

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
24 June 2003**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Herbert Levy, FAIA
Rudy D'Alessandro
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz

Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

Jerry Roller, J.K. Roller Architects
David Schmidt, J.K. Roller Architects
David W. O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbor's Association
Gary Gevurtz
Florence Bruy
Peter Bruy
Clara Armstrong
Tim Brennav, Weichert Realtors
Fred Tropea, Ruggiero Development Group
Joseph ruggiero, Ruggiero Development Group
Ronald Patterson, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg and Ellers, LLP
Jose Hernandez, J.K. Roller Architects
Roderick Foxworth
Eric Brown
Dianne Chambless
Alan Goldstein, 929 Clinton Street
Robert Powers, Powers and Company
Hugh Zimmers, AIA, 902 Spruce Street
Alan Delfiner, 902 Spruce Street
Matthew Semola, 902 Spruce Street
Bernice Hamel, 302 South 2nd Street
Brian Wengenroth, 238 Philip Street
Carol Hill Sox, 232 Philip Place
Michael E. Merkle, MCW Enterprises, LLC
Ned d'Entremont, Pella Windows
Stephen Wu, Kise Straw Kolodner Architects
Philip Scott, Kise Straw Kolodner Architects
James C. Gibson, 227 South 6th Street
Kristin F. Mullaney, Amburn/Jarosinski Architects
Jerry A. Lindheim, Esq., Greitzer and Locks
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
Salvatore D'Angelo, 258 South 20th Street
Richard Conway Meyer, 2018 Locust Street
Jonathan Broh, J.K. Roller Architects

Ivor L. Moore, 1501 Spruce Street
 Jay Tackett, WPEN Building
 Richard Thom, 8-10 Letitia Way
 Gie Lien, 8-10 Letitia Way
 Doug Seiler, Seiler and Drury Architects
 Sabrina C. Soong, Soong Associates, Incorporated
 Schaunn McKamey, Woodway Construction

Herbert Levy, Acting-Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

4050 Main Street

Gary Gevurtz, Owner
 David Schmidt, Architect/Applicant
 DATE: c. 1850 for Roxborough Mills
 PROPOSAL: Façade alterations, signage

This proposal includes the overall rehabilitation of the façade. The owner proposes to repaint the façade, but leave the brick arches over the windows exposed; install new metal four-over-four segmentally arched windows on the first and second floors with applied muntins; remove infill in some of the window openings and install new windows; and create new concrete steps with metal railings at the two existing doors. The two main changes to the building include the conversion of the central loading dock to an entrance with new double-leaf glazed doors and concrete ramp with metal railing, and a mesh metal sign band above the first floor with internally-illuminated plastic letters over the two entrances. The sign band forms a mounting platform for fixtures to light the façade. Banners will replace the existing ones between the windows at the second floor.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the windows, pursuant to Standard 6, they should be wood and match the details of the existing windows. Denial of the signage as proposed, but approval of halo-lit letters, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Manayunk Signage Ordinance [*“Internally illuminated box type signs shall not be permitted.”*]. Approval of paint, but only a single color; doors and ramps, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal, she noted that the Manayunk Ordinance does not approve of box signs.

Gary Gevurtz, the owner, Jerry Roller and David Schmidt, the architects, attended the meeting. Mr. Roller pointed out that the façade would be painted in two colors to differentiate the commercial businesses on either floor. He said that the proposed sign would have red letters encased in aluminum and that he proposes metal for the windows because the owner prefers a window with durability.

Ms. Spina showed a photograph, which shows the details of the frame. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the quality of the windows is important because the simple building has very little ornamentation except for the windows. Mr. Gevurtz said that he contacted wood window manufacturers, such as Kolbe and Kolbe, but they cannot handle an order until October. Mr. Roller asked about retaining the brick mold and installing aluminum sash. Committee members thought this inappropriate. Committee members discussed the signage.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the entrance doors, ramp and steps, signage, and banners, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. The Committee recommended denial of the windows as proposed, but recommended approval of wood windows with details to match the existing, pursuant to Standard 6, and was split on the

two-toned painting of the stucco.

223 South 42nd Street

Clay and Clara Armstrong, Owners/Applicants

DATE: 1868-69, John D. Jones, developer, for William Montelius

PROPOSAL: Cut wall for parking pad, install wrought iron gate

This mansion, built for William Montelius, a miner and coal shipper, has a 19th century random ashlar brownstone and wrought-iron wall around the property. The owners wish to demolish a section of the wall between two pillars (approximately 11'-7") and install a wrought-iron, picket sliding gate to have access to a parking pad in the rear yard.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9 and site guideline.

Ms. Spina explained the application. Clara Armstrong, the owner, stressed that her driving has become restricted, owing to the impossibility of finding a parking space in close proximity to her home. She noted that most of the single houses on the block have driveways. Committee members discussed the gate, with some members preferring a double-leaf gate that sat at the line of the fence rather than behind the piers. Mr. Levy inquired if the brick sidewalk would be retained and suggested taking up the bricks and re-installing them over a concrete pad. He also thought that the stone on the piers should be patched to match. The Committee thought that a simple picket gate would convey that it is a later addition.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposed or of a double-leaf gate set at the line of the wall, with the staff to review details.

12 Queen Street, 19 Christian, unit block of Beck Street

Fred Tropea, Equitable owner

Jose Hernandez, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830, permastone façade, c. 1955

PROPOSAL: Conceptual approval for complete demolition, new construction, and widening of Beck Street

The land bordered by Swanson, Queen, Interstate 95 and Christian Streets has a mix of vacant lots, factories and rowhouses. The developer would like to demolish the remaining buildings and construct 50 townhouses. 12 Queen Street, one of the remaining rowhouses, stands at the northwest corner of the development; the house at 19 Christian Street was demolished in 1985.

