

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

**VINCENT RIVERA, CHAIR
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
25 APRIL 2006**

PRESENT

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Herbert Levy, FAIA
Robert Thomas, AIA
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

Alexander Waddell, Acorn Properties
Randy Lewis
Kathy Lewis
Kevin Rasmussen, Architect
Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects
Michael Donohoe
Robert Graves, BLTA
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Bernice Hamel, SHCA
Rheta Smith
A. Johnson, MPA
P. Hirshorn
Deb Goldbert
Charles Loomis, Architect
Bob Moy
Jim Brzostowicz, HVMT Engineering
Charles Mottlehead, Capital Programs
Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission
Stephanie Craighead, Fairmount Park Commission
Jon Wagner, Architect
Jennifer Russell, PHR
Michael Greene
William Kane, Kane Woodworking
Daniel Richard, Buffalo Billiards
Frank Kakos, Kakos Architects
Edwin Rivera, QVNA
Ian Anderson, Phoenix Design & Development
Brett Harmon, Harman-Deutsch Architects
Rick Love, QVNA
Katherine Bottom, KSK
G. Gutierrez, Group G
Eric Johnson

CALL TO ORDER: Committee members Robert Thomas, Herbert Levy, and Suzanne Pentz called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. In the absence of Chairman Vincent Rivera, the Committee selected Mr. Thomas as its acting chair.

302-304 GASKILL STREET

Applicant: Steven Shapiro

Owner: Randolph Lewis

Project: Demolish party wall, rear façade, and rear roof; construct side and rear addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the east party wall, rear wall, rear roof, and interior structure and reconstruct the building with rear and side additions. The side addition would be constructed on a vacant parcel adjacent to the property. The side addition would be three stories tall and faced with brick; a large dormer would punctuate the roof. The design of the side addition would be based on the adjacent historic building. The application also proposes a stairtower addition on the rear of the historic building. This addition would extend above the ridge of the historic gabled roof and would require the demolition of the rear façade and rear half of the gable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant Standards 2, 9, and 10 and New Addition Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Owners Kathleen Lewis and Randy Lewis and architect Kevin Rasmussen represented the application.

Mr. Rasmussen began his presentation by noting that the 302 property is currently a courtyard. He stated that the house is too small for the owners, who would like to have a family. He explained that the party wall would be demolished on every floor to create larger, more open spaces. He stated that the third-floor ceiling height was too low and that the roof would be opened to provide more headroom.

Mr. Levy noted that no rear elevation had been provided. Mr. Thomas asked if the building had a rear ell. Mr. Rasmussen stated that it did and that it would be demolished to make room for the new stairtower.

Mr. Levy asserted that the architect was attempting to include too much in this very small historic house. He also objected to the falsely historic front façade of the side addition. Mr. Thomas agreed, stating that the addition should be compatible with the historic building, but should be of its time.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee should not concern itself solely with the new construction. He asserted that the application raised three important issues. In addition to the historicist design of the front façade of the addition, he contended that the height and scale of the additions and, more importantly, the demolition were problematic. He opined that the design proposes almost complete demolition. He noted that when the party wall, rear façade, and rear ell are demolished, the internal structure will not stand. All of the floor joists and roof structure will need to be removed. Only the front façade and west party wall will remain, leaving only a remnant of the historic building. Mr. Thomas suggested leaving the party wall intact and cutting openings into it to access the new addition. Mr. Farnham noted that the proposed stair tower would obliterate the rear of the historic building and stand above the ridgeline of the historic

gable roof. He suggested limiting the height of the rear addition to the historic cornice line. Mr. Rasmussen explained that that limitation would not allow the stair to access the new upper floor. Mr. Farnham suggested redesigning the project, moving the tall stair tower to the rear of the new addition, away from the historic building. Mr. Rasmussen agreed to study that option. Mr. Levy again asserted that he was trying to force too much into the small historic house. He suggested eliminating the deck and relocating some of the proposed additions to the historic building to its place. Ms. Lewis stated that she did not want to sacrifice the outdoor space by deleting the deck. The Committee noted that she is proposing to build on the outdoor space she now has.

