

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

**20 FEBRUARY 2007
CITY HALL ROOM 578
9:30 A.M.**

PRESENT

Rudy D'Alessandro
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz
Robert Thomas, AIA
Daniela Voith, AIA
Herb Levy

Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

ALSO PRESENT

KellyAnn Farrelly, Center City District
Frank Zampetti, TSP
Janet Kalter, Old City Civic Association
Joe Schiavo, Old City Civic Association
Larry Burkhardt, Cathedral Stone Products
Cory Kegerise, Elfreth's Alley Association
Steve Patron, Paradigm
William Rhodes, Elfreth's Alley Association
Sam Harris, S. Harris & Co.
Tony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing/Paradigm
David Slovic
Barb Hirshman, HTA, LLC
Brett Feldman, Klehr, Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
Edward Goldberg, Macy's
Lori Kiedaisch, Starbuck's
Frank Coulter, Bohler Engineering
Gerry Gutierrez, Group G
Howard Snitow, Snitow, Snitow, PA
Greg DiTeadoro
Marjorie Muecke
William Middleton
Marc Winkler, Asian Bank
Matt Carson, City Sign
Chris Christian, Capital Programs Office
Martin Lieberman, Capital Programs Office
Joseph Powell, Buell, Kratzer & Powell
Philip Burtnew

Larry Hercules
David Orphanides, Bellor Stouffer & Orphanides, LLP
Phyllis Schnell, Trinity
Stephen Maffei, Landmark Design
John Kohlhas, Cubellis GBQC
Michael Stern, Trinity
Michael Mattioni, Mattioni Law Firm
Martin Jay Rosenblum
Frank Rapisarda, Tackett & Co
James Stephen
Patrick Morrin

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Thomas called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Ms. Pentz and Voith and Messrs. D'Alessandro, Levy, and McCoubrey joined him on the Architectural Committee.

620-634 N. 15TH STREET

Owner: School District of Philadelphia
Applicant: David Scheuermann, architect
History: 1908, Henry DeCoursey Richards

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a resolution to a faulty repair made several years ago. With that repair, a roof membrane was attached to the top of the limestone cornice with nails spaced every four inches. Cracks have developed in the cornice along the nail line and at least one piece of the cornice has fallen off. The applicant proposes to remove a piece of stone along the entire cornice and replace it with a mortar mix formed to match the shape. The School district considered but then rejected owing to safety concerns an option to pin the loose material in place.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff offers no recommendation, but defers to the expertise of the Committee.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Frank Zampetti and Larry Burkhart of Cathedral Stone Products represented the application.

Mr. Zampetti summarized the failures induced by the nailing of the roofing to the limestone cornice. The School District is concerned about pedestrian safety and has cordoned off the area beneath the cornice. He will bid the project to include the more expensive removal and replacement of material, but hopes to be able to repair rather than replace where he can. Mr. Baron noted that the Standards recommend preservation of the historic fabric and, whenever possible, the reuse of historic materials. Mr. Zampetti explained that the more appropriate solution from a preservation standpoint is also the more cost effective solution. He concluded that they will repair where they can, but they will remove all loose material for safety reasons.

Ms. Pentz asked if it is possible to rebuild the cornice to the depth proposed with the Jahn material. Mr. Burkhart stated that it is possible. He reported that they used Jahn material to rebuild to a depth of 16 inches at Reagan National Airport. This repair would not require the addition of that much material.

Ms. Voith asked about their application process. Mr. Burkhart explained that it is like remaking plaster details. They use a metal or plexiglass template to shape the rebuilt cornice. Mr. Levy asked if they replicate the stone joints in the new material. Mr. Burkhart replied that they would. Mr. McCoubrey asked if they then would point the rebuilt cornice as if it was made of limestone. Mr. Burkhart replied that they would after the Jahn material had set.

Mr. Zampetti stated that they planned to waterproof the cornice after rebuilding it. Mr. Burkhart stated that they would R97, a waterproofing chemical that repels liquid water, but allows water vapor to pass through it.

Mr. Levy questioned the applicants on the removal of the old nails. Mr. Zampetti stated that they would either drill or cut out all remaining nails to ensure that they would not further damage the cornice. Mr. Levy asked about the new connection between the roofing material and the cornice. Mr. Zampetti stated that they would apply liquid roofing material at the cornice. Ms. Voith recommended that they slope the new cornice slightly away from the building to allow it to drain effectively.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal as submitted, with the staff to review details including a color match.

109-131 N. 2ND STREET, 117-125 ARCH STREET, 128 ELFRETH'S ALLEY

Owner: National East Associates, LP; Steve Patron; Paradigm Realty Alliance; Robertson Douglass Group

Applicant: Anthony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing LLP

History: various nineteenth and twentieth-century buildings; tile façade c.1950-1960

Project: Demolish buildings, demolish and reconstruct tile façade, landscape park, construct 3-story townhouses and 6- and 10-story multi-unit residential buildings

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert the National Products site of N. 2nd Street between Arch Street and Elfreth's Alley to a residential complex. The Commission approved iterative in-concept proposals for the complex in March 2003, August 2004, and November 2006. The Commission also approved in concept the faithful reconstruction of the orange tile facades in November 2006.

The orange tile façades and all of the buildings on the site except 128 Elfreth's Alley would be demolished. The tile façades would be rebuilt to match the original façades with new tiles and salvaged doors, windows, signage, and other elements including the granite channels. The applicant has obtained tile samples for comparison to the original tiles. A 6-story commercial and residential building would be constructed behind the reconstructed tile façade on N. 2nd Street. A 10-story commercial and residential building would be constructed on the Arch Street portion of the site. The entrance to the underground parking garage would be located at the east end of the Arch Street building. Ten 3-story townhouses would be constructed around an open courtyard at the northeastern corner of the site. The building at 128 Elfreth's Alley will be donated to the Elfreth's Alley Association.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the new tiles closely replicate the old tiles, with the staff to review details, pursuant to previous Commission approvals.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Attorney Anthony Forte, preservation consultant Sam Harris, and architect Gil Rosenthal, and developer Steve Patron represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that he had met with the development team at the site to compare the remanufactured tiles to the original tiles. He stated that the new tiles very closely matched the original tiles.