The development will also incorporate several, smaller streets, including the unit block of Beck Street. Beck Street appears on the Philadelphia Register as a part of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. The plans call for widening these streets. For Beck Street, the developers propose to keep the historic street paving, but install asphalt paving from the original curb-line to the new curbs.

The new construction will consist of 2½-story houses with raised basements, brick veneers, and multi-light windows. The top floors will have gabled roofs with large dormers and front and rear decks at the corners. All of the houses will have garages in the basement areas, but with entrances in the rears from within the development. The overall design of the houses will vary slightly to give visual interest.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the demolition, pursuant to Standards 2, 9 and 10. Demolition

of the building is not necessary for the overall development to proceed. Approval of the new construction at site of 19 Christian Street, pursuant to Standard 9. Approval of the widening of Beck Street, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ronald Patterson, Esquire, Jose Hernandez, the architect, and Fred Tropea attended the meeting. Mr. Patterson stated his belief that the property at 12 Queen Street should be demolished. Mr. Tropea said that the property's restoration would require a lot of work and he is not considering the restoration of the property as part of the deal. Staff showed the Committee photographs of the historic property across the street from 12 Queen that had its PermaStone removed and façade restored. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz stated that unless the applicant could show that the building proves unstable, the Committee could not recommend approval of its demolition.

Florence Bruy, the owner of 12 Queen Street, urged the Committee to consider the proposal, owing to her fear that the proposed new construction will damage her property. She pointed out that her property suffered from the construction of Interstate 95.

David O'Donnell, of the Queen Village Neighborhood Association, said that it supports the development, but it does not to lose more historic structures in the neighborhood. The Civic Association has seen the restoration of a number of historic buildings in similar condition. Joseph Ruggiero interjected that the site of 12 Queen Street is key to the development and without its demolition the project could fail.

Mr. Levy asked if Norfolk Street would be widened, and Mr. Tropea responded that both Beck and Norfolk Street would be widened to meet code requirements for emergency vehicles.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the demolition of 12 Queen Street, but conceptual approval of the development on 19 Christian Street and the widening of Beck Street, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

781 South 2nd Street Rear

Tim Levin, Owner

Chris Antico, Applicant

DATE: 1831, altered c. 1980

PROPOSAL: Alter two-story window

This proposal is for the rear property of 781 South 2nd Street; however, owing to the configuration of neighboring properties, it is visible from 2nd Street. The west wall has a two-story window in a room with an atrium ceiling. The owners would like to install a floor at that level, bisecting the window. The proposal includes installing a stucco spandrel and banks of casement windows at the 1st and newly created 2nd floor. The opening will retain the arched shape, with a new two-light arched transom.

Staff recommendation: Approval since it does not include removal of historic fabric, pursuant to Standard 9.

Ms. Spina presented the application. Alex and Tim Levin, the owners attended the meeting. Mr. Levin said that the spandrel between the upper and lower floors could either be stucco or wood. Mr. Rivera said that his preference is stucco, which is a more protective material.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with a stucco spandrel, pursuant to Standard 9.

506 Catharine Street

Roderick Foxworth, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: 2nd–story addition with roof deck, install garage, rebuild sidewall with new windows

This application involves several pieces. First, the west wall has some structural problems, which may be solved with star bolts. If not, the owner would like to rebuild the wall with stucco-covered CMU. Whether it is repaired or rebuilt, the plans show new window openings in the wall in line with the historic chimney. The plans show that the fireplaces on each floor will be demolished, but do not show how the chimney will be supported at the roof.

Second, the proposal includes creating a garage in the rear ell. This includes demolishing the west wall of the rear ell and extending it 1½ feet into the sidewalk. The garage would have a paneled overhead door.

Third, the application calls for a second-floor addition on the rear ell with a roof deck leading from the 3rd floor. The addition will have stucco to match the rest of the façade and the parapet wall for the addition will be high enough to serve as the railing for the deck. On the rear façade of the third floor, the proposal calls for removing the historic windows, closing one opening and widening the other for a double-leaf sliding glass door.

Staff recommendation: Approval of rebuilding the wall in brick with the proper bargeboard, if the structural report says that reconstruction is necessary, pursuant to Standard 6. If rebuilding the wall in brick proves a hardship, the applicant should make that case to the Hardship Committee. Approval of additional windows in the west façade, but not in that location. The northernmost windows cut where the chimney historically stood, so they should be moved south along the façade, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. Denial of the rear extension and garage, pursuant to Standards 2, 9 and 10. Approval of the addition on the rear ell; however, the deck should have an open, picket railing rather than the closed, brick parapet, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Denial of the changes to the 3rd floor rear. One window should remain and the other cut down for a single-leaf door, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Roderick Foxworth, the owner, and Eric Brown attended the meeting. Mr. Foxworth submitted an engineer's report, which confirmed the need for the rebuilding of the wall. Ms. Spina noted that the floor plans and elevations do not match and recommended that the owner have his draftsman correct the discrepancies.

In response to the Committee's query about window openings, Mr. Brown said that it did not have windows originally. Mr. Levy noted that the windows should be aligned away from the chimney. He pointed out that there needs to be a structural system in the roof to support the chimney once the fireplaces are removed, therefore, the drawings will require review by a structural engineer. Committee members concurred that the rear extension into the sidewalk and garage are inappropriate.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of rebuilding of the wall in brick, with the proper bargeboard, pursuant to Standard 6; cutting the window openings on the west façade, subject to their alignment away from the chimney; an addition on the rear ell, with a deck with an open picket railing, and cutting down one third-story window for a single-leaf door, with the retention of the other window, pursuant to Standard 9. It recommended denial of the rear extension and garage, and the alterations to the 3rd floor rear as proposed.

