regular spacing. Mr. Baron pointed out that, because the intention is to create a living space rather than a commercial space, adding a second pier would probably provide more privacy and a more residential scale. The Committee members suggested that all of the facades should be located in the same plane and that the belt-courses and cornices should align and be uninterrupted. The Committee members approved of the stair-house and deck design. They suggested that the parapet wrap the side on the end unit to meet the railing. Mr. Baron asked about the façade materials on the taller building. Mr. Broh explained that they would be two tones of cast stone, a cream and a grey.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the second-floor windows are two-over-two or six-over-six double-hung windows in punched openings; the storefront piers are consistently dimensioned and spaced including at the party walls; all front facades are in the same plane; and all cornices and belt courses are aligned, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 MAY 2013

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

ADDRESS: 253-55 N 02ND ST

Project: Construct 20-unit residential building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Papermill JV, GP LLC

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart Rosenberg, Arch. PC

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Contributing, 12/12/2003

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing an apartment house on the open east end of a lot that includes two historic buildings facing 2nd Street. The new building would stand behind the historic buildings, which face N. 2nd Street, and would face New and Letitia Streets. The new building would not attach to the historic buildings. The new building would have an off-white stucco veneer and punched openings of a similar proportion to historic windows in the district. The ground floor would be used for parking. The proposed building would be flanked by large, contemporary buildings to the north and south and by the I-95 embankment to the east. Tucked away at the corner of New and Letitia Streets, the building would have no discernable impact on the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Stuart Rosenberg and developer Doug Jordan represented the application.

Ms. Stein questioned the extent of stucco proposed for the façades and contended that the material is not the most appropriate for front facades and is not durable in a city setting. Mr. Rosenberg said that the stucco at the ground level is mitigated by an eight-foot setback at the south and east facades on New and Letitia Streets. He claimed that the setbacks are a zoning requirement. The Committee members suggested that the setback along the street faces was inappropriate. Mr. Rosenberg said the setback would align the building with the one to its west. The Committee members looked at the photographs of that building's relationship to the sidewalk and the civil engineer's plans and suggested that Mr. Rosenberg might be mistaken about the eight-foot setback; they suggested that the plans show a building built out to the sidewalk. They asked him to verify the locations of the facades and setback requirements. The Committee opined that the building lacks detail. They asked the architect to consider adding lintels, sills, a change of material at the base, and to build out to the property line along the sidewalk. They also asked him to screen the parking at the first floor and identify the entrance.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial.

ADDRESS: 274 S 03RD ST

Project: Construct addition and porch, replace patio and steps

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Geoff & Lee Dennis

Applicant: Christina Carter, John Milner Architects, Inc.

History: 1813; James Lyndall, carpenter

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story addition at the rear of the property. The property does not have a rear ell. Map research indicates that the building did not have a rear ell historically. The ground-floor of the rear façade was altered in the mid-twentieth century with the addition of a large window. The Commission approved enlarging a second-floor window into a French door with railing in March 2009. That work was carried out. The proposed addition would extend six feet into the rear yard of the property. The houses on either side of the subject property have rear additions. The proposed addition would not extend beyond the existing adjacent additions. The ground-floor would be finished in stucco with French doors. The second floor would be an open porch. The second-floor masonry wall and existing openings would be retained. The porch would have wood posts and railings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Chris Carter and property owner Lee Dennis represented the application.

Mr. Danta introduced a letter from the Society Hill Civic Association supporting the project but contending that it does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Cluver complimented Ms. Carter on the layout of the drawings. He pointed out that the window in the second-floor porch appeared awkwardly placed too close to the party wall of the neighboring building. Ms. Carter stated that the window is an existing condition and would be unaltered. The Committee reviewed the proposal and, disagreeing with the Society Hill Civic Association, concurred that it satisfies the Standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 239 QUEEN ST

Project: Construct residential building at rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 235 Queen Street LLC

Applicant: Dan Rosin, 235 Queen Street LLC

History: 1810

Individual Designation: 5/31/1966

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story residential building at the rear of 239 Queen Street, which will be consolidated with the property at 235-37 Queen Street. The new building is intended to recreate a row of historic trinity or bandbox houses, which stood on Caines Place, a narrow alley running from Queen Street. The trinities were demolished in 1956, before the property was designated as historic. Historically, those trinities as well as other houses faced a rear courtyard, which was located behind the larger houses at 233, 235, 237, and 239 Queen Street. The main houses at 235, 237, and 239 and the rear houses behind 235 and 237 survive. In addition to the trinities, the main and rear houses at 233 have been demolished. Trinity Church and its burying ground stood to the east of the court. The church has been demolished and the grounds redeveloped as Mario Lanza Park.