Mr. Forte reported that the application as initially submitted had requested final approval for all aspects of the project except the aboveground portion of the Arch Street building, for which the application initially sought in-concept approval. He stated that he was now amending his application to request final approval for the entirety of the project including the aboveground portion of the Arch Street building. He explained that the developer needed final approval of the entire project in order to guarantee his funding.

Mr. Harris, the preservation consultant, addressed the reconstruction of the tile façade. He updated the Committee on the condition of the tiles. He explained that recently there has been less new tile failure than he had expected, but that the earlier damage has continued to advance. Mr. Harris displayed new tile samples and explained that he can replicate the pattern, texture, and finish of the original tile. The Committee members agreed that the new tiles were excellent matches for the original tiles. The discussion turned to the glass tiles used in the storefront area. Mr. Harris explained that the original tile manufacturer is still in business in Central America, but cannot export to the United States because the company had been caught shipping illegal drugs with the tiles. Mr. Baron observed that the proposed glass tiles lack the opalescence of the original tiles. Mr. Harris conceded that he could provide a close but not an exact match for the glass tiles. Mr. Forte noted that the preservation team would continue to work with the staff to find appropriate replacement materials for the reconstruction. Ms. Pentz asked about the buff-colored tile at the top of the facades. Mr. Harris stated that it would be replicated. He added that he would prepare more detailed drawings of the façade reconstruction.

Ms. Voith asked about the landscape design for the park area. Mr. Forte stated that, although drawings were included in the submission, his client was not seeking approval for the landscaping. Mr. Patron explained that the Elfreth's Alley Association would submit a proposal to the Commission for the park. Mr. Forte asked that the landscape drawings be stricken from their application.

Ms. Voith and Mr. Levy objected to any recommendation for final approval of the building on Arch Street. Ms. Voith stated that the design had not been revised as the Committee had recommended during the previous review. Mr. Rosenthal, the architect of the building, contended that he had responded to the Committee's suggestions. However, before addressing the 10-story building, he displayed drawings and material samples for the 6-story building on N. 2nd Street. He explained that he had chosen Trespa as the material for the facades above the tile facades. He displayed a sample of the material to show the color, which would complement the tile. He provided details about the windows, which would coordinate with the tile and Trespa facades. He explained that at the rear of the 6-story building, facing the courtyard, the base of the building would be brick, to correspond to but not mimic the tile at the front and side. He also pointed out the strip windows at the rear, which would differentiate this façade from the historic facades. Ms. Voith again asserted that the Committee should not recommend approval of the new construction, but should ask for additional revisions to the plans. Mr. Rosenthal noted that he had chosen the Trespa because the Zoning Board of Adjustment had indicated that it was

opposed to metal siding. The Trespa was like metal siding, but was not metallic. Mr. Baron stated that the applicants have been responsive to the suggestions offered by the Committee.

Ms. Voith voiced strong concerns about the relationship between the 6-story building and the townhouses. She objected to the designs, stating that they are very different from one another. Mr. Rosenthal explained that the neighbors have always insisted that the three building types in the development appear very different. He stated that the neighbors had objected to one unifying design and instead wanted the complex to appear as though it was built at different times.

The discussion turned to the 10-story building. Mr. Rosenthal pointed out the refinements to the fenestration in the side facades, which the Committee had recommended. Ms. Voith stated that she was not “comfortable” with the design. She noted that she had requested that the balconies be moved to the corner of the building. Mr. Rosenthal reported that structural exigencies precluded relocating the balconies to the corner. He added that the marketing experts involved with the project had concluded that balconies were essential for sales in this building. Ms. Voith objected to the proportioning of the easternmost bay of the front façade, which reads as more of a tower with the brick spandrels. Mr. Rosenthal noted that he had designed the front façade to reduce the overall mass of the building. He also noted that the Zoning Board had limited his options for materials. Mr. Levy expressed surprise at this remark and suggested that the opinion of the neighbors should carry more weight than those of the Zoning Board. He also stated that the Historical Commission, not the Zoning Board, should be reviewing proposed materials. He requested that the historic preservation director contact the Zoning Board chair and outline the extent of the Commission’s powers. The Zoning Board should be directed to limit its purview to zoning issues and not address design issues. Mr. Levy asked Mr. Farnham to meet with the chair of the Zoning Board. Mr. Farnham declined to commit to such a meeting.

Corey Kegerise, the executive director of the Elfreth’s Alley Association, stated that his organization supports the final approval of the proposed 6-story building and the in-concept approval of the 10-story building, but not the final approval of the townhouses. He objected to the proposed rear garden walls that would enclose the rear yards of the townhouses. He noted that the walls would face the rear yards of the Association’s buildings. He objected to the construction of the walls in new brick and suggested that walls built of salvaged brick with an aged “patina” would be more appropriate. Ms. Voith asked if the walls were represented in the application package. Mr. Rosenthal pointed to them on the plans, but conceded that no elevation was included. Ms. Voith asserted that the Committee should consider the application incomplete without an elevation of the walls.