929 Clinton Street

Alan Goldstein and Dianne Chambless, Owners

Alex Rice, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: 5th-story addition and façade rehabilitation-final approval

The Committee and Commission approved the restoration of the 5th floor and a rear roof deck previously, on the condition that the architect works with staff to find a suitable roof shape and pitch. After several site visits, staff has determined that the pitch of 10-to-12 will result in a gabled roof that reaches the mid-point ridgeline at 18 feet in height. The historic pitch of the roof was approximately 5.5-to-12, reaching the ridgeline at 9'-9" high. On the rear, the roof will have a shallower pitch to accommodate the doors that lead to the rear roof deck. The revised proposal does differ from the conceptual concerning a major feature. The plans have eliminated the dormer, a feature in the historic roof, and instead call for three flat skylights and five solar cells.

The plans include replacing the replacement bricks at the upper story, new wood windows and door, new shutters and a new cornice. Alterations are also proposed for the rear, which the Committee and Commission had not seen previously. The proposal now calls for new double-leaf doors with transoms leading to the stair tower, new single-leaf multi-light doors on the rear of the rear ell leading to balconies and new vinyl, one-over-one windows on the second floor of the rear ell's east façade. However, the plans do not include details for any of these elements.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the addition as proposed, pursuant to Standard 6. The staff recommends approval if the proposal includes reconstruction of the historic roofline at the front gable, both in pitch and with a dormer. Approval of the windows, door, shutters and cornice, with staff to review details and shop drawings, pursuant to Standard 6. Staff notes that the cornice should have a Greek Revival profile, not the late 19th century profile proposed. The current replacement bricks match the historic ones in shape, size and almost in color, but have a glossy finish. These should only be replaced if the proposed bricks exactly match the originals in size, shape and color. Staff could not comment on the rear alterations without more details.

Ms. Spina presented the revised proposal. The owners, Alan Goldstein and Dianne Chambless, attended. At the last Committee meeting, the Committee asked the architect to work with staff to review the visibility of various roof pitches, while keeping the ridgeline at the historic location in the middle of the main section of the house. In order for the applicants to have the maximum amount of square footage in the addition, the pitch would have to be very steep, reaching the historic ridgeline at 18 feet in height. Ms. Spina noted that the staff thought the historic roof line of the front section should be restored, since the addition was based on the restoration of the missing 5th floor, while the rear roofline may be altered to have the doors leading out to the decks. Ms. Chambless and Mr. Goldstein objected to the restoration of the front slope because its shallow pitch would not allow the square footage they wish to have on that floor. Committee members discussed extensively the various possibilities for the roofline. Mr. McCoubrey was unclear whether the applicant proposes to recreate the historical features. He suggested a gable roof in the front with a flat roof in the rear with the retention of the dormer. Mr. Pentz thought a shallower pitched roof, like the original, more appropriate. Mr. Levy said that the dormer is a critical feature and should be restored. Other Committee members agreed. The Committee finally decided to move the ridgeline toward Clinton Street with a steeper pitch of the front roof, to accommodate the needs of the owners; however, the dormer must be restored. Also, any skylights and solar panels must be on the rear slope.

Ms. Spina noted that the rear of the property proves visible from 10th Street. Committee

members did not object to the installation of the doors and decks on the rear.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the windows, door, shutters, and cornice with staff to review shop drawings, pursuant to Standard 6. It also recommended approval of the 5th floor addition with the ridgeline moved toward Clinton Street, with staff to review details.

12 South 12th Street, PSFS Building

Loews Hotel, Owner

Robert Powers, Applicant

DATE: 1930-32, Howe & Lescaze, architects

PROPOSAL: Illuminated signage

This proposal calls for new signage for the restaurant at the PSFS building. The existing, non-historic neon and stainless steel letters will be removed. New stainless steel channel letters with neon will be installed, along with stainless steel rings. The entire assemblage will be attached to the stainless steel fascia and tied into an existing electric system.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

The Committee thought that proposed signage appropriate for this building.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

902 Spruce Street

Briar Management Company, Owner

Hugh Zimmers, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1831-33, Thomas Ustick Walter, architect, John Savage, developer, c. 1867, rear addition with bay

PROPOSAL: Demolish roof of rear ell, build 4th floor addition

This application is for the rear ell of a house on Portico Row. The rear ell has an addition that pre-dates an insurance survey from 1867. The proposal calls for removing the hipped, shingled roof and building a fourth-floor addition. The addition will be sheathed in cement-fiber board and have three sets of four, double-hung windows on the west side. Two treatments are proposed for the south elevation, one has no fenestration in the addition and the other proposes one double-hung window.

The application also includes excavating the area along the west wall of the basement and installing a patio with two sets of sliding glass doors. This work will be minimally visible from a public right-of-way because of vegetation.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the excavation and doors in the basement, pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of the rooftop demolition and addition, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. The rear of these significant properties have high visibility from 9th Street.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal, which is highly visible from 9th Street. Matthew Semola and Alan Delfiner, the owners, and Hugh Zimmers, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Semola contended that the roofline across the side and rear would be retained. Mr. Delfiner believed that the proposal will replicate the neighbor's dormer. However, Ms. Spina pointed out that the proposal as submitted would remove the entire roof structure.