Ms. Pentz stated that the proposal does not meet Standards. She suggested that the applicant redesign the project based on the Committee's and staff's comments. Messrs. Thomas and Levy reiterated their objections to the near-complete demolition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee concurred with the staff recommendation and voted to recommend denial, pursuant Standards 2, 9, and 10 and New Addition Guidelines.

2316 DELANCEY PLACE

Applicant: Alexander G. Waddell

Owner: Acorn Property Development, LLC

Project: Construct rooftop addition with deck on main block; demolish existing rooftop deck on rear ell; infill masonry openings; construct two-car garage with deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition with deck on the main roof of the property. The deck would extend up to the front parapet. The addition and deck would require the demolition of an existing light monitor and a roof deck, which is visible from Fidler Square.

The application also proposes to construct a two-car garage at the rear of the property. The rear of this property faces Fidler Square. The proposed garage would require the excavation of the basement level and would infill the rear yard. The garage would have a single automobile door and a pedestrian door and would be faced with brick. The deck would be constructed on the roof of the garage. The application also proposes to infill several masonry openings along the side-yard elevation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the garage with deck, approval of the masonry infill with reveals, pursuant Standards 2, 9, and 10. Denial of the main roof addition and deck, pursuant Standards 2 and 9 and the Commission's policy on main-block roof decks.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Steve Shapiro of Acorn Properties and architect Kevin Rasmussen represented the application.

Mr. Shapiro presented photographs to the Committee. He explained that the garage would extend into the basement, with the two cars parked end to end.

Mr. Thomas inquired as to the visibility of the deck proposed for the main roof. Mr. Shapiro noted the parapet and the narrowness of Delancey Street and stated that he was confident that the roof deck would not be visible from the street. He also offered to move the railing south, away from the parapet, to make it less visible. Mr. Thomas noted that the removal of the existing deck would be an improvement. He concluded that the rooftop proposal would satisfy the

Standards because it would not be visible from the street. He agreed with the staff's recommendation that the brick infill at the side-yard elevation be inset, creating reveals.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, provided the masonry infill is inset.

2142 GREEN STREET

Applicant: Arlene Matzkin

Owner: Keith Mikkelson

Project: Construct roof deck on main block and rear ell

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck on the main roof of the subject property. The deck would be set back from the front façade by thirteen feet. The deck would measure twelve by thirty feet and would have a stair house access. The property has a rear ell.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant the Commission's policy on main-block roof decks.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect Arlene Matzkin and owner Keith Mikkelson represented the application.

Ms. Matzkin displayed the photographs of the site. She stated that the deck would not be visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Mikkleson stated he is six feet tall; he was not visible from the street when he stood ten feet back from the front façade. Mr. Thomas noted that decks should be located on rear ells, but opined that this deck would be acceptable because it would not be visible from the street. Mr. Danta noted the Commission's policy on main-block roof decks.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal.

2113 MT. VERNON STREET

Applicant/Owner: Michael Donohoe

Project: Legalize roof deck on main block; install vinyl windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the reconstruction of a roof deck on the main roof of the subject property. The deck sits eight feet back from the front cornice and is accessed through an existing hatch. The property has a rear ell.

In addition, the applicant seeks to replace the existing vinyl six-over-six windows in the front façade with vinyl one-over-one windows. The owner has submitted copies of a signed contract for the installation of six Andersen vinyl windows. The property was individually designated in 1972.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the legalization of the deck, pursuant to the Commission's policy on main-block roof decks. Denial of the vinyl windows, pursuant to Standard 2.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Michael Donohoe and Nancy Bairers, the owners, represented the proposal. Mr. Donohoe stated that the property had cheap six-over-six vinyl windows when he bought it. Mr. Donohoe reported that he recently changed the shutters.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee could not recommend approval of vinyl windows because they do not meet the Standards. He also stated that non-historic windows should be replaced with the historically appropriate windows, not other non-historic windows.