Mr. Farnham asserted that the Committee had lost sight of its objective, to preserve historic resources. He noted that the Commission has already approved this project in concept several times and suggested that the Committee was subjecting the proposed new construction to an unusual level of scrutiny. He reminded the Committee that the primary preservation issue raised by this application was the reconstruction of the tiles facades and he noted that the Committee has already deemed the reconstruction details including the tile match appropriate. He warned that Committee that it would be imprudent to reject this application because a detailed drawing of a rear garden wall had not been included. He noted that the Committee had not asked for that detail during previous reviews. He conceded that the new construction would impact the district, which is an historic resource, but he requested that the Committee limit its review of the new construction to the mitigation of that impact on the historic resource. He asserted that design details of the new construction that had no impact on any historic resources should not be subject to a strict review on architectural or aesthetic grounds. He suggested that if the

Committee did not recommend approval, then it clearly define the extent of its concerns, allowing the applicant to directly address those concerns in a subsequent submission.

Joseph Schiavo of the Old City Civic Association stated that his organization is very pleased with the details. He noted that the community would meet with the developer on 27 February 2007 and then present its final comments to the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

Ms. Voith stated that she opposes the scale, rhythm, and proportion of the 10-story building. She concluded that she is not “comfortable” with the building. Mr. Levy questioned the windows in the side façade and remarked that neighboring construction may block those windows in the future. Several people reminded Mr. Levy that the Committee and the Preservation Alliance had, during past reviews, strongly suggested that the developer include windows in the side facades.

Mr. Thomas deemed the 10-story building appropriate. Ms. Voith disagreed and stated that it “doesn’t work.”

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend final approval of the 6-story building, with the staff to review details; final approval of the townhouses, with the staff to review details, especially the rear garden walls; final approval of the foundations for the 10-story building; and in-concept approval of the 10-story building.

1213-1215 LOCUST STREET

Owner/Applicants: David Slovic & Ligia Slovic-Rave

History: built 1896, Frank Miles Day, architect

Project: legalize doors and skylights

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to legalize the removal of historic wood doors and frames and their replacement with flush metal doors and frames as well as the installation of two skylights on top of the dormers. The Commission approved a permit application for interior work that specifically excluded all exterior work; nonetheless, exterior work was undertaken. Although the applicant claims that the doors were later replacements, historic documents indicate that the removed doors were original.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of legalization of the skylights; denial of the legalization of the doors, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. David Slovic, the owner and an architect, represented the application.

Mr. Slovic stated that he purchased the property from the Redevelopment Authority and has owned it for 25 years. He noted that the property had been vandalized when vacant and reported on renovations undertaken in the 1980s. He stated that the front doors he had recently removed were not original but had been salvaged from another property by the Redevelopment Authority. The building houses the four residences. Mr. Slovic is concerned about his tenants’ security. He stated that the old doors were not sound. He claimed that trespassers had entered the building owing to the lack of proper doors. He installed the metal doors and frames to increase security. Mr. Slovic stated that his insurance company and contractor suggested metal doors. Mr. Slovic, who is an architect, stated that the metal doors were sympathetic to the

building and replicated the proportions of the original doors. He noted the original doors were smaller; the new doors were wider and the frames relocated. He contended that the original doors would have opened in, not out. He displayed a drawing showing how he imagined the original door.

Mr. Baron asserted that the doors recently removed were original to the building; according to Standard 6, they should be replaced in kind.

Mr. Thomas concurred with Mr. Baron and citing examples in which the Commission had required the fabrication of new doors matching the historic wood doors. Mr. Thomas opined on the significance of the building. He contended that the historic doors should be replicated. Mr. Thomas suggested other solutions to ensure the safety of the tenants.

The Committee members agreed that the skylights were not visible from the public right-of-way.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of legalization of the skylights, but denial of the legalization of the doors, pursuant to Standard 6.

2017 SANSOM STREET

Owner: Slavko Slavko & Victoria Brkich

Applicant: Gerry Gutierrez, architect

History: built as two carriage houses c. 1870, now combined

Contributing to Rittenhouse district

Project: Cut garage door

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes cutting a larger opening at an existing original carriage door on Ionic Street and installing a garage door. The garage would be used to park cars. Rowhouses front onto this block of Ionic Street. The Ionic Street façade of this building is visible from Chestnut Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 1, 2, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Gerry Gutierrez, current owner Slavko Brkich, and prospective owner Barbara Hindman represented the application.

Mr. Gutierrez explained that the building currently has a garage door in the front façade on Sansom and a carriage door in the rear façade on Ionic. He claimed that it is unsafe to back out of the garage onto Sansom, which is much busier than Ionic. He stated that the prospective owner does not want to back her car out onto Sansom. He is seeking the approval of a new garage entrance on Ionic. Mr. Gutierrez stated that adaptive reuse of buildings is common on Sansom. Currently, the building houses an auto shop. He displayed photographs of neighboring buildings to point out how they had been reused. He explained that he would remove the carriage door on Ionic, cut a larger opening, and install a new door. He would retain the existing door for the potential of reuse by a future owner.

Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with the staff's recommendation of denial and suggested that many devices such as mirrors and cameras are available that might aid in the use of the garage door on Sansom.

Ms. Pentz asked the applicant about the plans for the Sansom Street façade. Mr. Gutierrez stated the submission addresses the rear door only. Ms. Pentz stated that the Committee may have looked favorably on a proposal that offered restoration at the Sansom Street façade in exchange for the new garage opening at Ionic. Mr. Baron noted that the staff had suggested to the applicant that he submit a comprehensive plan for the building.

Mr. McCoubrey remarked that more research is needed. Mr. Levy asked if the applicant planned to eliminate the garage door on Sansom Street. Mr. Gutierrez replied in the negative, but noted that it would be safer to exit onto Ionic Street. Mr. Baron noted that, although the applicant continued to refer to the Ionic Street façade as the back of the property, it was actually a front facade.

The prospective owner, Ms. Hindman reported that trucks park in a loading zone on Sansom that blocks her view of oncoming traffic, creating an unsafe condition. She will not purchase the property if an Ionic garage is not approved. Ms. Pentz replied that the Architectural Committee is charged with reviewing based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 1, 2, and 9.