The new building cannot replicate the lost row of trinities precisely because of current zoning and building code requirements. The new building would, however, be based on the lost historic buildings and would recreate the historic sense of space of the rear courtyard. It would be built against the stuccoed party walls at the rear of 239 Queen and at the side of 241 Queen. Like the historic trinities, the new building would be three stories tall with a half-gable roof and would be faced with red brick. It would also be clad with fiber cement panels and include decorative banding and a Juliette balcony. Decks would project off the north façade.

The new building would be minimally visible from Queen Street across the park and yards of 235 and 237 Queen Street. It would be visible from Mario Lanza Park, especially the dog park section of the park, which is located where 233 Queen Street once stood. The north façade and decks of the proposed building would not be visible to the public.

In general, the proposed building is compatible with this site and partially restores the courtyard's historic sense of space, its most significant attribute. The overall massing, scale, and materials of the proposed building are drawn from the historic trinities and are compatible with the site. The historic trinities were simpler than the proposed building and the new building may benefit from some simplifications. For example, brick could be substituted for some of the cement board cladding and some of the detailing like the banding could be eliminated. While the footprint and volumes are driven by strict zoning and building code requirements, the façade might be simplified to better echo the planarity of the lost buildings. However, the new building should not be a reconstruction of the lost buildings. The Standards clearly mandate that reconstructions are only appropriate in very specific circumstances when they are "essential to the public understanding" of extremely important sites or events. This is not a case when a reconstruction would be warranted, even if it were possible under the zoning and building codes. Moreover, the Standards require that new construction differentiated yet compatible. The new building should be compatible with its historic surroundings, yet clearly read as a building constructed in 2013, not 1830.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the detailing and materials are simplified, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Dan Rosin and architect Sam Olshin represented the application.

Mr. Olshin stated that their goal is to construct a building that evokes the trinities that stood on the site historically, but not recreate them. They wish to recreate the sense of space in the historic court, but construct a contemporary building. He presented boards and explained the setting and design of the proposed new building. He described the materials of the façade. The base would be finished with cement block, and then brick with fiber cement accent panels above. Mr. Olshin stated that they were willing replace some of the fiber cement panels with brick, per the staff's recommendation.

Mr. Cluver stated that the some of the fiber cement panels should be replaced. He encouraged a more consistent vocabulary with red brick throughout the façade. Mr. Cluver also suggested the removal of the balcony at the third floor of the front facade. Ms. Hawkins stated that the façade was too busy for the size of the building. She also encouraged simplifying the façade. Mr. Olshin asked what he should install in place of the balcony at the third floor. Ms. Hawkins stated that it could be a single or paired double-hung window scaled to match the other windows on the façade. Ms. Stein stated that the fiber cement panels give a sense of verticality to the façade that is not present in the surviving row of trinities to the north or the rear of the houses on Queen Street. She noted that removing those accent panels would result in a façade that was more appropriate to its context. Mr. Olshin asked if the cement base should also be eliminated. Ms. Hawkins stated that the base did not have to be changed and that it was a matter of design opinion. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the historic trinities had flat facades. He asked whether the second bay could be eliminated to make the new building simpler; he stated that he was not insisting on the change, or even convinced that it would lead to an improvement, but wanted to talk about it. Mr. Olshin stated that the proposed building is already very small and that eliminating the bay would have a detrimental effect on the marketability of the units. Others suggested that the symmetry provided by the bays was significant. The Committee members concluded that the bays could remain as proposed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the front façade is simplified with the replacement of some of the fiber cement panels with brick and the replacement of the third-floor balcony with a window, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 241 AND 243 S 07TH ST

Project: Combine two buildings, cut window openings, add and replace windows, add elevator and mechanical equipment