Mr. Donohoe reported that one of their front windows was cracked and needed replacement. He stated that the deck had been removed to allow the leaking roof to be repaired. Mr. Donohoe claimed that he was not aware of the historic designation. He stated that he was only proposing to replace existing features in kind. Mr. Donohoe explained that he had asked the Anderson Window Company if the windows would look historic. He had been assured by the window salesman that they would look historic. Although the windows have not yet been installed, Mr. Donohoe has signed a contract for them, committing to pay \$7,000.00 to the Anderson Window Company. He reported that similar windows had recently been installed in 2111 Mt. Vernon Street.

Mr. Thomas explained that the Committee is a technical advisory committee and that it must base its recommendations on historic preservation standards. He stated that the Commission has the authority to weigh other factors including hardship and other extenuating circumstances. Mr. Donohoe remarked that he has sticks propped in the windows to prevent a break-in and may board the windows with plywood.

Mr. Levy agreed with Mr. Thomas. Mr. Levy added that the Committee cannot require an owner to make a change, but can review proposed changes for appropriateness.

Mr. Thomas directed the Committee's attention to the roof deck. Mr. Donohoe reported that the previous owner never applied for a permit for the deck. Mr. Thomas noted that the deck was not visible from the street. He then noted that the Department of Licenses & Inspections may require an enclosed stair for safety reasons. Mr. Thomas recommended approval of the deck.

Mr. Farnham directed the Committee's attention to the Spring Garden Historic District notice letters in the property file. Countering the applicants' claim that they were unaware of the designation, he pointed out that applicants were the owners at the time of designation and received the notice letters. He provided copies of the letters to the applicants.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend the legalization of the roof deck, but denial of the vinyl windows, pursuant to Standard 2.

1600 ARCH STREET

Applicant: Robert B. Graves

Owner: 1600 Arch Street, LP

Project: Install three banners

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install three temporary banners. Two banners would hang on the 16th Street façade and one on the Arch Street façade. The banners would hang twenty feet above the side walk and measure twenty-seven feet in height. The banners would be framed. They would not be directly attached to the façade, but would be immovably positioned behind the capitals of large columns. The frames would be tied by cables looped around the shafts of the columns; the cables would be wrapped in protective plastic to avoid any damage to the limestone shafts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Robert Graves represented the application. Mr. Thomas inquired about the length of time the banners would be displayed. Mr. Graves responded that the marketing period will run until May 2008.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval for a period not to exceed 24 months.

2240-2248 N. BROAD STREET

Applicant: Cathy Harris, Philadelphia Mural Arts Program

Owner: Uptown Entertainment Development Corporation

Project: Legalize mural on party wall

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a mural painted on the south party wall of the Uptown Theater on North Broad Street. The mural covers the entirety of the party wall. This wall was stuccoed and painted white at the time of designation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Section 6.8.a.4 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations; the size and scale of the mural are not compatible with the historic building.

DISCUSSION: The Committee delayed the start of the review to await the arrival of the applicant. After waiting for almost ten minutes, the Committee asked Mr. Danta to proceed with the introduction without the applicant. He presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. He read Section 6.8.a.4 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations. Mr. Levy stated that he was surprised that the Mural Arts and Uptown staff were unaware of the building's historic designation.

Amy Johnston of the Mural Arts Program arrived and joined the meeting. She explained that Cathy Harris of the Mural Arts Program would arrive shortly to represent the application. Ms. Johnston stated that the mural meets the criteria because it is on a party wall. Ms. Johnston noted that the Committee and Commission were barred from considering content. Mr. Thomas explained that they were not considering the content, only the size and scale of the mural. Ms. Johnston said that their intent was to create a symbol of the positive change that the Uptown Development wants to bring to the area. The mural pays tribute to the city's musical legacy and the tradition of the theater.

The Committee reviewed the designation photographs of the building.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee was a technical advisory body. He added that he was in agreement with the staff's recommendation of denial, owing to the large size and inappropriate scale of the mural. He opined that the mural overwhelms the building. Mr. Levy agreed.

Mr. Levy asked why the Mural Arts Program had not applied to the Commission before installing the mural. Ms. Johnston stated that "the appropriate homework was not done."

