

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

**TUESDAY, 28 JANUARY 2014
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

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

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner I
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Jeremy LeCompte, Harman Deutsch
Carolina Pena, YCH Architects
Jason Borden
Sean Sullivan, JKR Partners
Brett Webber, BWA
Adam Montalbano, Moto Designshop
Stephen Beers
James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co. Architects
David Hess
Mark Travis
Martin Jay Rosenblum, MJRA
Mark Feinstein
Leonard F. Reuter, Esq.
Lorna Katz Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Paul Boni, Esq., Boni Law
David Gest, Ballard Spahr
Shimi Zakin, Atrium Design Group
Jonathan Doran, Atrium Design Group
Jay Schwartz, Friends of the Boyd (FOB)
Dana Kalmey, FOB
Richard Gelber, SPG3
Howard Haas, FOB
Nelda Horwitz, FOB
Nancy Kenny, FOB
Robert Shusterman, Esq., FOB
G.K. White, FOB

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2014
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Henry Hauptfuhrer, FOB
Michael Bencik, FOB
Caroline Boyce, Preservation Alliance
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance
Patrick Houck, Preservation Alliance

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Mses. Gutterman, Pentz, and Stein and Messrs. Cluver, D'Alessandro, and McCoubrey joined her.

ADDRESS: 542-44 N 04TH ST

Project: Construct roof deck and pilot houses
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Spring Garden Associates
Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch
History: 1902; Integrity Title Insurance Company; Paul and Seymour Davis; 1912 addition, 1920
Individual Designation: 1/7/1982
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate a bank building for commercial and residential use. The Architectural Committee reviewed a similar application for this property last month and recommended denial. The application was withdrawn before the Historical Commission meeting. The current application incorporates revisions to the design based on the Architectural Committee's comments.

The earlier application proposed to remove security grills and replace the first-floor windows with windows that would not replicate the historic configuration. The current application proposes to retain the security grills and historic windows on the first floor. In three locations, the bottom lights of the historic windows would be made operable by installing hopper windows matching the historic windows.

The application proposes to retain, or replace in kind, the second-floor single-light and double-hung windows with curved glass at the corner of the building. The single-light windows are an illegal condition and should be replaced with the appropriate double-hung windows with curved glass. The designation photographs show the original windows in place; the single-light windows were installed after designation without the Commission's approval.

The application proposes an accessibility ramp for the non-historic entry on Green Street. The cheek of the ramp would be faced cast stone to match the base of the building. The earlier application proposed a concrete cheek, which the Committee rejected.

The original application proposed numerous roof decks with a pilot house for each residential unit. The many pilot houses would have been conspicuous from the street. The current application proposes a common or shared deck with two pilohouses. As currently proposed, the pilot houses will be set back from the street facades significantly. It is likely that deck and pilohouse will be visible from up 4th Street. However, given the setbacks of the deck and design of the pilohouses, they will likely be inconspicuous.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the single-light windows at the corner are restored with the appropriate double-hung windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jeremy LeCompte represented the application.

Mr. LeCompte, stated that they did their best to respond to the Architectural Committee's comments from last month and have made modifications to the design. He stated that they wanted to reduce the number of pilothouses on the roof to only one based on the Committee's suggestion; however, for safety and egress reasons, they are proposing two pilothouses.

Mr. LeCompte stated that his client purchased the property after the illegal alteration was made to the curved windows at the corner and was unaware that it was an illegal condition. He stated that they have priced out the restoration of the curved windows and the cost is too high. He stated that the client has been receptive to practically all the comments and suggestions of the Commission's staff and the Architectural Committee, but they find this requirement would greatly increase the cost of the project, which is already over budget.

Mr. Cluver stated that the reduction of the number of pilothouses to two is a significant improvement over the first application. He suggested either changing the orientation of the stairs to get the pilot house off the parapet or, if that is not possible, squaring off the top of the pilot house to be parallel with the parapet. Mr. Cluver asked if the guardrail to the basement entrance would be replaced. Mr. LeCompte responded that they intend to replace the guardrail to meet code. Mr. Cluver asked about the siding at the side entrance. He suggested that they put a glass transom in that location. Mr. LeCompte stated that he would consider the glass transom. Mr. Cluver stated that the appropriate curved windows should be installed. Mr. LeCompte stated that they propose to use wood windows on the 4th Street and Green Street elevations but vinyl windows on the rear alley elevations. Ms. Cote stated that vinyl windows on the rear alley elevations could be approved at staff level, provided they are not visible from the public right of way. Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the curved windows are important and should be restored.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the single-light windows at the corner are restored with the appropriate double-hung windows and that the western pilothouse is squared off so that its roof is parallel to the parapet, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 131 N 20TH ST

Project: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: You Dale

Applicant: Yao Huang, YCH Architect

History: 1860

Individual Designation: 4/28/1970

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck on the roof of the rear ell of this corner rowhouse. A rear window opening would be cut down to create a door opening. No details are provided for the door or the deck materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the door is glazed in the upper half with a pane pattern like the nearby windows, and the deck railing is transparent, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Carolina Pena represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the proposed materials of the deck. Ms. Pena stated that the owner would like to match the materials of the previously approved and installed roof deck, which is a wood framed deck. Ms. Pena stated that the owner would implement the suggestions of the Committee and the Historical Commission. She stated that owner would be open to a black metal railing if the Commission prefers it. She informed the Committee that they were trying to determine if the Commission would approve a roof deck in this location first and then work out the details.

Ms. Pentz asked about the previously approved roof deck. Ms. Pena stated that there is a lower deck in the rear behind the garage addition. Ms. Cote pointed out the location of the other deck and she stated that that deck was reviewed and approved by the Historical Commission.

Mr. Cluver asked if the owner would consider a cable railing. Ms. Pena replied that the owner would consider such a railing. He asked about the use of the building. Ms. Pena responded that there are four residential units in the building.

Ms. Gutterman observed that this deck would be on the rear ell but will still be highly visible. Ms. Cote stated that an inconspicuous deck would satisfy the Standards. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission has routinely approved decks on rear ells, not on main rooftops, because some believe that decks were historically located on rear ells. He cited the reconstructed rowhouses at Independence National Historical Park as examples.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the roof would be altered for this deck. Ms. Pena stated that they wanted to install a platform and it would be approximately two feet above the parapet edge; the railing would stand 42 inches above the platform. Ms. Stein asked about the material for the platform. Ms. Pena stated that it would be wood, possibly with vinyl siding. Ms. Hawkins observed that this deck would add a minimum of five feet to this roof. Mr. Baron informed the Committee that the Commission typically approves decks with the skirts on the structure. Mr. Cluver opined that

the deck would be an intrusion. He noted that it cannot be pushed back from the façade because the ell is narrow.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that a deck in this location might be acceptable, but the application does not provide enough information to review this proposal. He suggested minimizing the height above the roof and using a transparent railing.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 1811-19 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Replace windows

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: The Belgravia Condominium Association

Applicant: Jason Borden, O&S Associates

History: 1902; Belgravia; Milligan & Webber, architects

Individual Designation: 6/3/1982

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application seeks in-concept approval of the replacement of all the windows and frames with aluminum windows. The proposed aluminum windows do not replicate the details of the historic windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Jason Borden represented the application.

Mr. Borden stated that they are seeking to replace the windows owing to water infiltration. The windows are in poor condition. He stated that in some instances the windows have become inoperable. He stated that the percentage of rotten wooden components is so high that piecemeal replacement would not be worthwhile. He stated that they are proposing this aluminum window because it is a close match for the existing glazing dimensions. He stated that they thoroughly measured the glazing proportions throughout the building. Ms. Gutterman asked if the brick molds are going to be restored. Mr. Borden responded that they propose to put in the aluminum framing system that is part of the proposed window. Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicant discussed customizing the aluminum windows to replicate the historic windows. Mr. Borden stated that they have not determined all the details yet and that they are hoping to gain some direction by an in-concept approval, then bid the project, make selections, and work out the details. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that they install new wood windows. Mr. Borden stated that they decided to pursue aluminum windows first as they determined that there is a \$200,000 cost difference between aluminum and wood windows.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Commission has in the past approved aluminum windows in the upper floors of high-rise buildings. She stated that the level at which the Commission approved the change from wood to aluminum windows was determined by visibility and a visual break in

the design of the building, such as a cornice line. She stated that she found this application troubling due to the amount of replacement and the lack of replication of the historic window details. She stated that she has been able to find aluminum window manufacturers that can replicate historic details and will do so when a large number of windows are being replaced. She suggested that the applicant may be too early in the design process to be seeking an in-concept approval. She suggested that he undertake additional investigation before pursuing a decision from the Commission.

Mr. Baron stated that the proposed windows do not replicate the historic windows and noted that aluminum windows that replicate the historic profiles should be available and cost effective.

Ms. Gutterman stated that the proposed windows fail to replicate the historic windows and their installation would constitute a major change to the building. Mr. Cluver stated that anodized aluminum would also be inappropriate for the building. He stated that the windows should have a painted look.