Committee members thought it important to preserve the property's historic character and believed that the hipped roof and dormer should be retained. Mr. Delfiner inquired if the rear could be a terrace and the Committee concurred that a terrace would be inappropriate. The Committee did say that a shed dormer on the western façade of the roof may be acceptable, but they should review new drawings.

The Committee agreed that the excavation along the western façade would not be visible.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the basement alterations and denial of the roof alterations, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

200 block Philip Place

Various owners

Brian Wengenroth, Applicant

DATE: 1962, I. M. Pei, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace sidewalk

The sidewalk in front of the houses along Locust Street have herringbone-patterned brick. The sidewalk on the courtyard side has large squares of concrete bordered by herringbone-patterned brick. The owners wish to remove the sidewalk and install new brick, again in a herringbone pattern, without the concrete pads. The residents claim that the difference in settlement between the two materials causes a tripping hazard.

Staff recommendation: The applicant should research Pei's design for the complex. If the sidewalk is part of the original design, staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Brian Wengenroth, Marvin Sacks and Carol Sox attended the meeting. Mr. Wengenroth pointed out that safety is an issue. He noted that there are 23 concrete pads in the sidewalk along 12 houses and various repairs by utility companies have resulted in different colors for the concrete. Mr. Wengenroth noted that brick pavers are easily taken up for repairs and will maintain consistency in appearance.

Committee members opined that I.M. Pei did create the sidewalk design. Mr. McCoubrey thought that the same effect could be accomplished with different pavers, such as 12 x 12 inch pre-cast pavers in place of the concrete squares. Other Committee members agreed.

Lenore Millhollen, of the Center City Residents' Association and Preservation Alliance, noted the replacement pavers in Rittenhouse Square, which match very well.

The Committee concurred that the general design should be retained with a contrast of smaller pavers in the squares.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of replacing the sidewalk with the retention the general design using herringbone brick borders and 12 x 12 inch pavers of a contrasting color in the squares, with the staff to review details.

310 South Front Street

Dolores Sloviter, Owner

Steve Wu, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1970, Louis Sauer, architect

PROPOSAL: Infill two-story recess at entrance

This contemporary rowhouse has a two-story recess at the front entrance. The application calls for infilling the recess at the second floor to expand the living space. The recess has an angle. The new design will square-off the recess and glaze the brick opening. The new windows will have single-light casements.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

Ms. Spina explained the application. Philip Scott and Steve Wu, architects, attended the meeting. Mr. Scott explained that the infill will allow for the creation of a half-bathroom on the main floor. He said that the proposed alterations are consistent with five other houses on the block, which have already received infill. Ms. Spina noted that the other alterations occurred prior to the designation of the district.

Committee members agreed that the infill should be glazed, as proposed, so that the brick still reads as a pier.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal.

227 South 6th Street, Lippincott Building

MCW Enterprises, LLC, Owner

Stephen Verner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1900, William Prichett, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace metal windows with wood

This building has three different kinds of windows. On the Sixth Street façade, the windows are wood with a one-over-one configuration and highly decorative brickmolds on the upper floors. On the Locust Street façade, the one-over-one windows are metal, with a simpler brickmold. On the Randolph Street and north facades, the metal windows have a two-over-two configuration and segmentally arched sash.

The proposal calls for new wood windows on all sides, with simulated-divided-lights on the Randolph Street and north facades. The arched windows on the first floor of the Sixth Street façade will remain. The Committee and Commission previously approved single-pane fixed windows in the arched openings in the middle of the Locust Street façade. The application now includes making these operable by installing a transom bar and then awning or hopper windows below.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the material change of the windows, but denial of the simulated-divided-lights, pursuant to Standard 6.

Ned Burns and Ned d'Entremont, Pella window representatives, Michael Merkle, James Gibson and Cecil Baker, the architect, attended the meeting. Ms. Spina explained that she reviewed the shop drawings provided by Pella. The proposed windows do not match the existing in several ways: on the 6th Street façade, the current sill is 1¾ inches while the proposed detail is 1 inch, and the meeting rail of the windows on the other three façades is 2¾ inches, but the proposed only 1¾.

Mr. Baker said that the first floor windows on the 6th Street façade would not be changed and that the arched openings on Locust Street would change to operable windows because master bedrooms will be created in this location. He said that simulated-divided-light windows, which

were approved at 1601 Locust Street, give a better acoustical benefit to these expensive units.

Committee members discussed the arched windows on Locust Street and said that they would consider the concept of a transom bar with 2 panes. The Committee said it would also consider vertical full-light casements in these openings. The Committee also concurred that the material change is acceptable as well as the simulated-divided-lights. They discussed the change in the meeting rail dimensions and found it acceptable.

The Architectural Committee recommended final approval of all windows, but the ones in the arched openings on the Locust Street façade. The Committee recommended approval in concept of the operable windows in those openings, but the details should return to the Committee.

600 South Washington Square

Gene and Sueyun Locks, Owners

David Amburn, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1923, Earl Nelson Edwards, architect

PROPOSAL: Stair and elevator towers

The Committee previously saw an application for this property that included a very large rooftop addition with a sculpture garden. The Committee recommended denial as proposed, but the owners withdrew the application before the Commission made a decision.

The application returns with part of the previous submission. The owners are now replacing the roof and wish to install a stairtower and elevator tower at the same time. The stairtower will stand 12 feet tall at the west side of the roof. This would be visible from Washington Square. The elevator tower and lobby will wrap around the chimney at the south side and stand 20 feet above the roof, with the chimney extended an additional four feet. These elements prove highly visible from 6th Street.