Ms. Johnston asked if a temporary approval was possible, the agreement reached for the illegal mural at 15th and Waverly Streets. Mr. Levy suggested that she discuss her options with the Commission. Ms. Pentz noted that that case was exceptional.

The Committee considered waiting for Ms. Harris, but then decided it needed to move ahead with its agenda. Ms. Harris never arrived at the meeting.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Section 6.8.a.4 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations.

273 S. 4TH STREET

Applicant: Charles Loomis, Loomis McAfee Architects

Owners: Julia Colton Cramer & Eric Colton

Project: Demolish one-story rear addition; construct two-story rear addition with deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story rear addition. This addition would require the demolition of a non-historic glass greenhouse above a one-story addition. The new addition would have a deck, accessed from the rear ell. The application proposes to alter several masonry openings on the rear, including new openings on the rear ell and enlargement of a single window into a double window. It also proposes to enlarge the rear dormer.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the enlarging of the rear dormer and third-story window, pursuant Standards 2, 6, and 9. Approval of the addition, pursuant Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect Charles Loomis represented the application. Mr. Loomis began his presentation by displaying a model of the proposal. He noted that the upper portion of the rear of the house can be seen from Jacob's Way, a public walkway. Mr. Baron noted the importance of this type of walkway in Society Hill. He also noted that dormers are character-defining elements.

Bernice Hamel, the vice president of the Society Hill Civic Association, spoke to the Committee. Ms. Hamel stated this project has created quite a stir in the community. She read from a SHCA letter supporting the concept in general, but with exceptions. The first concern is that the deck will impinge on the courtyard that is expressly mentioned in the district nomination. The association asked the Committee to consider the impact of such a deck if approved. The second issue is the significant zoning questions raised by the project; the association believes that the project will significantly change as the zoning is resolved. The third concern is the loss of the historic dormer.

Mr. Danta asked Mr. Loomis if he planned to alter the slope in the rear ell roof. Mr. Loomis stated that he planned to build a parapet that would hide the pitch of the roof. Ms. Pentz inquired the reasoning behind the parapet. Mr. Loomis responded it would clean up the façade. He also said that he may have to repitch the roof when building the addition. Mr. Thomas opined that the historic pitch should be maintained.

Mr. Loomis asked if a door on the side elevation of the rear ell to access the deck would be appropriate. The Committee agreed that it would be acceptable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the addition and deck, but denial of the enlarged dormer, enlarged third-story rear window, and parapet at the rear ell.

2221 PINE STREET

Owner/Applicant: Deborah Goldberg

History: built c.1845

OVERVIEW: This application involves the demolition and reconstruction of the front façade of this rowhouse. Noting its poor condition, an engineer's report recommends the rebuilding of the façade. The plans show a new front including a bracketed wood cornice and two-over-two windows, restoring the appearance of an Italianate rowhouse and matching the twin property next door. The applicant also wishes to demolish the rear ell and append an addition on the highly visible, but stuccoed rear façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the front façade is built with brick salvaged during the demolition, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Deborah Goldberg, the applicant and owner, represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that he had visited the site and confirmed that this building is a mirror of the preserved Italianate rowhouse to the west. Mr. Baron then expounded on the reasoning for reuse of the bricks; new bricks are of different dimensions and give a very different appearance. New bricks would not match the historic bricks next door; the coursing would not correspond. He suggested that bricks from the front and rear be salvaged for the reconstruction of the front façade.

Ms. Goldberg stated her intentions to return the front facade to its original condition.

She distributed revised plans. Mr. Baron noted that the windows on the new plans were specified as aluminum clad. They were wood on the original plans. Ms. Goldberg stated that wood were acceptable; she added that she would present all the window and door plans to Mr. Baron for a staff review.

Ms. Pentz asked Ms. Goldberg the reasoning behind the reuse of the star bolts on the new façade; she pointed out that they would be unnecessary on the rebuilt facade. Ms. Goldberg agreed to remove them from the design. Ms. Goldberg inquired about her stuccoed chimney. She stated that she will restore the brick chimney.