1301-1325 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: Macy's East/Starbucks Coffee

Applicant: Isaac Elmakis

History: 1904, Daniel Burnham and Co.
designated 8/2/1973

Project: Alter display window into entrance door, install sign

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to locate a coffee emporium at the corner of 13th and Chestnut Streets in the Wanamaker Building. The proposed entrance would be located in the easternmost display window of the Chestnut Street façade. The stone base would be cut down to allow for the proposed centered double-leaf fully glazed doors. The application initially proposed a new window with a non-historic pane configuration for the display window on 13th Street; this has been withdrawn. This application also initially proposed a blade sign for the corner of the building; this too has been withdrawn.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval provided the window on the 13th Street elevation retains its existing display window configuration, with the staff to review details, specifically the blade sign attachment details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Brett Feldman, engineer Frank Coulter, Starbucks's representative Lori Kiedaisch, and Macy's representative Edward Goldberg represented the application.

Mr. Feldman stated that his clients had updated their design to comply with the staff's recommendations and removed the blade sign and changes to the window on 13th Street from the application. He explained that Starbucks needed a direct entrance into their space to provide ADA accessibility and to accommodate to the difference in hours of operation between the department store and the coffee shop. He also noted that they had redesigned the entrance on Chestnut Street to leave in place as much of the original stone base as possible.

Ms. Pentz stated that she deemed the proposal acceptable. Mr. Levy disagreed. He stated that the proposed door on Chestnut Street was “horrendous.” He suggested that Dunkin Donuts would want to open a shop at the southwest corner of the Wanamaker Building if this application were approved. He suggested that the creation of entrance into the space from the vestibule to the west. Several Committee members, the staff, and the applicants objected strenuously to that suggestion, which would entail the demolition of a very significant, original Wanamaker mosaic in the vestibule. Ms. Pentz explained to Mr. Levy that, with the current proposal, the loss of historic fabric would be limited to a few inches of granite at the base of the window. It could be easily replaced in the future.

Mr. Goldberg stated that the nature of retailing has changed significantly in recent years. He stated that retailers now must provide expanded services with their merchandise, creating livelier atmospheres. The introduction of Starbuck’s into the department store is one step toward achieving that goal. It will add to the street life in the neighborhood.

Messrs. D’Alessandro and McCoubrey agreed that the impact on the historic fabric would be minimal and the proposal was therefore acceptable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised proposal without the blade sign or the alteration of the 13th Street window, with the staff to review details.

423 S. CARLISLE STREET

Owner/Applicant: Marjorie Muecke

History: c. 1850.

individually designated 9/28/1965

contributing to Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District

Project: Install fire escape in side alley

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to cut openings at the second and third floors of the side elevation on the alley and install a fire escape with a raised stair. The applicant does not own the alley into which the fire escape would extend. It is a common alley shared by several property owners including the owners of 419, 421, 423 and 425-427 S. Carlisle Street and 1413, 1415 and 1417 Lombard Street. All owners must join in this application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to the incompleteness of the application. All property owners must agree to the submission for the application to be considered complete.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect William Middleton and owner Marjorie Muecke represented the application.

Ms. Muecke stated that her home office and master bedroom, where she spends the majority of her time, are on the third floor. She explained that there is only one means of egress. She is concerned about evacuating during a fire. She is proposing the fire escape from the third floor bedroom to give her a second means of egress.

Mr. Middleton explained that the fire escape would be an open metal stair extending into the alley. The lowest section would drop down when used, but would normally be up at the second-floor level. Openings to the fire escape would be cut at the second and third-floor levels.

Ms. Cote stated that deed research undertaken by the staff indicates that the applicant does not own the alley, but it is an alley shared by numerous property owners. Mr. Farnham stated that all must join in the application. Ms. Cote explained that the deeds for 419, 421, 423 and 425-427 S. Carlisle Street and 1413, 1415 and 1417 Lombard Street all state that the owners have free use of the alley. Committee members noted that, when down, the fire escape would block the alley for others escaping a fire.

Mr. Levy noted a major design flaw with the fire escape. It directs users back away from escape at the street rather than toward sanctuary at the street. Mr. D'Alessandro questioned whether a fire escape like proposed would meet the building code. He suggested converting the existing interior stair into a fire stair using drywall, door closers, and shutters. He noted that it would be much less expensive than adding a fire escape.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of a fire escape facing out toward the street, provided all property owners sharing the alley join in the application.

540 CYPRESS STREET

Owner/Applicant: Greg DiTeodoro

History: c. 1809 to 1824

individually designated 12/31/1984

significant to the Society Hill Historic District

Project: Legalize reconstructed bulkhead

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the reconstruction of the bulkhead with a skylight. The designation photograph indicates that a basement window, not a bulkhead, occupied this location at the time of designation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Greg DiTeodoro represented the application.

Mr. DiTeodoro explained that he purchased the property in 2003. At that time, it had a bulkhead. He stated that the bulkhead was deteriorated. He rebuilt the bulkhead with the skylights. No masonry work was undertaken during the reconstruction.

Ms. Pentz commented that photographs show that there was a plate flush with the sidewalk, but no raised bulkhead in 1999. Mr. DiTeodoro stated that the former owner constructed the the bulkhead. Mr. Farnham asked Ms. Cote if the Commission had any evidence that it had reviewed or approved the addition of the bulkhead. Ms. Cote responded that there is no evidence that the Commission approved the bulkhead.

Mr. McCoubrey explained to the applicant that the Committee applies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to proposals; the Committee does not have the discretion to recommend approval of illegal work or work that does not satisfy the Standards. He suggested that the applicant present his case for legalization to the Commission.

The applicant noted that he recently received a violation for the bulkhead. He also noted that several of his neighbors all have similar bulkheads. He concluded that the repair was undertaken to prevent further damage. Committee members suggested that the skylights in the bulkhead might be dangerous for pedestrians. The applicant noted that metal bars beneath the glass would prevent pedestrians from falling through the glass.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the legalization, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

1010 ARCH STREET

Owner: Asian Bank

Applicant: Dottie Tuccio

History: 1902, W. Pritchett, architect
designated 1/7/1982

Project: Install two awnings and ATM bezel

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install two internally-illuminated, shed-type awnings on the front elevation at the first-floor level. This application also proposes to install an ATM and plastic, internally-illuminated signage in the front facade. The Historical Commission approved an application for awnings without lighting and egg-crate diffusers in these locations in 2001.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the awnings without lighting and egg-crate diffusers; denial of the ATM and signage, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Matt Carson of City Sign and Mark Winkler of the Asian Bank represented the application.

The applicants agreed to revise their application to comply with the staff's recommendations for the awnings, removing the lighting and egg-crate diffusers. However, the applicants refused to consider other options for the ATM, which is proposed for the front façade at the storefront. They stated that the Asian Bank has competitors with a few feet that have ATMs on the street. They need this ATM on the street to compete. They noted that the storefront already has a night drop box; the ATM would install in the window adjacent to the box without any masonry changes. Mr. Levy stated that an ATM without the lighting might pose a safety problem. Mr. Carson stated that he would develop a new lighting option in place of the rejected awning lighting. Mr. McCoubrey explained that he considered the ATM appropriate for this location because the storefront is not historic and its installation would not require any changes to the masonry opening. He agreed that a new lighting scheme should be developed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the ATM with signage and the awnings without lighting and egg-crate diffusers.

1400 MARKET STREET (CITY HALL)

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Christopher Christian, P.E

History: 1871-1901, John McArthur Jr. and Thomas U. Walter, architects
designated 5/28/1957

Project: Construct ADA-access ramp at the northeast entrance to City Hall

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an ADA-access ramp at the northeast entrance to City Hall. The construction of the ramp would not necessitate the removal of the historic granite steps at the entrance; instead, the steps would be retained in place and protected, but covered. The applicant proposes a multiple-layer water resistant barrier between the new and old materials to ensure future reversibility. The design of the ramp responds to the architecture of the building. It would be clad with granite along the walls of the ramp and would have simplified bronze handrails.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the disturbance to the historic fabric is minimized, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Chris Christian and Martin Lieberman of the Capital Programs Office and architect Joseph Powell represented the application.

Mr. Danta explained that he had met with the applicants and suggested that they simplify the railings to avoid confusion with the historic railings.

Mr. Powell explained that he was proposing to construct the ramp and steps from concrete, but would clad the wall of the ramp with granite to match the historic building. He noted that concrete, which would be poured in place, would be much easier to adapt to the historic entranceway. It would be very difficult and expensive to construct the steps and ramp from cut stone.

Ms. Pentz asked why the opening in the wall had been included across from the door. Mr. Powell replied that the opening with the railing had been included to allow views of the door. Mr. Levy stated that he would recommend denial of the design because the opening with railing would confuse people with poor vision. Ms. Pentz asked why the steps were not in line with the door. Mr. Powell replied that he had decided that pedestrians should be dispersed to the sides rather than out away from the building owing to the width of the sidewalk and the volume of pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

Ms. Pentz and Messrs. D'Alessandro and McCoubrey observed that the ramp should be shifted away from the historic façade. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the proposed ramp was too massive; it competes with the historic building. Mr. Powell stated that the building is very massive and therefore demands an appropriately large ramp. Responding to the assertion that it should be moved away from the building, he commented that he was endeavoring to avoid creating a narrow area where trash would collect. Mr. Powell noted that he would simplify the railing. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the architect consider again using real stone, not concrete. Mr. Powell, the architect, again noted that using cut stone would significantly complicate the design. Mr. D'Alessandro then suggested using a colored concrete that would harmonize with the building. Mr. McCoubrey again opposed the design decision to include a massive wall along the ramp; he again suggested a metal railing instead of a wall. A majority of Committee members agreed that Option 1 with the rusticated cladding on the wall was the better proposal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Option 1, with the staff to review details.

401 N. BROAD STREET

Owner: Gerald S. Kaufman Corp

Applicant: David G. Orphanides

History: 1929-1931; designated 5/11/1994

Project: Relocate two rooftop antennas

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to relocate three existing Nextel antennas atop the penthouse of the North American Building on N. Broad Street. The existing antennas are located at the rear of the penthouse and extend above the roofline. The application proposes to remove those existing Nextel antennas and replace them with two new antennas mounted to the south side of the penthouse. The mounting structure would not be flush with the penthouse wall, but would extend outward from the wall. The antennas and the mounting structure would be visible from N. Broad Street. The penthouse façade is finely detailed with decorative brick and terra cotta detailing like the front façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney David Orphanides and engineers Larry Hercules and Phil Burtnew represented the application.

Mr. Orphanides stated that existing antennas are and the new antennas would be visible from the south on N. Broad Street. He reported that there are numerous antennas and other mechanical equipment on the building. He explained that the existing antennas must be replaced because they are projecting too far and are interfering with other antennas in the network. He noted that these antennas were installed when the network was young; several antennas sites have been installed since that time. This set of antennas now must be focused on a smaller area around N. Broad Street. To focus them, they must be moved closer toward the street and angled down toward it. Their coverage must be contained and controlled. He noted that the new antennas would not be visible from the north.

Mr. Orphanides stated that his engineer may be able to reduce the size of the proposed structure, but must mount the structure on the side of the upper, central penthouse. It cannot be mounted on the lower penthouse. To accommodate the antennas on the lower penthouse, they would need to be placed on a very tall mast.

Ms. Pentz asked why they could not remain where they are. Mr. Orphanides stated that they cannot be angled down toward the street in their current position; the front section of the building stands in their path to the street.

Mr. Hercules elaborated. He stated that they needed to install “downtilt” antennas to cover a smaller area. To target the area on N. Broad Street, they either need to be moved closer to the front of the building or placed on a taller mast. Mr. Orphanides stated again that this site has become problematic as other sites in the city were added or improved.

The Committee asked about the visual impact of mounting an antennas structure on the side of the ornate penthouse. Mr. Orphanides responded that the elevation drawings do not provide a

view from the street, but instead provide a view only available to “Spiderman” hanging on the side of the Inquirer building. He then acknowledged that the new antennas would be visible from N. Broad Street to the south and Callowhill Street from the west.

Ms. Pentz asserted that the antennas should be held back from Broad Street and should not encroach on the decorative portion of the penthouse. She opined that taller antennas set back on the building would be preferable to antennas near the front façade. Mr. D’Alessandro agreed and stated that a taller, vertical structure set back would be far less intrusive than something that would look like a fire escape with antennas hanging from the decorative penthouse.

Mr. Burtnew, a civil engineer, stated that he might be able to reduce the size and complexity of the proposed armature for the antennas. Mr. Orphanides stated that the antennas would be painted to blend with the penthouse. Mr. Levy asked if the antennas could be moved closer to the wall of the penthouse. Mr. Burtnew stated that they might be able to move them closer. Several Committee members rejected Mr. Levy’s suggestion to move them closer to the penthouse wall. They asserted that nothing should be mounted to the decorative wall. Ms. Pentz and Messrs. D’Alessandro and McCoubrey contended that a taller mast located on the rear roof of the penthouse would be better than anything mounted on the side of the penthouse. Ms. Pentz suggested that they develop options for antennas on masts away from the front façade.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal as submitted, pursuant to Standard 9.

1216-1220 ARCH STREET

Owner: Young Smyth Field Condominium Association

Applicant: David G. Orphanides

History: Built in 1902, designated 6/13/1990

Project: Replace three sets of antenna on rooftop locations

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission has reviewed several applications for telecommunication antennas on this building. In July 2000, the Commission approved a proposal for an interim, ninety-day installation of antennas by Nextel in three locations on this building. The temporary approval allowed Nextel to provide coverage during the Republican Convention, which held events at the Convention Center. In October 2000, the Historical Commission reviewed an application to keep the antennas installed under the temporary permit and approved it with the following conditions: the antennas at the front façade were to be lowered and moved closer to the front parapet; the rear antennas were to be reduced in height; all antennas were to be painted brick color; and Nextel was to provide a letter stating that the antennas would be removed upon obsolescence. The Historical Commission files contain no record that these conditions were ever satisfied. In August 2001, Nextel submitted an application for the creation of an antenna zone on this building. The Historical Commission approved in concept an antenna zone to be determined. The Historical Commission files contain no records indicating that either an antenna zone was established or a final approval was ever sought or given. Therefore, the extant Nextel antennas are illegal. This application should be treated like a new or legalization application, not an application for minor modifications to a legal installation.

The current application proposes to replace several antennas and to eliminate two others. The current proposal refers to the same three locations that were temporarily approved in October 2000. Four existing antennas facing the front of the building would be replaced with three new antennas. Four existing antennas facing west would be replaced with three new antennas. Four

existing antennas facing southeast would be replaced with four new antennas. The existing antennas are 48" tall and 12" wide. The applicant proposes to replace them with new antennas that are of varying heights, but that would not extend any higher overall than the existing antennas. The applicant proposes to paint all antennas blue-gray.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz recused because her firm is working for the condominium association that owns the building. Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Attorney David Orphanides represented the application.

Mr. Orphanides documented that the building at 1321 Arch Street, where some Nextel antennas now stand, will be demolished for the convention center expansion. He stated that his client is therefore seeking to augment its capacity at this building to offset the loss of antennas at the other building. He noted that he was unaware of the earlier reviews before the Commission. He claimed that the antennas would not function correctly if moved forward toward the parapet, as required in an earlier approval. He also stated that painting them a brick-red color, as required in the earlier approval, would actually cause most of them to be more visible. Most are not located against brick backgrounds. Mr. Orphanides displayed several photographs showing the Nextel and other antennas on the roof.

Mr. Levy commented that the slight alterations to the antennas were acceptable. Mr. Farnham reminded Mr. Levy and the other Committee members that the extant antennas were not legal. The Committee should not review this application as a proposal to make minor adjustments to a legal antenna installation, but as either a new or legalization application. The Historical Commission has approved three Nextel applications for this building. One was approved for 90 days and has expired. One was approved finally with conditions that were not met. One was given an in-concept approval, which expired long ago. Mr. Levy stated that it was acceptable to him as a new or revision proposal.

The engineer commented that reducing the heights of the antennas or moving them toward the parapet will be detrimental to the efficacy. Mr. D'Alessandro indicated his acceptance of the proposal if the earlier approvals would result in installations that would not work. After asking for more information about the proposed locations of the antennas, Mr. McCoubrey also indicated his acceptance of the proposal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that those antennas that will be seen against the sky are painted blue-gray and those that will be seen against brick walls are painted brick red.

1701 LOCUST STREET

Owner: CDF, Philadelphia Holding, LP

Applicant: Martin Jay Tackett R.A

History: 1923-1925, Frank Hahn and Brian Baylinson

Significant in Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District

Project: Alterations to non-historic penthouse

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish and reconstruct a non-historic penthouse at the 21st floor of the Warwick Hotel. The extant penthouse is highly visible from Locust Street. Period photographs show that this space was originally an open terrace. The applicant

proposes to reconstruct a new glass and steel addition that would be similar to the existing one, but would have a small open terrace.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect Martin Jay Tackett represented the application.

Mr. Tackett stated that the proposed penthouse differed significantly from the existing penthouse. He stated that the owners would leave the existing penthouse in place if a new penthouse were not approved. He asserted that the extant penthouse is extremely unattractive and should be removed. Mr. Tackett stated about 40% of the terrace would be restored to its previous openness and the balance would be enclosed. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with the staff and added that the terrace space on the roof should be brought back. Mr. Tackett offered that there was terrace space on the other side of the building. Mr. McCoubrey responded that it was not a full terrace and suggested that the applicant restore rather than create something so visible. Mr. Tackett stated that his aim was to create something transparent so that it would not be highly visible. Mr. Levy suggested that the proposed penthouse be set back to create more terrace.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the reconstructed penthouse provided that the penthouse is set back five to six feet from the parapet, with the staff to review details.

241-45 MARKET STREET

Owner: 241 – 245, LLC (Louis J. Orocofsky and CNO, LLC)

Applicant: Stephen Maffei

History: vacant lot

individually designated with building, 11/4/1976

non-contributing Old City Historic District

Project: Construct six-story building

OVERVIEW: In 2004, the Historical Commission approved a proposal from this applicant for a 6-story building at this site. The neighbors opposed the design and it was eventually abandoned. In 2006, the applicant submitted a revised application proposing a six-story building that was similar in plan, but very different in elevation. The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the application, which was withdrawn before the Historical Commission reviewed it. In January 2007, the applicant submitted an application related to the 2004 design, but then withdrew it before the Architectural Committee meeting.

The applicant now proposes a revised version of the 2006 design. The design proposes a six-story building with commercial space at the first floor and residential units above. The plan includes brick and stone-veneer cladding with alternating brick and glass balcony railings. The front and rear facades are identical with strong horizontal emphases that relate to the neighboring historic structures. The applicant has also modified the garden wall along Church Street. The new garden wall presents a more solid appearance on a single plane that better responds to the façades along Church Street. The trellis has been eliminated entirely. The garden wall would be constructed of the same materials as the building. It would include wrought iron ornaments and wall sconces.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Stephen Maffei and attorney Michael Mattioni represented the application.

Mr. Maffei explained that this proposal incorporates the many suggestions the Architectural Committee and civic association offered during the previous reviews. He stated that he hoped that this design would accommodate the concerns of the Commission and the community.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the balcony railings. Mr. Maffei stated that they alternate between brick and glass on the upper floors. Mr. D'Alessandro inquired about the depth of the balconies. Mr. Maffei stated that the outer balconies would be about two feet deep; the inner balconies five feet.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 10.

2212 SPRUCE STREET (TRINITY MEMORIAL CHURCH)

Owner: Trinity Memorial Church

Applicant: John C. Kohlhas AIA

History: 1874, Henry A. & James P. Sims, 1874

Individually designated 2/8/1995

Significant in Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District

Project: Demolish historic addition and replace with enlarged addition.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a one-story link that connects the church to the parish building to the west. The link was constructed sometime between 1910 and 1923. The applicant proposes to replace it with a larger entrance pavilion that would accommodate an ADA lift that would provide ADA access to both buildings. The historic wrought iron gates at the street entrance would remain, but the brick pavement in the alley would be removed and reset in the areas not occupied by the new pavilion. The proposal presents a contemporary glassy design. The applicant proposes to utilize a metal and glass storefront system finished in a dark bronze color.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect John Kohlhas and church representative Michael Stern represented the application.

Mr. Kohlhas described this project as the final part of a three-part capital campaign. The building suffered a fire in the 1990s and has since been restored. Mr. Kohlhas stated that the lack of accessibility has resulted in a drop in attendance. Providing ADA access poses challenges owing to the differing floor levels in the church and parish buildings. He reported that he considered adding ramps at the front of the buildings, but they proved impossible. He therefore decided to create a new main entrance pavilion that would provide the access and tie the buildings together. He noted that the new pavilion would be insignificantly taller than the existing link. In fact, all but the skylight of the pavilion would be shorter than the existing link. He added that the pavilion roof would float between the buildings.

Ms. Pentz asked if the existing link is original or was added later. Mr. Danta stated that it is not original, but was built between 1910 and 1923. Mr. Kohlhas explained that the link is faced with tin, not masonry as it appears. He reported that it might have been open and then covered later. The link has several steps to accommodate the many level changes between the buildings and the exterior. Ms. Pentz asked about the existing door openings at the link. Mr. Kohlhas explained that he would permanently close but leave in place the parish-house door at the link. The lift would have three stops, the first at the sidewalk level, the second at the parish-house level, and the third at the church level. The door at the parish-house level would not be replaced as the plans indicate, but would be retained. Several Committee members asked about the location of the front wall of the pavilion, which seems almost to intersect with a window in the church building. Mr. Kohlhas explained that the location of the lift, which is set by the openings into the buildings, determined the location of the front wall of the pavilion. He stated that the lift has certain clearance requirements that he must meet.

Mr. Levy asked if the architect planned to reuse the brick paving. Mr. Kohlhas stated he would prefer to reuse salvaged brick to replace the concrete where plumbing projects have taken place. Ms. Pentz asked if he planned to modify the wrought iron gate at the sidewalk. Mr. Kohlhas stated that it would remain in place.

Ms. Pentz opined that the link was not historically significant and therefore could be demolished. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the demolition was acceptable.

Mr. Danta stated that the staff was concerned about how the new pavilion would fit within the two buildings. Mr. Kohlhas reported that he had studied the problem in great depth. He explained many of his design decisions and the constraints that produced them. The Committee decided that the design was appropriate in light of the goals and constraints of the project.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details.

2114 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: Paul Hoyer and Helen Leibowitz

Applicant: Martin Jay Rosenblum

History: c. 1860-1879

Project: Remove existing second story roof deck, extend second story to align with existing first story, and construct a solarium on the third story.