Patrick Hauck of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance holds a façade easement on this building. He informed the applicant that the Alliance must review the proposal as well. He stated that he is hoping to open a line of communication with the applicant and the owner.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 1708 DELANCEY PL

Project: Add basement entry stair and install railing; construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Horatio & Joanne Yeung

Applicant: Brett Webber, Brett Webber Architects, PC

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to excavate at the front façade and construct a below-grade stair and basement entrance on Delancey Place. The stair treads and risers would be stone to match existing treads, with a coursed stone veneer at the façade of the stone stairs. A wrought iron hand rail is proposed for this exterior stair. The extent of alteration to the existing front steps is not clear in the drawings. This application also proposes to construct a four story enclosed stair addition at the rear of the property, which is not visible from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the rear addition, pursuant to Standard 9. No recommendation for the basement entry stair, owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Brett Webber represented the application.

Mr. Webber shared additional photographs with the Committee, which were not part of the original application. He shared photographs of a recently-completed basement entry stair on the 2000 block of Delancey Place and suggested that it was comparable. He stated that his project will include some sort of steel structure to support the existing treads. Ms. Hawkins explained that there had been substantial discussion in regards to the comparable project regarding the support system of the existing landing. That applicant had provided specifics from a mason regarding the support system. Mr. Webber agreed that he will need to provide further details regarding the support system for the existing treads, and that he will review those details, in addition to window replacement, with the staff. Ms. Gutterman noted that the comparison stair on the 2000 block of Delancey Place was much taller and wider and was therefore potentially better able to accommodate a basement stair. She noted her concern if the existing treads are already cracked. Mr. Webber clarified that there are no fractures in the existing treads, but that there are some chips in the stone. He agreed that his proposal is conceptual in nature but that he is working with a structural engineer on the actual plate structure with ribbing for the edge of the landing. Ms. Gutterman inquired about plans for the relocation of the existing light pole. Mr. Webber stated that he plans to shift the light pole to the east several feet in order to accommodate the width of the stair. Mr. Cluver noted that there is a history of building these basement entrances in the city, and that he would consider it appropriate if it were consistent with what has been done in the past, without heavy reliance on structural steel. Mr. Webber agreed to review the support system further with the staff.

Mr. Baron offered that this proposal is an alteration to the spatial relationships of the property. He said that there are certain blocks where you would not want to recommend this type of alteration. He added that if the Committee were to recommend approval of this particular basement entry, it should make the approval specific to this particular building instead of an approval that would make this type of alteration appropriate for every stoop in the city. He noted that the previously-approved basement entry on Delancey Street had an existing large cutout in the stoop and was, therefore, already altered. Mr. Baron concluded that 1708 Delancey Place also has elements that make it unique and not part of a consistent row, such as the added mansard and the building next door, which already has a basement entry stair.

Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. D'Alessandro discussed briefly how there are examples in the city where the integrity of the slab itself supports the cutout without an additional support system. Ms. Gutterman asked for more information as to the support system and visibility of that system for the stair. Mr. Cluver noted that he was not suggesting a recommendation of denial of the project outright, but that he would be open to an approval in the future if the design were better developed, and a study to show why this is acceptable at this property. Mr. D'Alessandro and Mr. Cluver requested details to clarify any structural issues. Mr. Webber inquired about receiving conceptual approval instead of final approval for the basement entry stair, and Ms. Hawkins explained that the Committee could provide design guidance based on the information presented to the Committee at this time. Mr. Cluver explained that the Committee is hesitant to give a conceptual approval, as the project at the front steps is contingent upon the structural details. Ms. Hawkins noted that this is not on a pristine block and she would be more open to a properly-engineered alteration that will not compromise historic fabric. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Hawkins asked to see photographs of more of the block.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the rear addition was visible from the public right-of-way. Ms. Broadbent confirmed that it is not visible from the public right-of-way.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the rear addition, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of the basement entry stair as proposed, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 115-19 CUTHBERT ST. UNIT E

Project: Construct one-story rooftop addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Stephen Beers

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto Designshop

History: 1920

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to construct a small, one-story rooftop addition with roof deck on a residential multi-family building located within the Old City Historic District. The former light-industrial building was a box factory built about 1920; it was altered and added to in the 1980s. The design of the proposed addition is Modern in style, not to exceed 65 feet in height, and would be set back about five feet from Mascher Street. The addition would meet the parapet of the historic building along Cuthbert Street for a length of about 19 feet, with the remaining span along Cuthbert Street set back about two feet. Cuthbert and Mascher Streets are very narrow and views of the addition from the public right-of-way would be limited.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Adam Montalbano and owner Stephen Beers represented the application.

Mr. Beers explained that only he has rights to build on half of the roof through his condominium agreement, and that the other fifth floor addition on the building was built in 1997. He was granted approval to build on the roof prior to the Old City Historic District designation in 2003, so there was no involvement from the Historical Commission at that time.

Mr. Cluver inquired about access to the fifth floor. Mr. Montalbano explained that access will be provided via an interior stair. Mr. Cluver inquired as to the level of visibility of the proposed addition. Mr. Montalbano explained that it will be visible and directed the Committee to the renderings in his application. Ms. Hawkins commented that this is a challenging application because of the visibility of the addition, and asked if consideration was given to shifting the addition away from the facades of the building to reduce visibility. Mr. Cluver observed that he is concerned with this application because of the potential visibility of the addition, but he also noted that the warehouse building type often receives rooftop additions and those additions fade into the background. His concern with this proposed design is that it is trying to be an object that wants to be looked at, rather than a design that tries to blend in. Ms. Gutterman suggested pulling back the walls and providing an outdoor deck in that space, which will reduce visibility of the addition. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested a simplification of the materials. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Mr. Cluver that the building type lends itself to a rooftop addition, and that there is already one present on the other side of the building, but that a simplification of materials and colors could help to garner a recommendation of approval from the Committee. Mr. Montalbano

inquired as to recommendations for glazing. Mr. McCoubrey offered that he is in support of a large amount of glazing. Mr. Montalbano asked if there is a primary view that the Committee is most concerned about, but Ms. Hawkins responded that there are too many factors in that question and that it will have to be addressed in a future review of the project. Several Committee members suggested that Mr. Beers go back to his condominium association and ask if he might be able to shift his footprint of buildable area to reflect the Committee's request to push back the walls from the street sides.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposed design, but not denial of any rooftop addition, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 223-227 CHESTNUT STREET

Project: Reconstruction of façade at 227 Chestnut in fiberglass

Review Requested:

Owner: David Hess, for 225 Chestnut St Associates, LP

Applicant: James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co. Architects

History: 1856

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

Staff Contact: Laura.DiPasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove and reconstruct the façade at 227 Chestnut Street and the cornice along Bank Street in fiberglass, with a design to evoke the historic cast-iron façade, which extends the full height of the building.

The four-story iron-fronted store in "imitation of sandstone" replaced a three-story brick building around 1856. Although no early photographs of this store have been found, an illustration of the property appeared in Baxter's Panoramic Business Directory in December 1879. The Baxter configuration of the façades of 227 and 223-25 Chestnut seems to have remained intact until around 1890 when the façade of 227 was clad to make it more compatible with the façade of 223-25. This was done by installing a cold formed sheet metal cladding that replicated some of the configurations and details of the adjacent building while obscuring the original cast-iron façade. This ornamental sheet metal covering on the Chestnut Street façade also partially wraps around to Bank Street. Currently, the remnants of the original cast-iron façade are substantially hidden by the extant sheet metal cladding, and it is unclear precisely how many details remain.

According to an April 2000 condition assessment conducted by the engineering firm Keast & Hood, "the earlier façade had been poorly protected by the cladding for at least eighty years and the rusting of the plates was advanced, particularly on the unpainted portions." The report continued to state that "Several of the flat spandrel plates had cracked and/or spalled at the locations of their connections with the other components of the façade assembly." The assessment also found "'shadow' evidence on the flat cast iron spandrel surfaces of the previous existence of small ornamental items that were most likely removed when the sheet metal cladding was applied." The 2000 report stated that "It is this writer's opinion that little can be predictably done to retain and repair the old cast-iron façade underlying the present deteriorated sheet metal façade. Furthermore, this office recommends that the old cast-iron

assemblies be dismantled, removed, and replaced with a contemporary miscellaneous steel structure...”

The property underwent an incomplete renovation between 2006 and 2008, at which time permits were secured for the rehabilitation of the building in order to accommodate a day spa. The façade was not repaired at that time.

The more recent condition assessment by Keast & Hood, conducted in January 2014, found that the condition of the properties has slowly worsened, and recommended an accelerated timeline to brace the west (Bank Street) bearing wall and remove the front façade of 227 Chestnut Street. The report determined that the façade at 227 Chestnut was a high priority and recommended systematically removing the façade from top to base, and replacing it with a façade that evokes the original cast-iron but is constructed with lighter and more modern construction materials. The assessment concluded that all exposed cast iron is in poor condition, including the support columns that extend into the basement, and recommended installing secure structural engagement between the west wall, floor diaphragm and new south façade. The assessment also determined that the west masonry bearing wall along Bank Street is bulging, and recommended that through-building tie rods with anchor plates be installed at each floor prior to the removal of the façade. The report noted that there is no guarantee that a failure event, specifically with the 227 Chestnut Street façade, will not occur.