Rita Smith, the next door neighbor, spoke to the Committee about her concerns about the shared party wall. She said that the two buildings had been part of the Underground Railroad and therefore had no party wall between them. She stated that a party wall had been added many years ago. She is concerned that the party wall may not meet the current building code and therefore have to be replaced at her expense. Ms. Goldberg thought that the party wall was adequate and that she is not altering it.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the project, provided that the front façade is built with brick salvaged

during the demolition, appropriate wood true-divided-light windows are installed at the front, and the star bolts are not reinstalled, with the staff to review details.

2428 POPLAR STREET

Applicant/Owner: Robert Moy

Project: Legalize roof-deck on rear ell

OVERVIEW: This proposal seeks to legalize the construction of a deck on the rear ell of this corner property. The deck is extremely large, highly visible, and constructed in a way that the dormers are obstructed. A door will be cut through the rear mansard, which is clad with slate.

The Roofs Guideline in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards is directly on point. It recommends "designing additions to roofs such as ...decks and terraces ... 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." This deck is highly conspicuous from the street and would damage and obscure character-defining features.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Robert Moy represented the application. Mr. Moy explained that he did not know he needed a building permit for a deck. The staff explained that a permit was required and asked if his contract with the builder stipulated who was responsible for securing the permit. He stated that he did not have a contract. He had paid the contractor \$12,000 for the deck and the contractor had built it in one day. Mr. Farnham asked for the name of the contractor. Mr. Moy replied A&A Renovations.

Mr. Thomas stated that the deck does not meet the Standards. Ms. Pentz asked Mr. Moy if the mansard had been cut yet for the door. He replied that it had not. The Committee asked why he had not used one of the windows for a door. He explained that a bathtub blocks one window and the other is at the stairway and is many feet above the floor. Ms. Pentz asked why the deck stands so tall above the roof. Mr. Moy explained that it sits atop the party wall at the high end of the roof. Mr. Thomas noted that the roof slopes significantly.

Mr. Moy pleaded for a recommendation of approval. Mr. Thomas explained that he would vote to deny. He added that the Committee needed to judge this deck fairly, remembering the many similar deck proposals for which it had recommended denial.

Ms. Pentz opined that no amount of modification would make this deck acceptable.

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

FAIRMOUNT WATER WORKS

Applicant: Janice Woodcock, Capital Program Office

Owner: City of Philadelphia, Fairmount Park Commission

Project: Construct dock; install debris screen

OVERVIEW: This application proposes building a dock with debris screen at the Fairmount Water Works, south of the dam. The floating dock would connect to the Water Works garden with a series of ramps. The paths and ramps will feature new paving, lighting, and relocated signage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

Discussion: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Jim Brzostowicz of HVMT Engineering, Charles Mottlehead of the Capital Programs Office, and Theresa Stuhlman and Stephanie Craighead of the Fairmount Park Commission represented the application.

Mr. Brzostowicz explained that the dock would be built of dark colored steel and a composite wood-like material. Mr. Thomas suggested that the details be unobtrusive and fade into the background. Mr. Levy asked about the debris screen. Mr. Brzostowicz explained that it would be a series of piles with a floating screen.

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

122-124 CHESTNUT STREET

Applicant: Jon Wagner

Owner: Chestnut Lofts

Project: Construct two rooftop additions with decks

OVERVIEW: This proposal involves adding rooftop additions and decks to this building. The structure has a partial front parapet but has a lower building to its east, which will make the front addition visible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the front penthouse and deck, approval of the rear penthouse and deck, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jon Wagner and owner Jenner Russell represented the application.

Mr. Wagner described the proposed work, adding penthouses at the front and rear. The front penthouse would provide a first bedroom to each of the two loft units. The rear penthouse would add a second bedroom to each of the two one-bedroom units.

Mr. Baron noted that the front of the building is highly visible because it stands across Chestnut Street from Letitia Street.

Mr. Baron inquired about the building's current use and occupancy. Ms. Russell responded that her father converted the building to apartments twenty-three years ago. It was converted to condominiums last year. Ms. Russell stated that she and her brother own the top units. The condominium documents allow them to build on the roof.