The proposal also includes removing non-historic infill on the west façade and installing glazing with aluminum frames.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the glazing on the west façade, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Denial of the stairtower and elevator tower and lobby, pursuant Standard 9 and the roofing guideline. The elevator housing can be in the basement. Since the Commission has not approved the rooftop additions, these elements, which are interconnected with the design of the rooftop additions, should not be approved separately.

Ms. Spina presented the application. Kristin Mullaney, Sherri Eyer, Esquire and Jerry Lindheim, Esquire attended the meeting. Ms. Mullaney commented that there is no access to the roof for repairs, which need to be addressed. She cited a letter from the Society Hill Civic Association supporting the rooftop additions.

Rebecca Stoloff, of the Society Hill Civic Association, said that she is in agreement with the staff and that the rooftop additions should be seen as a whole and not in pieces.

Committee members concurred that the proposed elevator tower and lobby are predicated on the construction of the rooftop addition, which the Commission has not approved. The twenty-foot tower proposed for the elevator is unnecessary. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the roof repairs could proceed without the installation of an elevator tower.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the glazing on the west façade, but

denial of the stairtower and elevator tower and lobby, pursuant to Standards 9, 10 and the roofing guideline.

256-58 South 20th Street

Salvatore D'Angelo, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840, storefront at 258 c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Storefront alterations

This application seeks the legalization of some storefront alterations already completed and the approval of others not yet executed at 258 S. 20th Street, which, together with 256 S. 20th, forms D'Angelo's Restaurant. A violation was issued on 25 February 2000 for the work performed without a permit. The application proposes legalizing the removal of the storefront awning seen in the designation photo (1); legalizing the removal of a storefront window and security grate and its replacement with a fixed window and wood panels (2); legalizing the addition of a transom approximating the original Queen Anne transoms (3); legalizing the covering of an original single-leaf glazed and paneled Queen Anne door in the recessed doorway and its replacement with plywood infill articulated with molding (4); legalizing the shortening of an original double-leaf door to accommodate a floor-level change (5); legalizing the addition of plywood articulated with molding below the storefront window (6); the covering of all steps with "Marina Pearl" granite (7); and the addition of a new storefront awning (8).

Staff Recommendation: Legalization of the removal of the old awning (1); legalization of the storefront window alterations (2); legalization of the new transom, provided wood muntins are applied to better approximate the original light sizes (3); denial of the legalization of the covering of the single-leaf door, which should be restored (4); denial of the legalization of the shortening of the double-leaf door, which should be restored (5); denial of the legalization of the paneling below of the storefront window, which should better approximate the original paneling in the recessed doorway (6); denial of the granite step covering (7); no position on the awning until the receipt of information on its size, shape, and position (8); with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, and Restoration Standard 7.

Mr. Farnham presented the project. Salvatore D'Angelo, the owner and applicant, then discussed the work at length with the Committee. He explained that he had removed an awning (1, seen in the designation photo); replaced the storefront window and added the panels below (2); fabricated a new transom similar to the originals (3); covered the original single-leaf door (in recessed opening) with plywood ornamented with molding (4); cut the bottom off the original double-leaf doors to accommodate the interior floor level (5); and added plywood ornamented with molding below the storefront window (6). He further stated that he would like to clad both sets of steps with shiny black granite (7) and perhaps install a new awning (8). Committee members deliberated on each aspect of the proposal as they sought a compromise with the applicant. They decided that they did not have enough information on the interior and exterior floor and step configurations to render recommendations on the double-leaf door and granite cladding. They also explained that the staff could approve a historically appropriate awning if the applicant opted to propose one.

The Architectural Committee recommends legalization of the removal of the old awning (1); legalization of the storefront window alterations, provided the panels immediately below the windows are removed (2); legalization of the new transom (3); denial of the legalization of the covering of the single-leaf door, which should be restored (4); no position on the shortening of the double-leaf door until further information is provided (5); denial of the legalization of the paneling below of the storefront window, which should better approximate the original paneling in the recessed doorway (6); no position on the granite step covering until further information is

provided (7); no position on the awning until further information is provided (8); with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 3 [Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.]; Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.]; and Restoration Standard 7 [Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.]

2019 Chancellor Street

Alon Barzilay, Owner

Jonathan Broh, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations

This application proposes the rehabilitation of the front façade of the carriage house at 2019 Chancellor Street. The rehabilitation will include the restoration of the original arched entrance opening; the installation of an overhead wood garage door and multi-light arched wood transom; the replacement of a non-historic flush door with a four-light wood door; the replacement of a central window with new wood multi-light doors at the 2nd story; the addition of a central metal guardrail at the 2nd story; and the replacement of a flanking window and infill with a new fixed single-light window at the 2nd story. The questions of the infilled 1st-story openings as well as the paint on the brick façade are not raised by the application, but should be discussed.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of arched entrance restoration; the garage door; the entrance door; the multi-light doors, provided the glazing follows the arch of the opening; a guardrail, provided it is restricted to the existing masonry opening; and the window change, provided both 2nd-story flanking windows are replaced with wood, double-hung, true-divided-light windows, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal. The Committee addressed the issues of concern. The applicant agreed to revise the 2nd-story window design to stipulate four-over-four windows like those at 2006 Chancellor Street. He also agreed to adjust the 2nd-story door design so that the glazing would follow the curve of the segmental arched opening.