The proposed project would also include the installation of previously approved wood windows and doors at all floors, and new stone and painted concrete bases at 227 Chestnut, as well as the rehabilitation of the existing 223-25 Chestnut Street façade as previously approved by the Historical Commission in 2007, per the Harman Deutsch application.

The staff of the Historical Commission has been involved with the potential rehabilitation of this building for a decade, and accepts the engineering report findings that the deterioration of the historic cast-iron façade is beyond repair. Architect Richard Thom, who has worked on the building, claimed in November 2012 that “the cast iron facade could fall at any moment.” Given the presence of some existing details, of which more may be uncovered during the dismantling process, as well as historic photographs, the staff believes that the applicant could achieve an approximation, if not full recreation, of the historic façade. The staff recognizes that there are areas in which original details have been completely lost, and does not recommend that the applicant attempt to replace details without documentary or physical evidence. The current proposal is sensitive to the historic character of the building, and will seek to replicate details where evidence exists. The use of fiberglass or a similar modern material is appropriate in this situation, as the use of the original material, cast-iron, would be extremely cost-prohibitive. The staff recommends approval for the removal of the façade and bracing of the west wall, with the details of the new facade design to be refined as additional information is acquired during the dismantling process.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect James Campbell and developer David Hess represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the windows proposed in the drawings differed from the windows shown in the 1879 Baxter’s Directory image. Mr. Campbell stated that the windows are best shown in

the 1930s photograph, and that they appeared to be a two-light casement window, as shown on the elevation drawing in the application. Ms. Hawkins acknowledged this. Mr. Campbell noted that the staff has seen these windows in all proposed renovations of the property over the past ten years or so. The first part of the renovation was undertaken in 2007, with an approval from the Commission to repair the existing sheet metal covering on the façade. He stated that the question now is: To what extent can the original appearance of the façade be recreated? Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Campbell to explain how he does plan to answer that question, as she does not see it in the drawings. Mr. Cluver asked which era of façade they intended to recreate, and it was clarified that the intent was to recreate the original 1850s façade. Mr. Campbell noted that the façade depicted in the photograph from 1925 included the sheet metal covering installed to give the building greater resemblance to the neighboring building at 223-25 Chestnut Street.

Ms. Hawkins questioned the use of different window configurations from different eras of facades. Mr. Campbell stated that they think the window style has remained consistent. Mr. Cluver noted that he saw three different window styles on the first floor over time based on the historic photographs. Mr. Baron stated that this same question was addressed the first time these drawings were approved by the Commission, noting that the project had progressed far enough previously that the shop drawings for the windows had been approved, and the windows manufactured. The windows now sit in a warehouse in Connecticut. Mr. Baron went on to state that, owing to the fact that so much of the 1890s tin covering on the façade is missing, and because there was also a 1950s infill on the first floor windows, but much of the original cast iron is extant, there was a determination that the storefronts should be returned to their original configuration. The storefront approved previously included square transoms, as shown in the current drawings. The arched openings present today date from the 1890s, with a 1950's infill. Mr. Baron further noted that, when the arched tin façade pieces were added in the 1890s, they simply covered the rectangular 1860s openings, changing the sash but retaining the original frames. Mr. Baron stated that the majority of the materials currently exposed on the façade date to the 1850s.

Ms. Hawkins noted that this seems to be an attempt at a restoration, and asked about the period of interpretation for the building. Mr. Baron stated that it was around 1856, as depicted in the 1879 Baxter's Directory sketch. Mr. Cluver noted that he did not see the resemblance between the current drawings and existing conditions and the 1879 sketch, as the upper floor windows appeared to him to be a 3-by-6 fixed window, while the drawing shows a double hung with a transom over it. Mr. Campbell noted that the Baxter's drawing is an illustration, and they cannot be sure how accurately the illustrator depicted the building. Mr. Baron noted that the 1850s windows depicted in the applicant's drawings exist currently. Mr. Cluver questioned how they knew the windows were from the 1850s. Mr. Campbell stated that it appears to be original, and Mr. Baron agreed. Mr. Campbell opined that artistic license was taken with the Baxter's diagram, and that the illustrator did not do a great job of detailing the drawing. Ms. Pentz noted that regardless of the windows, the existing cast iron was not shown on the Baxter's view. Mr. Campbell disagreed. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Campbell how could he claim that everything else in the Baxter's drawing was accurate if he was questioning the accuracy of the depiction of the windows. Mr. Baron interjected that they could do so because they have carefully investigated the existing fabric at the building over many years.

Mr. Campbell described the portions of the existing cast iron façade, and the areas in which the cast iron is covered with tin. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the cast iron has been removed. Mr.

Campbell clarified that the cast iron is extant, but in poor condition. Mr. Cluver asked if the cast iron seen in current photographs is the same as what is seen in the 1925 photograph. Mr. Campbell explained that the 1925 photograph shows the façade after its covered in sheet metal. Ms. Pentz noted that the cast iron shown in the drawings is not well rendered. Mr. Baron explained that, since so much of the cast iron exists, it would be possible to take the information directly from the building once the remaining sheet metal covering is removed.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicant intended to remove the tin and use it to cast the new fiberglass. Mr. Campbell clarified that the intent was to remove the tin and use the cast iron underneath to mold the new fiberglass. Mr. Campbell noted that the problem facing them was that they are not sure that enough cast iron detailing survives under the tin to cast new pieces. Ms. Pentz noted that, with the original cast iron, the detail was part of the original structural casting. Mr. Baron noted that the panel columns exist, but that details were bolted on and were probably removed when the tin sheet metal covering was installed. Mr. Campbell noted that the shadows of some details are extant and could be used to inform the new design.

Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Campbell to state his intent. Mr. Campbell clarified that the intent is to recreate the essence of the cast-iron façade in fiberglass, and to replicate the other features such as windows. Mr. Campbell stated that they will not know until they remove the tin other details have survived. If the details have not survived, they would create an abstracted version of the façade. They would not guess at details.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether the intent was to create the sense of the late nineteenth-century, cast-iron façade. The applicants clarified that the intent was to recreate the mid nineteenth-century, cast-iron façade. Ms. Hawkins further clarified that this would be done using fiberglass of a pattern yet to be determined, but with the understanding that cast iron is a kit of pieces and parts for which there is some rhythm and hierarchy which will all be determined at some future date. Mr. Cluver interjected that some of the details would be speculative because they are using some extant material and an unreliable sketch. Mr. Campbell noted that they would be able to obtain additional evidence once the tin has been removed. However, they do not have firm evidence for some other elements, such as the cornice. Therefore, they are proposing to create a simplified cornice similar to the existing cornice. Ms. Gutterman noted that they would not be recreating a mid nineteenth-century building because the applicant is not proposing to replicate the original cornice.

Mr. Cluver suggested recreating the façade depicted in the 1925 photograph. Mr. Campbell countered that the 1920s-era façade was a fake façade, placed over top the original façade, which does not speak to the uniqueness and grandeur of the building. Mr. Cluver expressed concern that the proposed reconstruction would also not speak to that grandeur either because there are so many speculative elements to it. Ms. Pentz clarified that it is also fiberglass attached to an underlying structure. Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the underlying structure would be the existing structural frame. Mr. Campbell clarified that it would be a new structural frame.

Ms. Pentz asked if the applicant was seeking final approval. Mr. Campbell stated that they were hoping to get an approval of the overall scheme, with details to be reviewed by the staff.

Ms. Pentz stated that it sounded like the structural report considers the façade in need of urgent attention. Mr. Campbell stated that they need to take the façade down now; some pieces have

fallen off and loose pieces have been removed. Ms. Pentz noted that she would find it easier to approve a structural drawing showing a new tubular frame, even if it is just temporary, until the final design of the façade is worked out. Ms. Gutterman said that, if they had to take the pieces down anyway, that might give the applicant the chance to find out what is underneath and to revise the drawings to reflect the existing material so that the approval would not be based on speculation. Mr. Campbell noted that they have included some typical details in the drawings.

Ms. Hawkins stated that, since the goal is the greatest amount of authenticity, the biggest challenge was the idea of creating a false sense of history by using pieces from different eras. She expressed concern over not having a clear vision of what era was to be represented, and that there was too much picking and choosing, or “decorating the box.” Mr. Campbell noted that they are carefully selecting details from the various pieces of evidence to ensure the highest degree of authenticity. Ms. Hawkins said she did not mean to diminish the thought process that had gone on to date, but was concerned there was no cohesive vision to work towards, beyond a nice, presentable building. Ms. Gutterman noted that there was also insufficient photographic evidence to show the sources of the design. Mr. D’Alessandro noted that there should be enough fabric left at the building to create an accurate replication. Ms. Gutterman continued that the existing fabric should at least provide the major elements, if not the trim features. Mr. Campbell stated that they do think they have the major elements, and Mr. D’Alessandro concurred.