OVERVIEW: The application proposes to demolish an existing roof deck at the second-story level and extend the second story to align with a first-story bay. The addition would be similar to the extant building, using similar brick and a Queen Anne bay design with 2-over-2 windows, wood side panels, and a heavy cornice and woodwork. On the third story, a metal and glass solarium would be constructed flush with the new second story and existing first story. Cypress is a common alley that is abutted by the rears of buildings on Spruce Street and Delancey Place.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Martin Jay Rosenblum represented the application.

Mr. Rosenblum explained that the rear flat roof leaks and the owners have been unsuccessful in repairing it. They hope that the proposed addition will resolve the roof problems and provide the owners with a much needed greenhouse space for their orchid cultivation. Mr. Rosenblum stated that the streetscape has changed dramatically through the years and that few original rear facades exist. Therefore, this alteration would not be inconsistent with the varied streetscape.

Ms. Pentz inquired whether the owners had considered a deck instead of a greenhouse. Mr. Rosenblum responded that the deck would not provide the climate-controlled space sought by the owners for their gardening. He added that decks are seldom used.

Mr. Levy stated that he found it unnecessary to replicate the bay at the second-floor level. He mentioned that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation do not allow for replication of historic designs. Mr. Rosenblum stated that he could consider a double window instead of a bay if the design of the bay would prevent approval.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that either design would involve the removal of original historic fabric on a rear ell that retains a high degree of integrity. He also objected to historicist second-floor addition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

100-102 MARKET STREET

Owner: ESK Ventures

Applicant: Allison Fritch

History: 1882, individually designated 10/7/1976, contributing to the Old City Historic District

Project: Install ADA ramp on Front Street, replace storefront windows, clean and point brick

OVERVIEW: The applicant submitted an application in November 2005 for interior renovations and a handicap access ramp to be installed along Market Street. The Commission approved the application providing that the ramp was paved with brick and granite, with the staff to review details. The staff approved the restoration of the second through fifth-story windows, cast-iron columns, wood sills and trim, and wood base panels on the first story in September 2006.

The applicant returned to Commission in October 2006 proposing the replacement of six large storefront windows with tall, vertical, double-glazed, four-paneled, bi-fold windows opening accordion style. The Commission denied the application as submitted, but approved the replacement of each large storefront window with two casement or pivot windows, provided the historic transoms were retained, with the staff to review details.

This application proposes to install the ADA ramp along the Front Street elevation; it was previously approved for the Market Street elevation. The owner has changed the interior design, moving the residential portion to Market Street, necessitating the relocation of the ramp to Front Street.

This application also proposes to replace six large storefront windows on the first story with six casement windows. The casements have two vertical glazed panels in wood frames that will open into the interior. The existing transoms and sills are to remain and be repaired.

Brick cleaning and spot repointing are also proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Frank Rapisarda and Martin Jay Tackett represented the application.

Mr. Tackett mentioned that a fire had damaged the interior of the building and that interior structural work would be necessary.

Mr. Levy inquired whether the ramp would expand beyond the entry. Mr. Rapisarda explained that it would not.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

1701 GREEN STREET

Owner: James Stevens, 1701 Green Real Estate Holdings, LLC

Applicant: Christina Blumbach

History: Built circa 1859, storefront circa 1895, storefront renovated 1991

Project: Extend existing ADA ramp, install exterior lights, install new signage, install interior glass window screens, place facon lettering on east transom, and paint exterior cornice and brick.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes several changes to the first-story storefront exterior of this corner building. The proposed work includes the extension of an existing ADA ramp on the east side about one foot to the north. The metal rail for the ramp would connect into the existing frame of the wood window. Two blade signs would be affixed to existing wood pilasters on the south and east elevations. Additional signage would be added to the transom on the east side of the building with vinyl lettering. Mounted to the brick above the pressed tin cornice would be ten exterior lighting fixtures attached with four bolts each. The project also proposes to paint the exterior brick and woodwork black on the south side and red on the east side. The light-colored brick is believed to be a turn-of-the-century material.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of ADA ramp extension and interior glass screens pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of blade signage, exterior lighting fixtures, and painting of exterior brickwork, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Martin Jay Tackett and owner Christina Blumbach attended the meeting.

Alan Rubin of the Spring Gardens Civic Association stated that the Association would continue to work with the owner on the details of the proposal, but that they were in agreement with the proposal. He opined that the proposed red and black color scheme would not be acceptable to the Civic Association and that the lights on the side would not be appropriate or necessary in this block.

Ms. Pentz stated that the Civic Association's position was in agreement with the staff's recommendation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the ADA ramp extension and interior glass screens, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of the blade signage, exterior lighting fixtures, and painting of exterior brickwork, pursuant to Standard 9.

159 N. 21ST STREET

Owner: Patrick and Danielle Morrin
Applicant: Patrick and Danielle Morrin
History: c. 1860
Project: Legalize roof deck on main block

OVERVIEW: The application proposes the legalization of a roof deck on the main block of this building. The wooden deck is accessible from the third-story apartment only. The applicant purchased the property with the roof deck in place and presented this application to the Commission after discovering that a building permit had not been issued for its construction.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to the Commission's policy on decks on the main blocks of rowhouses.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application. Owner Patrick Morrin and attorney James Stephen represented application.

Mr. Morrin stated that he was unaware that the deck was built without a permit when he purchased the property in July 2005. He also stated that the Logan Square Association as well as his City Councilman's office supported the legalization of the deck.

Ms. Pentz inquired whether the deck was visible from the street. Mr. Morrin stated that the deck was virtually invisible from the street and that the reason for the application was to limit his liability. Ms. Pentz stated that, although it is on the main block, it satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards because it is inconspicuous. She deemed the deck appropriate. Her fellow Committee members agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend the legalization of the deck.

ADJOURNMENT: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

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 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.