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Evan Linnett

Applicant: Evan Linnett

History: 1963, Stonorov & Haws, architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to two adjacent townhouses to combine them into one residence. The buildings are located at the southeast corner of S. 7th Street and S. Washington Square. The front facades face S. 7th Street and the north or side façade of 241 faces the Square. The buildings are part of a complex that includes rows of townhouses on S. 7th and Spruce Streets and the Hopkinson House tower on S. Washington Square. The complex was designed by the architectural firm of Stonorov & Haws and constructed in the early 1960s. With the exception of Louis I. Kahn, Oscar Stonorov was arguably the most prominent Modernist architect working in Philadelphia at the time. The complex was an important component of the Washington Square East or Society Hill redevelopment plan and its reuse was overseen by the Redevelopment Authority, which assembled the parcel and conveyed it to the developer with restrictions. The townhouses ring the tower at the south and west and provide a transition from the overtly Modernist tower to the surrounding low-scale eighteenth and nineteenth-century neighborhood. To effect this transition, the facades of the townhouses have two personalities. The rears, which face Hopkinson House and its Modernist courtyard, are Modern in style. The front facades, which face older historic buildings, are traditional in style. The exposed side facades of the townhouses, of which there are three, were originally unfenestrated brick. The townhouses are classified as Contributing to the Society Hill Historic District.

The Modernist rears of the properties are visible from S. Washington Square. The rears of 241 and 243 S. 7th are essentially in their original conditions, except that the undivided, plate-glass, Modernist windows and doors in 241 were replaced with inappropriate small-paned Neo-Colonial windows and doors before designation. This application proposes to retain the inappropriate rear windows and doors in 241 and remove and replace the Modernist windows and doors in 243 with inappropriate, small-paned windows and doors. In November 2002, the Historical Commission denied a proposal to replace the Modernist rear windows in another townhouse in this complex, 637 Spruce Street, with incompatible windows. In light of the Commission's 2002 precedent, the Contributing classification of these properties, the significance of Stonorov, the design significance of the juxtaposed Modernist and traditional facades, the unaltered state of the window openings, and the visibility of the rear facades from the public right-of-way, the Standards dictate any replacement windows and doors should match the historic windows and doors.

The bulk of the work proposed in this application would occur at the north or side façade, which faces Washington Square. Originally, the façade was unfenestrated brick. In 1971, two windows were cut into the façade, a small, single-light window at the first-floor east and a tall, narrow, projecting window at the second and third-floor west. The two other exposed side façades in the complex, at 255 S. 7th Street and 637 Spruce Street, remain unaltered. This application proposes to remove both windows and significantly enlarge both openings, cut several new

openings, and install multi-light windows and doors, some with transoms and guard rails. The proposal fails to satisfy the Standards and Guidelines. The Historical Commission has allowed for the alteration and addition of window openings, but only within certain circumstances. For example, in February 2013, the Historical Commission approved the enlargement of a non-historic window opening in the front façade of the building at 500 Spruce Street, but it required that the sill and lintel heights of the enlarged opening match those of the historic openings and that the new window match the historic windows. In this case, the proposed openings have no relationship to the original openings, because there were none in this wall, and the proposed fenestration has no relationship to the original fenestration. Moreover, in that case, the proposal entailed the modest enlargement of one opening from an awkward non-historic condition, not the significant enlargement and creation of several openings in unaltered brick. In another example, the Commission approved the enlargement of window openings at 2100 Fairmount Avenue in April 2013. However, in that case, the window openings and facades had already been significantly altered multiple times from their original conditions. In this case, the existing alterations to the original condition are minimal and could easily be reversed. The proposed alterations would require the removal of significant amounts of historic fabric in its original condition. Moreover, in the 2100 Fairmount case, the building had been adapted from industrial to commercial use, necessitating alterations. In this case, the use has always been and remains single-family residential. One additional example offers insights into the Commission's precedent in such matters. In June 2004, after much debate extending over two Commission meetings, the Historical Commission approved an application for 413 S. 3rd Street that proposed cutting new windows in a brick side façade of a rowhouse in the Society Hill Historic District. The Commission did not approve the design as proposed, but did approve a scaled-back version with fewer window openings that were more appropriately arranged than originally proposed. The approved windows mirrored exactly the historic windows in size, pane configuration, and alignment. The windows and doors proposed in the current case bear no resemblance to the historic windows, front or back, and do not align with the historic windows, front or back. Moreover, it is not possible to employ either the front or rear windows as models for appropriate side windows in this case because the front and rear windows differ radically and that difference is the very essence of Stonorov's design for the houses. The blank brick side wall mediates between the Modernist rear and Traditionalist front and is therefore a character-defining feature of Stonorov's design. The Standards and the Commission's practice dictate that minor alterations to the non-historic openings in the north façade that render the windows more compatible may be acceptable. However, wholesale enlarging and new cutting of window openings in the undisturbed historic brick fabric is not.