Ms. Hawkins polled the Committee members, noting that the applicant seemed to be relying on a discovery process that had yet to occur. Therefore, she stated, there seemed to be a few options: one, to require that discovery occurs and then have the applicant return to the Committee; two, that the Committee provide sufficient, explicit direction to the staff to allow the applicant to work successfully with the staff. Mr. Hess stated that he could not follow the first suggested process because it would be financially infeasible to scaffold the building, remove the tin covering, examine the cast iron, design the replacement fiberglass pieces, have them fabricated, and install them because he cannot leave the scaffolding in place during the lengthy fabrication process. He must have the new façade pieces in hand before he erects the scaffolding.

Ms. Stein opined that the discovery process was important and that the Italianate façade was the one they should be trying to achieve because of the adjacent brick façade. Mr. Cluver asked about the period of significance for the Old City Historic District, and Mr. Farnham stated that it runs from 1673 to 1929. Mr. Cluver stated that if there is strong interest in the mid-nineteenth century Italianate façade, and sufficient evidence discovered, then it should be replicated. However, if significant speculation is required, and reliance is placed on the inaccurate Baxter’s sketch, then the reconstruction should be based on the 1925 photograph. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he would like to wait to see how much information is able to be uncovered beneath the tin, because he thinks there are more elements extant from the cast-iron façade. Ms. Gutterman concurred with Mr. Cluver.

Mr. D’Alessandro stated he was concerned with the process of discovery. Mr. Hess responded that it would require the erection of scaffolding, which would be a large undertaking. The façade, he stated, would be taken down piece by piece and documented, but that he would like the new façade to be ready to be put in place at that time. He stated that he cannot feasibly scaffold the building twice, the first time to gather details and the second to install the new façade.

Ms. Pentz noted that she sees a rope detail in photographs, which is part of the existing cast iron façade, but the detail is not present on the proposed drawings or in the Baxter's view. Mr. Campbell noted that there have obviously been pieces removed, and that the plan was to replicate the simpler pattern of the upper floor columns. Ms. Gutterman countered that, if the pieces are extant, no additional evidence would be needed. Mr. Campbell noted that there are pieces missing from the extant cast-iron façade.

Mr. Hess noted that, when the building was put under agreement, they had not realized they would have to replace the façade. He stressed the necessity to move forward with the project quickly. Ms. Pentz suggested using a temporary façade protection. Mr. Hess stated that that was not feasible. The new façade must be ready to be installed before the old façade is removed.

Ms. Hawkins expressed her concern over the reliance on the Baxter's image. She also noted the lack of coherence between the visible existing fabric and the proposed drawings. She stated that she believes that the 1925 photograph provides a clear image of a simplified façade, and provides more evidence than is present from any earlier period. Therefore, she would be comfortable approving its reconstruction, with the staff to review details.

Ms. Hawkins asked for public comment. There was none. She then asked for a motion. Mr. Cluver stated that they had not yet discussed the fiberglass aspect of the project, and asked if there were any other instances in which they had approved replacement fiberglass extending all the way to the street. Ms. Hawkins noted that the Widener Building and Smythe Stores both used ground-floor fiberglass.

Mr. Baron interjected that the Old City Historic District has one of the most important collections of cast iron in the country, second only to SoHo in New York City. Ms. Pentz concurred. Mr. Baron asserted that all of the details documented by the existing cast iron should be replicated. He noted that, with fiberglass, it is no more difficult or expensive to create the details than it is to create a simplified version.

The Committee suggested that either the façade be reconstructed to the mid nineteenth-century period, provided that sufficient information can be uncovered to support an accurate reconstruction, in which case a revised design should be presented for review; or, if insufficient information is uncovered, the reconstruction should be based on the 1920s appearance, with the staff to review details. The Committee suggested approval of fiberglass, provided that all details are replicated, not approximated, and that close attention is paid to the joints in the material so that they occur in logical positions consistent with the cast iron.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, but approval of an accurate reconstruction of the cast iron façade in fiberglass, with the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission to review details or, if such a reconstruction is impossible, a reconstruction of the tin façade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 1700-06 CHESTNUT STREET

Project: Insert door in storefront window, add canopy

Review Requested: Final approval

Owner: 1700 Chestnut, LLC—JEMB Realty and Morris Jerome

Applicant: Sean Sullivan, JKR Partners, LLC

History: 1927; Bonwitt Teller; Clarence Wunder, architect

Individual Designation: 1/3/1985

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Laura.DiPasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a single section of an existing storefront window and fabric canopy to construct a glass, frameless double entry door and modern glass and steel canopy in the southeastern most bay of storefront windows on 17th Street. The new door would require the removal of a single section of the existing storefront glazing and stone sill, and would serve as the new entrance for the potential future residential development on floors 4-8 of the building. The extents of the existing bay of storefront windows, including the ornamental transom, would remain intact.

Given the large scale of the building, the proposed intervention is minimal and does not destroy the spatial relationships that characterize the property. The proposed door would require the removal of a low stone sill, but otherwise would retain the existing window opening, and maintain the building's distinctive fenestration pattern and rhythm.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Robert McCall and architect Sean Sullivan represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked about the line on the drawing at the base of the door. Mr. Sullivan explained that it was for a kick-plate, designed to maintain the line of the existing stone sill.

Mr. Cluver then questioned how rain would exit the canopy, whether it would be allowed to drip off or if there would be a collection system. Mr. Sullivan explained that they still need to propose some type of collection system. Mr. McCall stated that their first choice would be not to install a downspout, and noted that, if a downspout is not required, they will not install one. Mr. Cluver noted that the glass canopy is really no different from the existing canopies in some ways, but that it would still create a definite drip line. Mr. McCall stated that they would prefer not to run a downspout down the side of the building.

Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant how the canopy would be anchored into the building. Mr. McCall explained that they are planning to put a steel tube on an inside face of an existing channel. Ms. Gutterman noted that the drawings made it appear as though the tube would run along the exterior of the building. Mr. McCall noted that there is a piece of steel in the transom from which they are planning to cantilever the canopy. Ms. Pentz asked if the steel tube would be new, and Mr. Sullivan explained that a new tube would be inserted into the channel that housed the rolled fabric canopy and the rolling mechanisms. Ms. Hawkins clarified that they would be using the existing awning pocket to support the structure. Ms. Gutterman noted that a glass and steel canopy is significantly heavier than a fabric awning.

Ms. Hawkins, Mr. McCoubrey, and Mr. Cluver all questioned whether the existing masonry opening and jamb would be retained. Mr. McCall explained that the intent of the applicant is to remove the glass and fit the new door into the existing opening, with the stone sill being the only historic material to be removed. Ms. Hawkins asked if the left hand mullion would increase in thickness to allow the door frame to be inserted into the existing jamb. Mr. McCall noted that the reason for having the channel behind the door was so that the mullion did not have to be thicker. He noted that it might be thicker if they have to include a plate to grab the hinge or support for the transom piece, but the intent is to retain the existing sight line, understanding that the channel may be wider when viewed through the glass.

Ms. Stein questioned whether the location of the proposed lobby would alter the view of the space from the street. Mr. McCall explained that freight elevators and stock room are currently located behind this bay of windows, and that a solid wall is all that is visible behind the glass. In the proposed plans, he noted, the elevators would be reused for the proposed residential development of the upper floors, and the solid wall would be opened up to reveal the new lobby.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that he would prefer that any approval for the door cut be contingent upon securing a new use for the upper floors.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided no work is undertaken until the submission of a building permit application for interior renovations to the upper floors, and provided that the existing jamb against the stone is retained, with staff to review details.

ADDRESS: 417 S. CARLISLE STREET

Project: Construction of roof deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final approval

Owner: Mark and Cindy Feinstein

Applicant: Martin J. Rosenblum, AIA

History: 1855

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a new roof deck and pilot house on the main block of the historic rowhouse's gable roof. The proposed roof deck would be 25 feet in length, set back five feet from the front façade, and extending across the ridge of the roof. The pilot house would be set back 16 feet from the front façade, and would be greater than 10 feet in height above the roof. The proposed project also includes the installation of a nine-foot high pergola. Both the deck and pergola would be visible from Carlisle Street. The deck would be supported on both the front and back slopes of the roof with through-roof post bases that would be connected to the inner wythe of the solid masonry party wall.

The staff contends that the proposed project would be extremely conspicuous from Carlisle Street, and would destroy the spatial relationship of this block, which is characterized by the consistent height of the rowhouses that were constructed as part of one development.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2014

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Mark Feinstein, attorney Leonard Reuter, and architect Martin Rosenblum represented the application.