The Committee asked about the height and shape of the penthouse roofs. Mr. Wagner explained that the clerestories would bring light into the north-facing units. Mr. Wagner reported that they would only be visible from Chestnut to the east. Mr. Baron added that they would be visible from Letitia. Ms. Pentz commented that the front penthouse would be highly visible from Chestnut.

Mr. Rivera suggested a more anonymous, simple design. He also suggested lowering the ceiling height and deleting the pergolas from the design. Mr. Levy agreed with the assessment. Mr. Wagner agreed to use open railings on the decks. Ms. Pentz suggested that the plans be revised significantly with the aid of the staff.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the interior ceiling heights are reduced to no more than 8'-6", the shape of the penthouses are simplified, the pergolas are deleted, and the deck railings are black, open, metal railings, with the staff to review details.

1234 WAVERLY STREET

Applicant/Owner: Jeffrey Wing

Project: Replace front facade windows; legalize front door and door surround

OVERVIEW: This proposal seeks to partially correct and legalize work done to this rowhouse without a permit. Several years ago, the owner had six-over-six wood windows removed and new four-over-four vinyl windows installed. He received a violation at that time but did not correct the violation. More recently, he had the c. 1950 Colonial Revival frontispiece and door removed and a new, similar frontispiece and metal door installed. The original design, seen on the twin house next door, featured a transom window, without a frontispiece surrounding the door. The original wood door likely featured horizontal panels. The owner now seeks to correct the windows with new frames and sash, but wishes to retain the metal door and frontispiece.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the windows, denial of the door and door surround, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. William Kane, who will manufacture the custom windows, represented the application.

Mr. Kane explained that his client is attempting to cure the violation. He is will incur substantial expense to correct the illegal work. Mr. Baron reported that he inspected the project while the illegal work to the doorway was underway. He noted that the former transom was infilled with brick many years ago. Mr. Rivera asked Mr. Baron to explain the staff's recommendation. Mr. Baron stated that the metal door should be replaced with an appropriate wood door, but the wood surround was acceptable because it was very similar to the one removed illegally and because the transom area had been infilled many years ago. Mr. Kane stated that the owner would be willing to install the correct wood door.

Mr. Levy objected to the owner's failure to correct the window violation several years ago, to the subsequent illegal work after receiving the first violation, and to his failure to attend the meeting.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend legalization of the door surround, provided the appropriate wood windows are

installed and the illegal metal door is replaced with an appropriate wood door, with the staff to review details.

1525 PINE STREET

Applicant: Frank Kakos

Owners: Robert Driscoll & Michael Greene

Project: Legalize sidewalk

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of a concrete sidewalk with a blue tint and small-block patterning. The original sidewalk, extant on the neighboring property, features very large blocks of bluestone. Also, the brownstone door surround was damaged when a light fixture was installed on it.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Frank Kakos, the architect, and Michael Greene, the owner, represented the application. Messrs. Kakos and Greene explained that the City's Streets Department excavated the street and his sidewalk. Upon completion of the water line repair project, the sidewalk was left unfinished. Mr. Greene stated that he was unaware that he needed approval of the Commission to replace a sidewalk. Mr. Kakos stated that the sidewalk was concrete before the work was undertaken.

Ms. Pentz inquired on the length of time between the street repair project and the laying of the new sidewalk. Mr. Greene stated that it was "quite a while," but he was unsure as to any exact amount of time. Ms. Pentz concluded that he had the time to submit an application to the Commission. Mr. Greene stated that he attempted to replicate his neighbors' sidewalks. He said he did "what looked best." Mr. Kakos added that his client has undertaken significant restoration work to the house with the Commission's approval.

Mr. Rivera and Ms. Pentz asked the applicant about the outside light. Mr. Greene stated that he had installed a new light in the same location as his neighbor's. Mr. Baron noted that the base of the fixture was too large for the area of attachment and that the brownstone door surround was therefore "chipped away" to install it. Mr. Rivera opined that the fixture is not appropriate for the building. Ms. Pentz suggested a compromise that would require the replacement of the fixture in exchange for legalizing the concrete pavement. Mr. Levy did not agree. He noted he was more concerned about the absence of a railing at the basement steps. Mr. Levy added the rail should be in keeping with the railing at the front steps. Mr. Greene said it would be the only house in the row with such a rail. Mr. Baron cautioned the Committee that there was no evidence the houses had basement railings historically, none of the other identical houses have railings, and the applicant had not proposed a railing. Mr. Levy insisted that the Committee require a railing.

Mr. Greene asked if he could install a light in basement entrance. The Committee replied that a light would be acceptable and that he should work with the staff on the matter.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend legalization of the sidewalk, provided the existing light at the entrance is replaced with an appropriate light, and a railing is installed at the basement stair, with the staff to review details.

718-724 S. 2ND STREET

Applicant: Katherine Bottom

Owner: Queen's Mews South LP

Project: Demolish large portions of two historic buildings, rebuild historic facade; construct multi-unit residential building with garage connected to the historic buildings

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to demolish portions of two designated buildings and combine these with structures on three other lots into a residential complex. On 718 S. 2nd, the applicants propose the demolition of the later yellow brick facade and the restoration of the red brick facade. The house will be joined by and internally connected to three additional houses to be constructed on two lots to the south on 2nd Street and one lot on Monroe Street as well as the other historic house at 724 S. 2nd Street. The vacant lots are not designated. 207 Monroe Street was demolished without Commission review during the period of the demolition moratorium in Queen Village. The Commission reviews conjoined additions to designated buildings. The staff seeks to work with the applicants on the facade details for the restoration of 718 S. Front where details are lacking. The application is incomplete however in the lack of a demolition plan and photos of the rear. The plans seem to show substantial demolition of the sides and rear of the historic houses.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. James Francis and Ian Anderson of Phoenix Design and architect Brett Harmon represented the applicant. Architect Katherine Bottom arrived later and joined the review.

Ms. Pentz asked about the historic roof on 724. Mr. Baron replied that the historic roof has survived; it is a half gambel. Mr. Baron then outlined the proposed demolition. He stated that the front facade, rear ell, rear facade, and much of the side facade would be demolished at 718. He stated that the rear ell, rear facade, and much of the side facade would be demolished at 724. Mr. Levy commented that this proposal was akin to the Gaskill Street proposal reviewed earlier. It proposed almost total demolition. Mr. Baron remarked that he had concerns about the sections of the buildings proposed for retention. He asked how they would be supported during the construction particularly of the underground garage. He explained to the Committee that two buildings at 207 and 209 Monroe Street, which are part of this project, were lost while the developer was working on them, possibly because of inadequate underpinning. Mr. Anderson objected and stated that they had been issued a building permit days before for underpinning, but had not started the work. The collapse occurred during the restoration of the two buildings. The Department of Licenses & Inspections had required him to completely demolish the two buildings after the initial collapse. Mr. Baron suggested that the demolition should possibly have been reviewed by the Commission because the Queen Village Demolition Moratorium was in place at the time. Mr. Harman stated they were now in the process of hiring a competent structural engineer. He reported that the engineer that they initially considered was not acceptable to the community.

Mr. Baron expressed his concern about the amount of demolition. He asked whether the roof and floor structures could be retained with the demolition of the walls. Mr. Farnham suggested that the Committee should consider whether the proposal crossed the demolition threshold and triggered the hardship-public interest test in Section 14-2007(7)(j) of the ordinance. Ms. Pentz posited that it certainly crossed that line with the demolition proposal for 718.

Mr. Harman methodically explained the demolition proposed by the application. He said that they planned to retain “much” of the foundation of 724 and “a good bit” of the foundation at 718. They planned to demolish the rear ells of both buildings and the rear wall of 718. He listed in great detail the many openings proposed for the party walls of 718 and 724. He also noted that they planned to demolish the gable end on 724. He elaborated that they planned to demolish the party wall at 724 down to the third-floor level. He stated that he would know much more about how and what the demolition would need to be done once they hired a structural engineer. He concluded, announcing that they would keep almost 100% of the foundations of the historic buildings.

Ms. Pentz asked how the historic half gambrel on 724 would intersect with the new building on 722. Ms. Bottom, the architect of the façade, stated that she was “not quite sure.” Ms. Pentz asked if the yellow brick façade on 718 was applied on top of the old façade or in place of it. Ms. Bottom replied that they would demolish the entire front façade and replace it because the red brick seems to have been entirely replaced with yellow brick. Ms. Pentz stated that it would be a 100% demolition. Mr. Baron suggested a site visit to clarify the proposal.

Mr. Rivera, the owner of 213 Catherine Street and a member of the Queen Village Neighbors Association historic preservation committee, stated that tremendous neighborhood concern was expressed about this project at the zoning hearing. He asserted that Queen Village has lost many historic buildings recently. He noted that the demolition moratorium did not work in this case; this developer circumvented it with the 207 and 209 Monroe buildings. He beseeched the Committee to consider this proposal very carefully.

Richard Cole, the zoning chair of the Queen Village Neighbors Association, expressed concerns about safety and the failure of the developer to hire a structural engineer. He then noted the failure of the demolition moratorium for the Monroe Street properties.

Mr. Francis, the developer, introduced himself and offered his version of the events surrounding the demolition of the Monroe Street properties. Ms. Pentz asserted that the Monroe Street case is not relevant to this review. Mr. Anderson stated that he would ensure that these buildings remained standing.

Mr. Levy stated that the design of the Front Street façade of the new building was inappropriate. It was poorly scaled and combined unrelated features from a range of historic buildings. For example, the combination of an alleyway gate and a front stoop was incongruous. Ms. Bottom stated that 720 and 722 were new construction. The Committee noted the Commission’s jurisdiction over additions to historic buildings.

Mr. Rivera asserted that the design documents are incomplete. Citing the lack of information, he agreed with the staff’s recommendation for denial. Mr. Rivera asserted that the demolition and new construction must be clearly shown. Mr. Rivera suggested the applicant amend the plans and return to the Committee. He also noted the need for a structural engineer. Ms. Pentz emphasized the importance of the dormer and gable.

Mr. Farnham stated that this proposal does not meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, which preclude pseudo-historic construction. This project is a *mélange* of several different styles including Georgian, Second Empire, and Italianate. He said that this project is presented as two-dimensional object, solely a façade. He requested that the entire project with all its facades be presented to the Commission for its review.

Ms. Bottom distributed a section drawing of the front facade of 718. Mr. Farnham asked how she planned to retain the historic roof structure if she was demolishing most of the three facades. Ms. Bottom replied that they would retain the roof.

The Committee members agreed that they must recommend denial owing to the amount of demolition, the lack of complete plans, and the new façade designs.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

116-118 CHESTNUT STREET

Applicant: Gerry Gutierrez, Group G LLC

Owner: Michael Samchik

Project: Construct outdoor dining deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a dining deck on top of the one-story portion of the building. A window would be converted to a door on the side façade. The deck would be set back 12'-9" from the front façade. It would have a canopy roof structure to reduce the amount of noise rising to the residences above it.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Daniel Buchness, the general manager of the establishment, and Gerry Gutierrez, the architect, represented the application. Mr. Baron began by noting that it would not be visible from the east or west on Chestnut, owing to the tall buildings on either side. However, it would be visible from Letitia Street, which intersects Chestnut near the property.

Ms. Pentz noted that it looks temporary. Mr. Gutierrez replied that it is demountable. In response to questions about its height above the roof, he explained that the roof is sloped and the deck is raised to account for the pitch. Mr. Levy suggested a less solid wall at the front of the deck. Mr. Gutierrez stated that he could replace the stucco parapet wall with an open railing.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the stucco does not extend above the plane of the deck and the railing is open, not solid, with the staff to review details.

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 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 work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportions, 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.

New Addition Guidelines: Not Recommended: Duplicating the exact form, material, style, and detailing of the historic building in a new addition so that the work appears to be part of the historic building; Not Recommended: Imitating a historic style or period of architecture in a new addition; Recommended: Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that the character defining features are not obscured, damaged or destroyed.

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.

ADJOURNMENT: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron
Jorge Danta
Jonathan E. Farnham
Karen Gonski