The application proposes additional work to the exterior. It proposes to replace the windows in the front facades in kind. No details are provided. The application proposes to rebuild the original pergola at the rear in kind. No details are provided. The application form stipulates that AC condenser units will be "replaced and relocated," but no other information about this work is provided.

Finally, the application proposes the installation of an elevator, which will run between the basement and the third or top floor. The plans do not indicate that the installation will require any work to the exterior of the building including the roof. Therefore, it is assumed that the elevator work will be limited to the interior only. If the elevator requires alterations to the exterior, for example for an overrun, a new application must be submitted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the reconstruction of the pergola and the replacement of the front windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6; denial of the

replacement of the rear windows and doors at 243, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Window Guidelines; denial of the alterations to the side or north façade at 241, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 9, and 10 and the Window Guidelines; denial of the replacement and/or installation of any exterior mechanical equipment, owing to incompleteness; if the elevator has an exterior component, denial of its installation, owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Ian Cope, preservation consultant Kevin McMahon, and property owner Evan Linnett represented the application.

Mr. Cope stated that the non-historic, two-story, prism window on the side façade is in very poor condition and does not work well with the interior. It was installed in 1971, before the area was designated as historic. It was approved by the Art Commission. Mr. Cope introduced the property owner and explained that he has lived at 243 since 1999 and recently purchased 241 with the intent of connecting the two buildings. He stated that the owner would like to create views onto the square from the house. Mr. Cope called the side façade “austere” and “an anomaly.” He stated that the front façades would be restored, but not altered. He stated that the side façade, which is “banal,” presents an opportunity to be “enlivened.” Mr. Cope explained that they would like to create a “great room” on the second floor with large windows onto Washington Square. He claimed that other buildings on the Square have large windows. He explained that they are also proposing new and enlarged openings at the east end of the north façade with Juliette balconies that would project no more than four inches. He reported that these houses are strange, with three floors at the front and two at the rear. He clarified that they are planning to install an elevator, but it will not project above the roof. It will be entirely limited to the interior. He reported that there is a hidden driveway under the decks at the rear. The air conditioning units will be installed in this driveway area and will not be visible from the street.

Mr. McMahon, a preservation consultant with Powers & Co., stated that there is precedent in the neighborhood for a large, two-story, divided-light window like the one that they are proposing for the north façade. It is a house of the same period. He contended that the proposed window “is not completely out of character with the neighborhood.”

Mr. D'Alessandro observed that the Commission would not seek to protect the non-historic windows in the north façade. Ms. Hawkins agreed, but noted that the north façade was originally an unfenestrated brick wall. The proposed windows would make “a much grander statement.” Mr. D'Alessandro stated that it is remarkable that the side façade did not include windows originally. Mr. Cope added that it is remarkable that the front façade did not face the square. Mr. Cluver stated that the side façade was specifically left unfenestrated as a transition from the traditional front facades and the Modernist rear facades. He asserted that the side façade “is very much in keeping with the aesthetic” of the development. He contended that it is an original, historic, and integral component of these townhouses. He stated that he understands the desire to have windows in that façade, but claimed that cutting windows in that façade would be inappropriate when judged within the context of the design of this complex. Mr. Cluver stated that the alteration might be acceptable when judged in the context of the entire district, but not in relation to the building. Mr. Farnham reported that the Commission has allowed minor alterations to existing non-historic window openings such as these in the side façade. For example, the Commission approved a change to a non-historic opening at 500 Spruce Street recently. However, in that case, the proposal sought to render an inappropriate opening more appropriate for the building. The Commission required that the change to the window opening render it more compatible with the historic openings in the building. In this case, the proposed

changes would make the non-historic openings less compatible and would create new, incompatible openings. Ms. Hawkins stated that she objects to the proposed window openings. She observed that the typical side-façade window openings in the district are small punched openings that are related to the front-façade openings. She stated that the change in floor levels complicates this situation. She objected to the “enormously grand scale” of the proposed great-room window. She also objected to the awkward changes in scale between the small and large windows as well as the balconies. She objected to the major changes to this “plain brick façade.” She claimed that “there is no unifying vocabulary to all of the pieces and parts.” She opined that the historic, Modernist windows at the rear should be preserved. She stated that the plain brick side façade acts as an important transition element between the Modern rear and traditional front. The plain brick façade “cleanses your visual palette” as you look around the building. Mr. Cope stated that he sought to create some verticality with the new window openings.