Ms. Pentz inquired if the jack-arch around the garage opening would be raised or flush with the surface of the façade. The applicant responded that was originally flush and that he would not modify its position.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the arched entrance restoration; the garage door; the entrance door; the multi-light doors, provided the glazing follows the arch of the opening; the guardrail, provided it is restricted to the existing masonry opening; and the window change, provided both 2nd-story flanking windows are replaced with wood, double-hung, true-divided-light windows, with staff to review details.

2018 Locust Street

Ellen Varenhorst, Owner

Richarad Conway Meyer, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1890, extensively altered c. 1925

PROPOSAL: Review in concept of windows, doors, rear balcony, demolish garden wall

This application proposes several alterations to the front and rear facades at 2018 Locust Street. The building will be converted from one commercial and four residential units to a single-family residence. Originally a Queen Anne townhouse built about 1890, the building was converted for commercial use about 1925. At that time, the front façade was extensively remodeled in the Art Deco style. Although not original, the Art Deco façade has acquired historic significance in its own right.

On the front façade, the application proposes the installation of a new front door; the division of the large single-light fixed storefront window into three lights; the replacement the recessed 2nd and 3rd-story windows with a multi-light, multi-story projecting steel window system; the restuccoing of the façade; and the restoration of the stone trim.

On the rear façade, the application proposes the addition of a 2-story metal bay with aluminum windows; the addition of a balcony atop the new bay with double-leaf aluminum doors, sidelights, and transoms; and the addition of a new entry stair with single-leaf door, which would necessitate the demolition of a rear garden wall.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the restoration of the stone trim, the rear bay, the balcony with doors and windows and the rear entry stair and door, with staff to review details. Denial of the division of the storefront window and the 2nd & 3rd-story front window alterations, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, and 9. The staff requires additional information on the front door and stuccoing before offering a recommendation.

Richard Meyer, the architect, and his associates Caroline Boetzelen and Kevin Smith attended the meeting. Mr. Farnham explained the proposal. He noted that the staff no longer opposed the division of the storefront window because a recently discovered photograph establishes that it historically had a tripartite configuration. The applicant explained that, excepting the 2nd and 3rd-story front windows, the Art Deco renovations executed in the 1920s were of a very high quality. The window alterations, he claimed, appeared to be unfinished. Committee members discussed the proposed 2nd and 3rd-story window system and concluded that it would be an improvement over the awkward windows in place. Committee members then discussed the proposed front door with the applicant. Owing to a lack of detail about the door, they asked the applicant to explicate his design. The applicant explained that it would be door appropriate to an Art Deco building; he added that he would provide a detailed drawing of the door for the Commission to review. The Committee members agreed that an Art Deco door would be appropriate. After reviewing the proposed rear alterations, the Committee agreed that they were acceptable given the context.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as submitted, with staff to review details.

1501 Spruce Street

Parkway Corporation, Owner

Liz Pisano, Applicant

DATE: 2002

PROPOSAL: Legalize illuminated signage

This application proposes legalizing two large illuminated signs installed without a permit. They hang on a chain restaurant in a parking garage at the corner of 15th and Spruce Streets. Each sign is neon with plexiglass faces, is 26'-6" x 4'-8", and hangs above the storefront at the 2nd-story level.

Staff Recommendation: Although no staff member condones unpermitted work, some contend that the large, internally-illuminated signs are acceptable on a new parking garage and therefore recommend approval. Others contend that they have a detrimental effect on the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District and therefore recommend denial.

Mr. Farnham presented the application. Ivor Moore attended the meeting and noted that the signs are internally illuminated plastic with neon. Committee members concurred that the scale and materials of the signs are appropriate for this newly-constructed building.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the legalization.

2212 Walnut Street, WPEN Building

Sant Properties, Owner

Jay Tackett, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1928, Ralph W. Bencker, architect

PROPOSAL: Roof deck and rooftop screening fence

This application proposes a deck with a combined stair tower and storage closet on the roof of the WPEN Building at 2212 Walnut Street. Owing to the width of Walnut Street, the proximity to the corner with 22nd Street, the large open gas station at the northwest corner of 22nd and Walnut Streets, and the diminutive neighboring building at 2110 Walnut Street, this important building is highly visible from many locations. To minimize visibility, the applicant has set the deck back from the front (north) and east facades. The stair tower is set back to the rear of the deck. The applicant should clarify whether the rooftop fence around the mechanical equipment is existing or proposed.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the application. Jay Tackett, the architect, explained that the first floor would consist of retail and there would be two apartments on the upper floors. The deck would be set back from all the facades to preclude visibility. He also added that the mechanical equipment would be enclosed with the rooftop fence depicted on the plans.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the roofs guideline.

8-10 Letitia Street

Gie Lien, Owner

Patrick Dewey, Contractor/Applicant
 DATE: c. 1885
 PROPOSAL: Replace canopy

This application proposes the replacement of a barrel-arched awning at 8-10 Letitia Street. The awning extends over the sidewalk and is held aloft with poles. The Commission has no record of an approval of this awning. The building was designated on 7 October 1976. The existing and proposed awnings are arch-shaped; all of the storefront openings at this loft building are square-headed. The staff contends that an arch-shaped awning is inappropriate, but would recommend approval of a square-headed shed awning without poles.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Richard Thom, the architect for the project, thought that an arched awning, would harmonize with the arched upper windows and enhance the building. He presented photographs to illustrate arched awnings installed in square shaped openings. Mr. Thom also noted his preference for a canopy held aloft by poles in the sidewalk instead of diagonal bracing, which he claimed is much more intrusive.

Mr. Rivera remarked that the proposed awning is not attached to the building and is of the simplest form, which will allow water to run off.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal.