Mr. Reuter acknowledged that the Commission has had a policy of not permitting roof decks on the gable roofs of the main blocks of buildings, but he said that this policy is not specifically mentioned in the Secretary of the Interior Standards. He said that the deck is visible though not conspicuous. He said that the Commission has approved inconspicuous roof decks. He said that the railing would be made of cable, which would make it more inconspicuous. He said that the property owners want to have a usable roof deck, but they do not want to locate it on the rear ell because of the proximity of Symphony House, which towers over them to the rear. In addition, a deck on the rear would cast a shadow on the neighbor's yard, doing a disservice to the neighbor. Mr. Rosenblum explained how the location of the stair tower was based on the position of the interior stairs. He said that there are weaknesses in the rear wall making it hard to place the stair against that single wythe wall. He said that the design would add value to the building. The new owners are willing to spend significant amounts of money to preserve the interior which he said is very intact. They would also be willing to restore the basement window.

Ms. Gutterman commented that the design is intrusive and precedent setting. Nothing should set forward of the ridge.

Messrs. Cluver and McCoubrey expressed concerns not only about the conspicuousness of the deck from the street, but also about the public visibility of the large pergola and penthouse. Mr. Baron noted that the staff had not been asked to review a mock-up. He also stated that the sight line studies showed the view from directly in front of the building, but the visibility is greater from side angles. Also, the mock-up did not include the pergola or the stair house.

Mr. Baron explained that this block of rowhouses is intact, of a high style, and consistent in height. The building has a large rear ell, where a deck could be located in compliance with the Commission's practice. Ms. Pentz agreed.

All the Committee members opined that the proposed roof structures would be highly conspicuous from the public right-of-way and would not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Ms. Gutterman made a motion to recommend denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and the Roof Guidelines, which the Committee unanimously adopted.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend denial of the proposal pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 1800 DELANCEY PL

Project: Construct roof deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1800 Delancey Street Partners, LLC

Applicant: Robert Flaynik, RFA Architecture, LLC

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck and pilot house on a corner row house. The roof deck includes planters, glass panel guardrails, a skylight, and a small rain barrel. The pilot house will house both stairs and an elevator, and rises less than ten feet in height above the surface of the roof deck. Part of the pilot house is sloped towards Delancey Place to reduce the surface area that is visible from the street. The proposed exterior cladding material for the pilot house is a zinc-colored panel. It is placed in a location that is farthest away from any exterior wall front or rear.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Rooftop Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Mark Travis, architect Robert Flaynick, and attorney Leonard Reuter represented the application.

Mr. Flaynick explained that the rendering represented the mock-up and that a physical mock-up had been done to verify the accuracy of the rendering. Owing to time constraints, Mr. Baron had not yet been able to visit the site to verify the results of the mock-up. Mr. Reuter claimed that the deck would be inconspicuous. Mr. Cluver questioned the use of zinc and said that the finish should be non-reflective. Mr. Flaynick said that he was open to other materials except stucco. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the necessity of an elevator at the roof level. Mr. Flaynick said that accessibility was an important consideration in this case. It was pointed out that a large cinderblock addition on the neighbor's house, which would stand forward of the proposed pilot house. An existing tall chimney also stands in front of this addition both of which serve to make this proposal inconspicuous.

Mr. Cluver made a motion to approve the proposal based on these mitigating factors, but asked the staff to confirm the accuracy of the mock-up. Ms Gutterman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the staff confirms the accuracy of the mock-up, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 317 S 06TH ST

Project: Construct rooftop addition with pilot houses and roof decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Cypress Court Condominiums, LP

Applicant: Yao Huang, YCH Architect

History: 1920; c. 1970 shopfront altered to residential and pent eave cornice removed

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes rooftop additions to this rowhouse in the Society Hill Historic District. The Historical Commission reviewed and denied a similar application in January 2014.

The current application proposes to construct a one-story addition on top of the three-story structure. The addition would be set back 11 feet from the front façade. Two pilot houses and roof decks would be constructed on the addition. The addition and pilot houses would be clad in stucco. The missing Mission-style parapet with pent eave would be restored to the front façade. Also, a small addition at the rear would be demolished.

The original application denied in January 2014 proposed a mansard addition rising from directly behind the restored parapet at the front façade. The current application proposes an addition set back 11 feet from the front façade. Despite the setback, a mock-up shows that the addition will be conspicuous from 6th, Cypress, and Delancey Streets.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Mark Travis represented the application and stated that he was withdrawing the application. Ms. Hawkins acknowledged his withdrawal.

ADDRESS: 1914-16 RITTENHOUSE SQ

Project: Renovate building, demolish and construct additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Barton Blatstein

Applicant: Carl Primavera, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP

History: 1859; Alfred M. Collins House

Individual Designation: 4/28/1970

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Significant, 2/8/1995

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations and additions to the property at 1914-16 Rittenhouse Square, at the southwest corner of the square. In November 2013, the Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application and found that the proposed project would constitute an alteration as defined in Section 14-203(15) of the Philadelphia Code, not a demolition as defined in Section 14-203(88), pursuant to the Commission's approval of 27 September 1999, Standards 2, 4, 5, and 9, and Section 14-1000 of the Philadelphia Code. At that time, the Commission approved in concept the general form, scale, massing, placement,

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2014

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

height, and footprint of the proposed building, provided the garages on Manning Street are redesigned, the tripartite division of the new façade on Rittenhouse Square is appropriately scaled, and the material choices are developed, and the fenestration patterns are refined, pursuant to Standard 9.

In keeping with the Commission's findings and approval in concept, the current application proposes to remove the non-historic domed entrance pavilion and construct a four-story addition. The addition would mirror the height of the existing main block and would be recessed from the sidewalk line where it would attach to the main block to respect the mansard on the main block. The application also proposes to remove the non-historic rear ell and garage and construct a new rear ell and garage of roughly the same sizes in roughly the same locations. Since the Commission's approval in concept, the applicant has redesigned the garages on Manning and developed and refined the design of the new façade on Rittenhouse Square.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Commission's in-concept approval of November 2013.

DISCUSSION: Mr. D'Alessandro recused, owing to his firm's potential involvement in the project, and left the room. Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Shimi Zakin and Jonathan Doran represented the application.

Mr. Farnham stated that, in the staff's opinion, the current application addresses the comments and requirements of the Commission and Architectural Committee set forth during the in-concept review and should be approved.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the applicants concentrate their presentation on those aspects of the design that the Commission asked them to reconsider and not discuss the entirety of the project, which the Committee reviewed at length and approved in concept in November 2013. Mr. Zakin agreed to limit his comments to those aspects of the design to which the Commission suggested revisions during its review. He discussed the rear or Manning Street façade first. He noted that the Commission had asked him to redesign the garages to reduce the impact that the two very large garage doors would have on Manning Street. He explained that garage door technology has advanced significantly in recent years and garage doors are now available with a variety of options that reduce the scale of the doors. He stated that he believes that he has found a way to provide his client with the garages he desires and yet give the appearance of smaller doors on the exterior. He reported that he has selected garage doors that have vertical glazed areas adjacent to the solid wood sections that reduce the massiveness of the doors and appear like garage doors with sidelights or windows, even though the glazed areas are operable. He displayed a drawing of the façade with the doors. Ms. Hawkins informed the Committee that the Commission had determined that the garage doors that were originally proposed did not have the typical rhythm of this block of Manning Street, with alternating single-car garage doors and pedestrian doors. Mr. Zakin stated that the revised design reduces the apparent sizes of the garage doors and creates "windows" that relate to the windows at the upper story. He contended that the rhythm and proportions of the first-floor openings on Manning Street are now compatible with the surroundings. Ms. Hawkins asked if the windows in the garage doors would have clear glass. Mr. Zakin responded that they would be frosted glass; they would allow light through, but would prevent views of the cars from the street. Ms. Gutterman asked about the panels at the bases of the second-floor windows on Manning Street. Mr. Zakin stated that they are metal spandrel panels that allow the masonry openings to be

larger, but the windows to have the same scale and proportions as the windows in nearby buildings. He stated that the metal of the panels will match the metal of the windows. He also noted that they may add flower boxes at the metal panels at the second floor.

Mr. Zakin turned his attention to the front façade on Rittenhouse Square. He noted that one change made at the Commission's request was inadvertently left off the drawings. He apologized and explained that the windows at the west or right side of the new section of the building will be wider than shown to better relate to the widths of the windows in the historic section of the building. He marked up the front façade elevation drawing to reflect the proposed width of the windows. He stated that they are seeking an A-B-B-A rhythm on the front façade to relate the wider and narrower sections of the historic façade to the wider and narrower sections of the new façade. He questioned the claim made at the Commission meeting that the front façade has a tripartite configuration and contended that it has a four-part configuration, A-B-B-A, or historic narrow, historic wide, new wide, new narrow. He asserted that the proposed arrangement of the new front façade is compatible with the historic façade. Ms. Hawkins replied that the Commission had questioned the ratio of solid wall to window in the new façade and suggested that that ratio differed from the ratio at the historic buildings on the street. She stated that less of the proposed façade is dedicated to windows than at the historic buildings. Mr. Zakin disagreed. He stated that the ratios of solid to void are approximately the same in the new and old. He noted that the new façade includes a very large window that is broken down into smaller pieces, each of which relates in scale and proportion to the windows in the historic building. He pointed out the narrow columns of glass at the door and the stone panel. Mr. Cluver stated that the historic façade is very symmetrical, but the new façade is not. Some features deviate from the symmetry. He also noted that the strong cornice line on the historic building and some of the new façade becomes light at the terrace railing. Mr. Zakin countered that they are not simply cutting and pasting from the historic building for the new building. He informed the Committee that he had made a very detailed presentation to the Commission that highlighted the various relationships between the new and old. He noted that the relationships are sometimes subtle, but are always present. He asserted that the new façade would be differentiated from but compatible with the historic façade. The new elements echo and correspond to the old elements. He contended that the new façade may not be precisely symmetrical, but the overall composition of the façade creates a new balance that is not identical to, but is compatible with, the balance of the old. Mr. Zakin stated that he would consider revisions to the design of the addition, but would not want to disturb the overall design, which is very carefully composed.

Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Zakin if the new brick would match the old. Mr. Zakin responded that the new brick would match the old precisely. He explained that he would work with the staff on the details of the replacement windows for the historic façade and would then use those details to inform the details of the windows in the new façade. He stated that the windows in the new façade will relate very carefully to the windows in the old façade, even though they will be of different sizes and pane configurations. The new and old will "connect but not match."

Mr. Cluver objected to what he perceived as a change to the dormers at the top floor of the historic building. He asserted that removing the dormer windows and leaving the openings empty and converting the mansard roof into a railing for a deck on the roof of the main building was inappropriate. Mr. Zakin responded that Mr. Cluver was misinterpreting the architectural plans. They are not proposing a deck on the roof of the historic building behind the mansard. They are proposing to retain and restore the mansard and dormers. The space behind the mansard will remain interior space, as it is now. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Zakin to confirm that there

would be no deck. Mr. Zakin replied that Mr. Cluver was confused. The third floor would be retained and restored. Its historic exterior appearance would not change. The space that is currently interior space would remain interior space. There would be no change to the mansard and has been no change in the design since the in-concept approval.

Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Farnham about the period of significance for the Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District. Mr. Farnham replied that there is some uncertainty related to the district's period of significance, but the best answer is 1801-1950, the dates that are listed on the nomination form. He noted that some have claimed that the district has no end to its period of significance, but reported that he has found no documentation indicating that the Committee on Historic Designation or Commission revised the period of significance during the consideration of the district.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the stone choice for the front façade. Mr. Zakin stated that he had been asked during the in-concept review to consider a darker color stone instead of the white or gray stone. He recounted that they considered changing the stone to a red and brown stone, but decided that the darker color stone merged with and became indistinguishable from the brick and created one large, awkward, unarticulated mass. Therefore, they decided that a darker stone would not be appropriate. He stated that they believe that the link or the connector between the old and the majority of the new should be different in color. The lighter stone creates an appropriate link; the darker stone does not. Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Zakin to provide the studies as well as materials samples for the designs with the darker color stone that he rejected. Mr. Zakin stated that he did not have them with him, but asserted that they had confirmed that the darker stone was a poor choice from a design perspective. Ms. Stein suggested that Mr. Zakin simplify the palette and limit his materials. Mr. Zakin stated that he perceives the stone section of the front façade as a work of art that gives meaning to the recessed area. He added that they might place a sculpture in the recess; the stone will be an appropriate backdrop.

Ms. Pentz stated that she is convinced that the applicants have adequately addressed the issues raised by the Commission during the review-in-concept process. She moved to adopt the staff recommendation and recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Commission's in-concept approval of November 2013. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which failed by a vote 1 to 4. Ms. Gutterman and Pentz and Messrs. Cluver and McCoubrey dissented. Ms. Hawkins abstained.

Ms. Gutterman moved to recommend denial and require the applicant to present additional materials. She stated that "the applicant needs to present more information to us on the selection of the materials and the wider windows and really present what it is that you believe in that you are doing that we are not understanding you are doing in the representation of the drawings." Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion. Ms. Pentz again stated that, in her opinion, the applicant has satisfied the conditions and recommendations of the Commission's approval in concept. She suggested that the Committee should not ignore the Commission's action. Ms. Gutterman stated that she made her motion of denial because she did not entirely understand the proposal. Others responded that they did not entirely understand Ms. Gutterman's motion. The Committee voted 5 to 1 to adopt the motion and recommend denial and require the applicant to present additional materials. Ms. Pentz dissented.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial and require the applicant to present additional materials.

ADDRESS: 1910 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Partially demolish building, restore entry arcade, construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Live Nation Worldwide, Inc.

Applicant: Matt McClure, Ballard Spahr, LLP

History: 1928; Boyd Theater, Sameric Theater; Hoffman & Henon, architects

Individual Designation: 8/9/2008

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: The Boyd Theater is an Art Deco movie palace located at 1910 Chestnut Street, on the south side of the street. The theater was constructed in 1928 and operated until 2002. The building has been vacant since 2002. It is an L-shaped building with an entry arcade and lobby running south from Chestnut to an auditorium, which runs east-west along Sansom Street.

The Historical Commission individually designated the Boyd Theater as historic on 9 August 2008. The designation authorizes the Commission to regulate the exterior envelope of the building only. The Commission has not designated the interior of the building as historic and has no authority to regulate any interior features, except where alterations to those interior features would impact the exterior. The site is not located in a local historic district. Therefore, the appropriateness of the proposed work should be judged according to its compatibility with the site itself and not its compatibility with a larger district.

This application proposes to retain and restore the Chestnut Street façade and entry arcade, demolish the auditorium and lobby sections, and construct an addition that would house a movie theater complex. The application contends that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, or, in other words, that its compulsory preservation would deny the owner of all economically viable use of the property, thus creating a financial hardship. The Committee on Financial Hardship is reviewing the application as well.

With the 2010 revision of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, the Commission clarified the roles of the Committee on Financial Hardship and Architectural Committee in the reviews of applications claiming financial hardship. Section 9.5.e of the Rules & Regulations stipulates that the Committee on Financial Hardship focus on the hardship question and seek to determine whether the application demonstrates that the property cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. Section 9.6 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, which refers to Sections 6.9 and 6.11 of the Rules & Regulations as well as Section 14-1005(6)(e) of the preservation ordinance, stipulates that the Architectural Committee apply its standard review criteria and seek to determine whether the proposed work complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and other review criteria. Therefore, the Architectural Committee should focus its review on the architectural aspects of the application. Primarily, it should determine whether the restoration measures proposed for the Chestnut Street façade and entry arcade are appropriate and whether the proposed new construction is compatible with the site itself, especially the section of the historic building to be retained. Of course, the Architectural Committee may consider the financial hardship segment of the

application, especially as the Committee members' expertise in architecture, engineering, and construction bears on hardship questions, but it is not required to consider the financial hardship aspects of the application.

The application proposes to retain and restore the Chestnut Street façade and entry arcade. The later marquee would be removed and the historic horizontal marquee would be reconstructed. The vertical marquee, which read "BOYD" would not be reconstructed. The stone façade, art glass windows, and entry arcade windows and doors would be restored. The architectural drawings in the current proposal are taken directly from the architectural drawings reviewed and approved by the Historical Commission in November 2008 as part of the ARC/Wheeler proposal to renovate the theater and construct a hotel tower. At that time, the Historical Commission voted to:

Approve the restoration of the exterior of the theater building including the removal of the non-historic marquee and the reconstruction of the historic marquee, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7.

The application proposes to demolish the auditorium and lobby sections of the theater. This segment of the application does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and is the subject of the financial hardship application.

The application proposes to construct an addition on the site of the demolished auditorium and the surface parking lot to the west. The addition would house eight movie auditoriums and related spaces. The addition would be 67 feet tall. The existing auditorium section of the theater ranges from 57 to 72 feet tall. The addition would be clad in brown brick, like the existing auditorium, at the east and then buff brick where it would extend out into what is now the parking lot. The brown brick would indicate the location and volume of the existing auditorium. The addition would include emergency exits, a staff entrance, blade sign, and poster cases on Sansom Street. It would have a service door for the loading area on the west façade, facing a driveway out to 20th Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: If the Historical Commission finds that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted and approves the proposed demolition pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the City's historic preservation ordinance and Section 9.4 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, the staff recommends approval of the architectural segment of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9 and the Historical Commission's approval of November 2008.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorneys Matthew McClure and David Gest, architect Richard K. Gelber, developer Neil Rodin, and iPic executives Hamid Hashemi and Paul Safran represented the application.

Mr. Gelber displayed a Powerpoint presentation on the proposed project. He stated that his firm has significant expertise in movie theater design. The firm has completed many types of projects including movie theaters. Moving on to the design for the Boyd Theater, he showed a rendering of the front facade and entry arcade and stated that it would be restored. The historic marquee would be reconstructed. He explained that they would retain the historic building for 50 feet back from Chestnut Street. He showed a rendering of the Sansom Street side of the proposed building. This section would be new construction and would house eight auditoriums. It would be 67 feet tall. The existing building varies from 57 to 75 feet tall. The new building

would be clad in a dark brick, where the existing building stands, and buff-colored brick with soldier-course bands of the dark brick to the west, where the parking lot now is located. Mr. Gelber showed a plan of the proposed building and pointed out the section that would be restored. He walked the Committee members through the floor plans for the proposed multiplex. He noted the landscaped drive from 20th Street to the enclosed loading area. He also noted the plan to replace the sidewalks, retain the existing street lighting, and add street trees. He showed an elevation drawing of the Chestnut Street context and highlighted the restored limestone facade and entry arcade. He stated that the new structure to house the theaters would be located 140 feet back from Chestnut Street. He pointed out that the architectural drawings submitted with the application include detailed plans for restoring the front facade, entry arcade, and marquee. He observed that the detailed drawings specify all aspects of the restoration and reconstruction of the façade and entranceway including the storefronts and doors in the entranceway. He pointed out the art glass. He added that the drawings are annotated with details regarding the restoration. He displayed drawings of the Sansom Street façade and discussed the details including the 67-foot building height. He described the doors and poster cases. The rooftop mechanical equipment would be set back about 90 feet from the street and screened. He observed that the materials are all identified in notes on the architectural drawings. He displayed an elevation of the façade of the building facing 20th Street and stated that the façade is set back about 90 feet back from 20th Street. The façade will include an overhead service door to the loading dock. Mr. Gelber turned his attention back to the front or Chestnut Street section of the building. He observed that an internal exit stair within the entranceway will need to be rebuilt to satisfy the building code. He presented plans and other drawings depicting the internal layout of the theater complex. He displayed a section drawing cut through from Chestnut to Sansom and pointed out the area of restoration. The second level of the historic head house and its roof may be used for outdoor dining. He noted that the very tall parapet on the front façade would block any views of the roof and potential dining area. He displayed additional drawings of the interior as well as landscape plans for the exterior including paving patterns.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether the work to the front façade and entranceway would comply with the Restoration Standards. She noted a historic photograph of the building that was distributed at the Committee on Financial Hardship meeting. She asked if the vertical “BOYD” blade sign would be reconstructed. She also noted that the drawings of the entranceway storefronts call for an appliqué on glass to create the impression of etched glass, but do not call for real etched glass. She asked the applicant to define his notion of restoration. Mr. Gelber stated that there is some question about the date of the installation of the vertical blade sign. He questioned whether it was original to the building. He noted that he would be willing to revisit the question of the blade sign if his understanding of it was incorrect. Mr. Gelber stated that their intent is to reconstruct the historic marquee. He stated that they would use modern materials but attempt to evoke its appearance as closely as possible. Regarding the façade and entranceway, he stated that they would retain and restore wherever possible all surviving materials. Where elements are missing or damaged beyond repair, they will recreate them “to evoke the historic image of what was there.” Mr. McClure pointed out that the blade sign was not included in the restoration plan that the Commission approved as part of the Wheeler project. He added that the Architectural Committee recommended approval of the Wheeler project, which included exactly the same restoration plan for the façade and entranceway that is now proposed. Ms. Hawkins responded that this is a new application, not the Wheeler application. She stated that the proposal does not reflect a strict application of the Restoration Standards in all regards.

Mr. Cluver observed that the proposal would increase the extent of blank wall on Sansom Street by about 35% over the existing building. The design includes “only minor appeasements to creating an interesting streetscape” along Sansom Street. He conceded that the historic building currently presents a blank wall to Sansom Street, but commented that it has a fire escape that provides “visual interest.” He asserted that the blank façade along Sansom is incompatible with the streetscape. He then asserted that the application is incomplete because it does not include a historic photograph of the front façade. He contended that he cannot “opine” on the façade restoration without a photograph of the original façade. He then noted that the Commission has no jurisdiction over the interior, but asked why the application proposes the demolition of the interior lobby. Mr. Cluver stated that he would like to address the financial hardship portion of the application. He asked Mr. Farnham if it would be appropriate for him to address that matter. Mr. Farnham explained that the Committee on Financial Hardship is charged with reviewing and advising the Commission on the hardship portion of the application and observed that that Committee met and heard considerable testimony and will meet again to hear addition testimony. He noted that it is infeasible for the Architectural Committee to attempt to duplicate the Committee on Financial Hardship’s efforts, but stated that the Architectural Committee could certainly provide information, especially information derived from its particular expertise, to the Commission that would assist it in its deliberations. Mr. McClure noted that his financial experts presented to the Committee on Financial Hardship, but are not in attendance at the Architectural Committee meeting to participate in a discussion of finances. Ms. Hawkins asked that Mr. Cluver simply raise his concerns about the financial hardship segment of the application, but allow any discussion of those concerns to occur before the Committee on Financial Hardship. Mr. McClure objected. Ms. Hawkins observed that the members of the Committee on Financial Hardship will have an opportunity to review the minutes of this meeting. She assured Mr. McClure that his team would have an opportunity to respond to Mr. Cluver’s comments at the Committee on Financial Hardship meeting. First, Mr. Cluver stated that the application contends that the four-screen version of the Boyd was not financially viable and asserts that the fact that it closed in 2002 is evidence of that lack of viability. Mr. Cluver contended that the application does not prove that the proposed eight-screen iPic theater would be financially viable. He asserted that the applicants should be required to prove that the proposed multiplex is financially feasible. Second, Mr. Cluver stated that he did not understand the application’s comparison of the Boyd and Forrest Theaters because the Forrest has fewer than 2,000 seats. Third, Mr. Cluver acknowledged the consideration of historic tax credits and New Market tax credits, but suggested that all other potential grants and subsidies should be included in any financial analysis. Mr. McClure pointed out that the third comment was legal and not architectural. Fourth, Mr. Cluver stated that the documents refer to building sizes ranging from 20,000 to 40,000 sf and asked for an explanation of the differences. Fifth, Mr. Cluver asked about the neglect of the building. He asked what measures have been taken over the last 10 years to mitigate the deterioration.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the elevation drawing shows a darker base running the length of the Sansom Street façade, but the rendering shows the base at the eastern section of the building only. He suggested that the base should run the entire length of the façade, across both the lighter and darker brick as shown in the elevation drawing. Mr. Gelber agreed and noted that the rendering would be updated to show the full base.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Boyd is an important landmark in the city and the front façade and entranceway should be truly restored. She stated that the applicants should have provided historic images of the building to support the restoration plans. She agreed with Mr. Cluver that

the Sansom Street façade would be a very long blank wall. She acknowledged that the trees, doors, and poster boxes alleviate some of the monotony of the wall, but additional measures like some vertical articulation could be included. She suggested elements that would add rhythm.

Mr. McCoubrey asked how iPic would advertise the movies. Mr. Hashemi responded that they do not intend to advertise the movies that are showing on the marquee. He stated that that is an antiquated idea that is not relevant to current movie marketing techniques. He explained that movies theaters such as the iPic theaters are destinations that do not rely on walk-in customers. Customers purchase their tickets online in advance and do not rely on movie titles on marquees to bring them to the theater. Mr. McCoubrey conceded that he is old-fashioned.

Ms. Hawkins asked the audience to strive for conciseness with their comments and to focus them on the architectural issues.

Howard Haas distributed a document to the Architectural Committee. Ms. Hawkins noted that it includes numerous photographs of the interior of the historic building, over which the Commission has no jurisdiction. Mr. Haas suggested that the Architectural Committee ignore the photographs of the interior. Mr. Haas then asked that the Committee members return the copies of the document to him. Ms. Hawkins suggested that they retain the copies of the Friends of the Boyd document. Mr. Haas asked for their return. Mr. Haas stated that he is the president and founder of the Friends of the Boyd. He stated that the vertical blade sign was in place on the day that the theater opened, Christmas Day, 1928. It was removed in 1934 on the order of the Art Jury, the predecessor of the Art Commission. The original marquee and ticket booth were removed in 1953. They are “fundamental characteristics” of 1920s movie palaces. Mr. Haas noted that the restored front would only “evoke” the original. Mr. Haas claimed that the new construction on Sansom Street would fool the public into thinking that the 1928 movie palace had survived. The new addition would replicate the historic building, not be contemporary architecture. He stated that the new addition should not replicate the old building. “We, of course, do not believe that this is historic preservation.” He asked the Committee to deny the application because “it is not historic preservation.” The “evoking of this and that and the bringing back of whatever you want to bring back and combining it with a new building that kind of looks like the original building” is not historic preservation. He noted that the Movie Tavern in Collegeville does advertise its movies on the marquee. The Friends of the Boyd wants the entire building to survive. He noted that architect Hy Myers had claimed at the 2008 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation that the sides and rear of the Boyd are important as well as the front. Mr. Haas stated that many members of the Friends of the Boyd were in attendance. He asked them to raise their hands. Five people raised their hands.

Robert Shusterman addressed the Committee, stating that he is the attorney for the Friends of the Boyd and also an architect. He stated that the shape of the overall theater is historically significant. He asserted that the new façade along Sansom Street should not be as “brutal to Sansom Street” as the existing wall of the historic Boyd Theater. He stated that, if the Commission allows the demolition, it should require as mitigation for the demolition a façade along Sansom that is compatible and links the commercial area at 19th Street with the commercial area at 20th Street. He stated that Sanson Street is a “service street and not particularly a full shopping street” and has “a great variety of roof heights.” The variation adds to the “character” and makes it “less oppressive.” He applauded the proposal to add street trees and asserted that they would be “truck-sheared” or “truck-pruned” by big trucks driving on

Sansom. He complained that the trees shown in the architectural drawings are too large. He explained that the size of a tree is equal to the size of its root ball. "Great care has to be given to designing the area where that historic wall was." He concluded that the proposal was not "fair" to the community and the users of Sansom Street.

Michael Bencik stated that he restores houses in West Philadelphia. He stated that it is "not fair" that he is required to undertake true restoration to qualify for tax credits, but "a big developer can come in" and not undertake a true restoration. "They should be required to replicate everything like it was if they are going to get the historic credits." He concluded that "a big brick wall [on Sansom] is not nice."

Caroline Boyce, the executive director of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, stated that the Restoration Standards should be applied to the project. She stated that her organization objects to the design of the Sansom Street façade and requests that the Committee recommend denial owing to incompleteness.

Leonard Reuter, an attorney representing the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, stated that the Committee may ask the developer to explain why demolition is the only way to accomplish the architectural goals of the project. Mr. Reuter stated that it is improper for the Architectural Committee to only consider the exterior of the property and accept the claims of the developer regarding demolition and hardship at face value. He asked why the Committee members would do that in this case when they do not do it in other cases. He strongly advised the Committee members to absolutely consider whether the uses that they are proposing for the property require the changes that they are proposing.

Jay Schwartz stated that he and his wife saw the renderings of the proposed Sansom Street façade for the first time today and they "gasp[ed]." He reminded the Committee that Inga Saffron had declared Carl Dranoff's Symphony House on South Broad Street to be the "ugliest building in Philadelphia." Mr. Schwartz stated that the iPic building would now be the ugliest in the city. Mr. McClure objected.

Henry Hauptfuhrer stated that one could insert four or five theaters into the original auditorium and then construct two additional theaters in the parking lot, thereby preserving the original façade along Sansom Street.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she noted at the meeting of the Committee on Financial Hardship that the applicants could demolish the entire interior of the building and insert several theater boxes in the historic auditorium by right, without the Historical Commission's review. She asked the Committee to consider the loss of the Sansom Street façade in light of this fact.

Mr. McClure reminded the Committee that the Commission approved restoration drawings for the façade and entranceway as part of the Wheeler project that were virtually identical to the drawings included in the current application. He asserted that the Commission accepted as complete and approved a "facsimile application" in 2008. Preservationists advocated for the approval of that identical application, yet now they call it incomplete. He also noted that Clear Channel had proposed to demolish the existing stage house and construct a new, larger fly tower into the parking lot in the west in 2005. That project would have created a large blank wall on Sansom Street, yet no one including the preservation community objected at that time. He stated that the iPic building will not be a residential or office building with windows. It will be a

movie theater. Mr. McClure stated that the Commission's staff and others had suggested echoing the historic building on Sansom Street. He stated that they also met with and worked with the City's zoning experts to ensure that the new Sansom Street façade satisfied the new zoning code. He stated that they have obtained a zoning permit for the project. He stated that it was their intention to allude to the old building with the new design. He stated that this philosophy guided their design. He noted that, if the Architectural Committee has suggestions, they would be willing to study and perhaps implement them. He again noted that the preservation community is now objecting to a design that they wholeheartedly supported and advocated for in 2008. He stated that, over the last decade, as various reuse designs were considered, no one objected to a blank wall on Sansom Street. He stated that the preservation community has not indicated any opposition to such a wall until today.

Mr. Farnham apologized for using the word "restoration" with regard to the work proposed to the front façade. He stated that he was not using it in the staff overview with regard to the Restoration Standards, but instead as a broader term to indicate that the front façade would be restored to its early appearance. He stated that he sees the proposed work as a rehabilitation, not a pure restoration. Ms. Hawkins stated that she was responding to the applicant's architect's use of the word, not the staff's. Mr. Farnham noted that it appears that some in the audience are regarding a true restoration of the front façade as mitigation for the demolition at the rear. He explained that the Commission cannot predicate an approval of a demolition on mitigation measures. The Commission can approve a demolition after a finding of financial hardship, but not in exchange for mitigating work such as restoration. In this case, the restoration at the front is not proposed as mitigation for the demolition at the rear. The work at the front must comply with the Commission's review criteria, but the Commission cannot extract additional work at the front from the applicant to offset demolition at the rear. The two are not linked. Mr. Farnham added that the Commission routinely approves restoration proposals that would restore existing features without reconstructing missing features. The Commission cannot unilaterally require owners to recreate missing features. For example, when the Commission approved a project to restore the façade of the German Historical Society on Spring Garden Street, it ensured that existing features were treated appropriately, but it did not require the reconstruction of the missing cupola. Mr. Farnham concluded that the Commission cannot unilaterally require the applicants to reconstruct the vertical blade sign removed in 1934 or the ticket booth removed in 1954; it can review for approval the restoration or rehabilitation of the existing fabric under either the Restoration or Rehabilitation Standards.

Mr. McClure noted that the blade sign could not be reconstructed by right, but would require an ordinance of City Council permitting the encroachment. Ms. Hawkins stated that the blade sign would not project farther out into the right-of-way than the marquee. Mr. McClure responded that that would not be the deciding factor. Ms. Gutterman replied that the approvals might be able to be obtained for the sign.

Ms. Gutterman acknowledged that the Commission had approved the same architectural drawings for the front façade for the Wheeler project, but asserted that "we are a different group of people." She moved that the Committee recommend denial of the application, owing to incompleteness. Ms. Gutterman explained that "More information needs to be provided as to what is, be it restoration, renovation, adaptive reuse, whatever you are going to actually say for the materials that you are keeping for the front of the building, we need a drawing that actually says specifically what is being proposed." She clarified that she is referring to the restoration area of the project. Mr. Cluver stated that he would like the applicants to provide historic

photographs of the building. Mr. Cluver proposed amending the motion, stating that he “would like to see further consideration of the treatment of Sansom Street to make the pedestrian experience more pleasant.” Mr. Farnham stated that he had two fundamental objections to the motion. He observed that he would not try to influence the outcome in one way or another, but had to insist that the Committee provide a defensible recommendation. He stated that the drawings provided for the restoration of the front façade are not only very detailed, but are the very same drawings that the Commission approved in 2008 without objection. He suggested to Ms. Gutterman that, if she has decided to recommend denial, she needs to justify that recommendation cogently so that a denial can stand up on appeal. Regarding Mr. Cluver’s amendment to the motion, Mr. Farnham suggested that Mr. Cluver identify review criteria that the Sansom Street façade fails to satisfy. He asserted that making “the pedestrian experience more pleasant” is not a review criterion listed in the ordinance or Standards. He noted that the ordinance does allow the Commission to consider the effect of the application on surroundings and streetscape, but it does not address pleasantness. He advised the Committee that, whatever it decides on this application, it devise a recommendation that can stand up on appeal.

Mr. McClure contended that the drawings for the restoration of the front façade are complete. He stated that he and his architect will gladly discuss the proposed work with the Committee if there are concerns that it is not appropriate. He contended that completeness cannot be an issue because the proposed work is fully described by the drawings. One may disagree with the work proposed in the drawings, but not with the completeness of the drawings themselves.

Mr. Cluver reworded his amendment to Ms. Gutterman’s motion. He withdrew his statement about “pleasantness” and stated that the extension of the building along Sansom Street by about 35% is not appropriate from a restoration perspective. Ms. Hawkins stated that she disagreed with the motion because the applicant never claimed that they were restoring the Sansom Street façade. She stated that she finds that the Sansom Street façade lacks an appropriate rhythm for the streetscape. She stated that the façade could be better articulated to correspond to the rhythms of the facades of the neighborhood and street. Mr. Farnham noted that the preservation ordinance authorizes the Commission, when reviewing applications, to consider the compatibility of the proposed work with the character of its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape.

Ms. Hawkins polled the Committee members on Ms. Gutterman’s motion with Mr. Cluver’s amendment. Mses. Gutterman and Stein and Mr. Cluver voted in the affirmative. Mses. Hawkins and Pentz and Mr. D’Alessandro voted in the negative and the motion failed.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she finds that the application materials delineating the work at the front façade are commensurate with similar application materials that the Commission has approved. She cautioned her colleagues that the Committee should not hold this applicant to a higher standard than it holds other applicants. She observed that the applicants have used the term “restoration” imprecisely and advised them to use it more carefully as they proceed through this review. She advised the applicants to work closely with the staff on the details to verify that the work at the front façade described as restoration is appropriate.

Ms. Hawkins moved to recommend approval of the architectural segment of the application, provided the Sansom Street façade is better articulated, with the staff to review details including the front façade restoration details. Ms. Pentz seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of five to one. Ms. Gutterman dissented.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the architectural segment of the application, provided the Sansom Street façade is better articulated, with the staff to review details including the front façade restoration details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 5:25 p.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 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

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.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.