Mr. Cope explained that he reviewed Stonorov’s original drawings for the complex and discovered that his first design for the townhouses differed significantly from the final design that was constructed. He explained that Stonorov originally imagined sliding windows with white marble infill. He stated that the Historic American Building Survey photograph, taken in 1965 and reproduced in the application, shows that the buildings were built as they exist currently. Therefore, Stonorov must have revised design between the original plans and the construction. Mr. Cope stated that the original drawings show a different design for the side façade. However, that design was never implemented. Mr. McMahon added that he does not know why Stonorov amended the design. Ms. Hawkins responded that all architects refine and revise their designs as they work. She said that many explanations are possible. For example, the developer may have requested the change. She noted, however, that the Standards and Guidelines require the preservation of as-built designs, not proposed but unexecuted designs. She stated that the Commission and applicant must work with “the hand they were dealt.”

Mr. D’Alessandro observed that the proposed changes are too drastic and should be reduced in scale. Mr. Cope stated that the Society Hill Civic Association has reviewed and approves of the application. Ms. Hawkins commented that the proposed alterations to the side façade are not compatible with the vocabulary of the historic house. Mr. Cope asked for guidance. Ms. Hawkins replied that the Committee cannot design for him. Mr. Cope asked if they could draw from the west façade and install punched, double-hung windows in the side façade. Mr. McMahon asked if the Committee objected to replicating the front-façade windows on the side façade. Ms. Hawkins stated that they should not replicate the front windows, but could alter the existing non-historic openings to have a “punched opening” appearance. Ms. Hawkins stated that any changes to the window openings should be regular, not random as is currently proposed. She also noted that the side facade serves as a transition between the very different front and back facades and that should be taken into account. She noted, however, that she was not simply proposing a Modern opening at the east and a traditional opening at the west end of the side façade. Mr. Cluver asserted that the proposed openings were too large from a preservation perspective, but also from a practical perspective. He said that it would be impractical to have a very large bedroom window opening onto Washington Square. Mr. Cluver quickly sketched a plan for windows on the side façade showing punched openings at the west and larger openings at the east. When he completed it, he commented that he would not necessarily be in favor of it if the architect proposed it. Mr. Cluver concluded that he is not convinced that there is an appropriate solution for more or larger window openings in this wall.

Mr. Linnett stated that he finds the side façade and the prism window to be the ugliest things on Washington Square. He stated that the other non-historic, side-façade window looked into the office of the attorney who used to reside in the unit. He noted that it has no trim and is unattractive. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee is not asserting that the existing openings in the side façade cannot be changed. She stated that they can be improved in appearance. The Committee is stating, however, that the proposed design for the side façade is not appropriate. Mr. Cluver added that the replacement of the Modern rear windows and doors with multi-pane units is also not appropriate. Mr. Cope stated that they could retain the Modern rear system. Ms. Hawkins stated that they should also restore the inappropriate rear window system at 241, but she noted that the Commission cannot require that restoration. Mr. Cope stated that the rear windows vary in the complex; some have been changed, but others have not.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the reconstruction of the pergola, replacement of the front windows, replacement and/or installation of mechanical equipment, provided it is not visible from the public right-of-way, and installation of the elevator, provided it is limited to the interior, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9; denial of the replacement of the rear windows and doors at 243, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Window Guidelines; and denial of the alterations to the side or north façade at 241, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 9, and 10 and the Window Guidelines.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 10:28 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard 3: Each property will 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 elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will 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.

Window Guidelines: Not Recommended: Removing or radically changing windows which are important in defining the historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished; Changing the number, location, size or glazing pattern of windows, through cutting new openings, blocking-in windows, and installing replacement sash that do not fit the historic window opening; Changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which noticeably change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of the glazing; or the appearance of the frame.