241-43 Chestnut Street

Carolyn Caton, Owner
 Douglas Seiler, Architect/Applicant
 DATE: 241, c. 1857, Stephen Button architect, 243, c. 1897, Wilson Eyre, architect
 PROPOSAL: Storefront restoration at 241, HVAC at 241, two-story addition to 243

This application proposes additional pieces of the ongoing rehabilitation at 241-243 Chestnut Street. The Commission approved some aspects in concept including the 2-story rear addition at 243 Chestnut in April 2003. In May 2003, it gave final approval to fire escape modifications at 241, the 6-story addition at 241, and the basement access at 243. At that meeting, it denied the proposed 2-story rear addition at 243.

The current application proposes some storefront restoration at 241 Chestnut; rooftop HVAC equipment at 241; and a modified design for the 2-story rear addition at 243. The storefront at 241 is four bays wide. The proposed restoration involves the transoms of all four bays as well as the doorway in the westernmost bay. Another architect has prepared a design for the three eastern bays. An insurance survey documents the original storefront configuration. Following the insurance survey, two-light transoms will be installed in the boarded openings of all four bays and a double-leaf door, with two lights in each leaf, will be installed in the westernmost bay. The proposed HVAC equipment will not be visible. Since the last submission, the applicant has modified the design of the 2-story rear addition at 243. As the Committee suggested, he has adjusted the proportions of the glass façade panels, further emphasizing their verticality. However, the applicant has not implemented any of the changes to the south (right) entranceway recommended by the Committee. To differentiate the addition from the very significant Wilson Eyre bank building at 243, the Committee recommended that the applicant delete the canopy, shift the doorway one bay to the north (left), and extend the recessed niche with metal grating down to the sidewalk. With the canopy, the proposed addition would impinge upon the northwest corner of the Eyre building, especially its quoins.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the restoration of the storefront, which is documented by an insurance survey; approval of the HVAC equipment at 241; denial of the 2-story rear addition at 243; with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, Restoration Standard 7; and the Roofs.

Following Mr. Farnham's presentation of the project, the Committee, Doug Seiler, the applicant, and William Caton, an owner, discussed it at length. Although somewhat dismayed that the application proposed the restoration of some but not all of the 4-bay storefront, the Committee decided that the proposed transom and doorway restoration was faithful to an 1857 insurance survey. The Committee also decided that the HVAC equipment would not be visible. Turning to the addition at the rear of 243 Chestnut, Committee members contended that, although improved, the new design still failed to protect the view and fabric of the Wilson Eyre building. Asserting that the proposed canopy would negatively impact the historic building, Committee members suggested several more appropriate schemes for entranceways, canopies, and signage. The applicant, who is the architect for much of the project but not the 2-story addition, stated that he would relay the Committee's suggestions to the architect of the addition.

The Architectural Committee recommends approval of the storefront restoration; approval of the HVAC equipment; and approval of the 2-story rear addition at 243, provided that the canopy is deleted from the design; with staff to review details, pursuant to 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.]; Restoration Standard 7 [Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.]; and the Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as ... 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.] and [Recommended: Installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof such as air conditioning ... when required for the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

241 Chestnut Street

Carolyn Caton, Owner

Jon Wagner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: C. 1857, Stephen Button, architect

PROPOSAL: Storefront alterations

This application proposes several alterations to the easternmost three bays of the four-bay storefront at 241 Chestnut Street. Another application on this month's agenda proposes alterations for the remainder of the building including the transom area and westernmost bay of the storefront. This application proposes replacing the existing fixed storefront windows with paired wood casement windows; replacing the existing door and infill with a frameless glass single-leaf door, transom, and sidelights; replacing the existing concrete step and flush steel bulkhead doors with concrete steps flanked by cast iron and bullet glass sidewalk panels; and adding a steel canopy over a segment of the storefront.

An 1857 insurance survey documents that the four-bay storefront originally had double-leaf doors with two-light windows in each leaf in bays 1 (westernmost) and 3. This application proposes a frameless door system for bay 3. The door system is incompatible with the

historically appropriate doors proposed for bay 1 by the other application on this month's agenda. The insurance survey also documents that the storefront originally had 6-light storefront windows in bays 2 and 4. This application proposes paired single-light casement windows for bays 2 and 4. If divided with muntins into three lights each, the casements would approximate the original storefront windows. The proposed cast iron and bullet glass sidewalk panels will replicate original panels. The proposed steel canopy is entirely inappropriate for this antebellum building; historically, this type of rigid metal canopy was employed on early twentieth-century residential hotels. Furthermore, any awning or canopy should be centered on one or on all four storefront bays, but not on three of the four bays. The staff would recommend approval of an appropriate awning over the entry door. Finally, no signage is included with this application; the Commission must review all signage for this building.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the windows, provided each casement is divided into three lights; denial of the door, transom, and sidelights; approval of the steps and the cast iron and bullet glass sidewalk panels; denial of the canopy; with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and Restoration Standard 7.

Mr. Farnham presented the project. Jon Wagner, the architect, and Doug Seiler, the architect for the other 241 Chestnut Street application on this month's agenda, attended. Mr. D'Alessandro recused himself. Mr. Wagner explained that the owner of the restaurant that will occupy the three eastern bays of the storefront wanted to distinguish his space from the surrounding spaces. Committee members unanimously agreed that the pseudo-historic canopy was entirely inappropriate for the building. They suggested alternative ideas for a canopy or balcony. Mr. Levy and Ms. Pentz suggested a conventional awning shaped like and fitting within a storefront opening. Mr. Rivera contended that the proposed canopy had no relation to the historical architecture. Mr. McCoubrey suggested a contemporary canopy attached to the storefront piers. Other Committee members agreed with Mr. McCoubrey and recommended a design without any historic overtones. Discussing the windows, they suggested that the applicant divide the casements into 3 lights each to replicate the historic windows. The applicant agreed that the modification was satisfactory. Compromising, the Committee decided that the frameless door system in bay 3 might be acceptable even though it would not match the historically appropriate doors proposed for bay 1. Finally, Mr. Wagner explained that he was proposing steps to bay 3 rather than the ramp originally considered. Committee members agreed that the steps along with the cast iron and bullet glass sidewalk panels were an improvement over the existing conditions.

The Architectural Committee recommends approval of the windows, provided each casement is divided into three lights; approval of the frameless door system; approval of the steps and the cast iron and bullet glass sidewalk panels; denial of the canopy; with staff to review details, pursuant to 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.]; and Restoration Standard 7 [Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.].

103-07 Church Street

Woodway Construction Company, Owner

Hugh Zimmers, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1848

PROPOSAL: Windows, doors, rear decks, 5th-story addition with decks, roof deck

This application proposes numerous alterations to the easternmost three of five Greek Revival warehouses built by the Girard Estate on Church Street in 1848. The Committee reviewed an earlier conceptual version of the proposal at its May 2003 meeting. At that meeting, the Committee recommended denial of the rooftop additions for reasons of visibility. The applicant withdrew the first submission during the Commission's June 2003 meeting. The current application proposes restoring the front facades; constructing a 5th-story stucco addition with decks on the existing roof; constructing a large roof deck with elevator and stair tower on the rooftop addition; excavating the basement at the rear, cutting openings, and installing windows and doors; infilling two door openings at the 1st-story rear; installing new windows in all existing rear openings; installing decks with French doors and transoms at the 2nd-story rear.

The existing building is 46'-8" tall; at its highest point, the modified building would be 84'-8" tall. Since the first submission, the applicant has moved the easternmost 5th-story unit back 19'-10" to reduce visibility from Front and Church Streets. Nonetheless, the deck railings at the 5th-story level remain set back only 2'-0" from the cornice of the original building. Although the staff approves of the 19'-10" setback, it contends that the 2'-0" setback for the deck railings is not enough to preclude visibility. The staff contends that all rooftop construction including decks and railings should be set back at least 10'-0" from the original cornice.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the front façade restoration; the basement excavation and new openings with windows and doors; infilling the 1st-story rear door openings; the new, rear windows; and the 2nd-story rear decks with French doors and transoms, with staff to review details. Denial of the 5th-story addition with decks as proposed and the roof deck with elevator and stair tower on the rooftop addition as proposed, pursuant to Standard 9, Restoration Standard 7 and the Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the revised submission, which includes a setback to minimize visibility. Shaunn McKamey, the owner, and Hugh Zimmers, the architect, attended the meeting. The discussion centered on the visibility of the rooftop additions, especially the railing directly above the historic façade. Mr. Zimmers explained that he had determined that the proposed rooftop additions would not be visible. He stated that he had set poles marking the highest points of the proposed additions and that the poles were not visible from Church Street. He noted that the setback of the eastern section of the addition had been added to reduce visibility. Mr. Farnham informed the Committee that the staff member present during the mock-up believed that the 5th-story front deck railings would be visible. The Committee asked Mr. Zimmers to prepare sight-line studies confirm his claim that the additions would not be visible. Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the height of the elevator tower, which he claimed was much taller than needed. Committee members wondered if further additions were planned. Mr. Zimmers noted that the historic front facade retains its features and will be restored.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised proposal as submitted, subject to the receipt of sight-line studies, with the staff to review details.

625 North 16th Street

Jonathan Oler, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1859

PROPOSAL: Build retaining wall, pergola, basement bulkhead

This application proposes adding a metal basement bulkhead and wood pergola at the rear of the rear ell and a CMU retaining wall between the rear yards of 625 and 627 N. 16th Street. All additions would be visible from Wallace Street, which runs along the southern boundary of the

property. Although not proposed, the retaining wall may necessitate a fence along the top to meet the building code.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the wall, provided that is faced with stucco and capped; approval of the bulkhead; denial of the pergola; with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application. Committee members concluded that not enough information had been submitted and therefore suggested that the proposal be withdrawn and re-submitted. No one attended to represent the proposal.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal.

627 North 16th Street

Peter Kura, Owner

Leroy Sterling, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Concrete back yard

This application proposes placing a 20'-3" x 35'-6" concrete pad at the rear of 627 N. 16th Street. The pad would occupy most of the rear yard and would be visible from Wallace Street. Please reference the photos from the previous submission at 625 N. 16th Street, which shares a rear yard with this property.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application. Committee members concluded that not enough information had been submitted and therefore suggested that the proposal be withdrawn and re-submitted. No one attended to represent the proposal.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal.

1701 Green Street

Jerome Donovan, Owner

Sabrina Soong, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859, storefront c. 1895, storefront renovated 1991

PROPOSAL: Window replacement

This application proposes replacing fixed windows with operable windows on the 17th Street façade of the commercial space in the row house at 1701 Green Street. Replacements would be made in seven groups of triple windows. Additionally, the eight transoms closest to Green Street would be converted from fixed to operable. Shop drawings for both window types should be reviewed. Also, the staff contends that the operable transoms should be hopper-type windows. Finally, no signage is included with this application; the Commission must review all signage for this building.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal. Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the division of the windows. Ms. Soong said that, like the existing windows, the operable windows are divided into three panels.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary