

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

**TUESDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2014
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

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

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

ALSO PRESENT

Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Sam Olshin, Atkin Olshin Schade
Paul Avazier, Atkin Olshin Schade
Jared Brey, PlanPhilly
Mathew E. Grubel
Richard Tyler
Paul Sehnert, University of Pennsylvania
Jon Weiss, Equinox
Peter Staz, Equinox
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Mary Daniels
Paul Boni, Esq., Boni Law
Jessica Senker, J&M Preservation
Rob Kettell
Tom Barton, Barton Partners
Sylvia Deyé, Barton Partners
Anne Fadullon, Dale Corp.
Janet Kalter
Joseph Schiavo
Walt Gavula
Joseph Polinski
Karen Anderson, KRN Architecture
Francesco Sgrazzutti, Studiomado
Luke Wolfram, Lincolnshire Equity
Ali Corso
Kara Litvinas, John Milner Architect
Chris Carter, John Milner Architect

Neil Patterson
Sandra Pierantozzi
Philip Scott, KSK
Jeff Peters, KSK
Justino Navarro, Spring Garden CDC
Barbara Eberlien

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman, Pentz, and Stein and Mr. McCoubrey joined her. Mr. Cluver joined the meeting while in progress.

ADDRESS: 400 S 40TH ST

Project: Construct five-story residential building
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: OAP, Inc.
Applicant: Jonathan Weiss, Azalea Garden Partners, LP
History: 1853; John P. Levy House; Colonial Revival alterations and additions for David P. Leas, 1902; additions for convalescent home, 1964, 1975
Individual Designation: 11/1/1973
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a five-story residential building at 400 S. 40th Street, at the corner of 40th and Pine Streets. The Historical Commission approved the demolition of the existing building, which it determined cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, and approved the new construction in concept in May 2012. The demolition is not the subject of this review.

The current proposal for final approval of the new construction is very similar to that approved in concept in May 2012. Minor revisions, some suggested by the Architectural Committee, have been made to the design since the last review. The window pane configurations have been updated, eliminating the very small panes of the earlier windows. The base of the building has been accentuated. String courses have been removed. The materials and colors have been updated. The number of balconies has been reduced. Additional information about light fixtures and other features has been provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's approval in concept of May 2012.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Matt McClure, architects Sam Olshin and Paul Avazier, Paul Sehnert of the University of Pennsylvania, and developers Jon Weiss and Peter Staz represented the application.

Mr. Olshin stated that they have updated the design based on the comments provided by the Architectural Committee in April 2012, the Commission in May 2012, and also the University of Pennsylvania design review committee. He reported that the height, footprint, and number of beds have not changed since the approval in concept in May 2012. He stated that they have

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 SEPTEMBER 2014

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

made seven refinements to the design. He displayed large versions of the architectural drawings on boards for the Committee and audience. He noted that they are working with a landscape architectural firm on the plantings for the grounds. He pointed out the interior spaces using interior plans of the proposed building. He detailed the modifications to the design since the last review. He explained that they have substituted a Tuscan Red siding for the previously proposed green siding used for accents. He noted that the six-over-six windows were replaced with more appropriate one-over-one windows. He observed that some had recommended adding a base to the building; in response, they have added a limestone-like block base. He explained that they have added spandrel panels between the second and third-floor windows. He stated that the primary cladding material remains as approved. He noted that the height, massing, and cornice have not changed since the last round of reviews. He stated that some brick banding has been removed and slate banding has been added. He remarked that the two facades facing away from the street, the south and west facades, will include through-wall mechanical units. The other mechanical units will be located on the roof. He stated that, other than the mechanical equipment, the south and west facades will be treated exactly as are the primary facades. He displayed renderings of the proposed building in its context. He pointed out the relationship of the cornice line on the proposed building to that of the building to the west on Pine; they align. He explained that the bays and u-shaped plan have precedents in the neighborhood. Mr. Olshin displayed a materials board with samples of all of the proposed exterior materials on it. He displayed information about the lighting fixtures, window colors, the slate for the banding, the Hardi plank, the stone for the base, and the metalwork for the balconies. He stated that the main cladding material will be stucco; he offered to work with the staff to develop an appropriate color and texture for the stucco.

Ms. Hawkins thanked the applicants for addressing the suggestions provided by the Architectural Committee at the last review. She observed that she supported the design during the last review and supports the current design, which includes several refinements. Mr. McCoubrey also praised the design, but suggested that the Hardi plank at the spandrels between the second and third-floor windows should be paneled, not flat. Mr. Olshin stated that he agreed that panels would be an improvement and offered to implement the paneling, if possible. He stated that he would investigate the possibility. Ms. Gutterman asked why the windows at the top floor were still proposed as multi-pane instead of the one-over-ones proposed for the rest of the building. Mr. Olshin responded that they stipulated the multi-pane windows at the upper floor for reasons of scale. He stated that they have fewer panes than originally proposed, but still have multiple panes. Ms. Stein asked about the mechanical equipment on the roof. She suggested that it would be visible from the street. Mr. Olshin responded that it will not be visible from the street except at great distances from the building. He stated that the unit will be screened with louvers that will match the color of the exterior of the building. Ms. Stein asked if any machinery would be visible on the roof. Mr. Olshin responded that none would be visible; it would all be screened for visual and acoustic reasons.

Attorney Paul Boni stated that he represents the Woodland Terrace Homeowners Association, Constellar Corporation, and Maryann Kurmlavage. He stated that his clients have opposed and continue to oppose the proposals to redevelop this site. He asked the Committee to reject the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the spandrels between the second and third-floor windows are

panelized and any rooftop mechanical equipment is screened, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's approval in concept of May 2012.

ADDRESS: 109-31 N 02ND ST

Project: Reconstruct façade, construct six-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Patriot National LLC

Applicant: William Cargill, Patriot National LLC

History: 1958; National Products Building; Sabatino & Fishman, architects

Individual Designation: 11/8/2002

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a six-story, mixed-use building on a large, irregular lot that fronts on N. 2nd and Arch Streets, where the National Products building stands. The property was individually designated for its significant Modern-style orange tile façade, which runs along N. 2nd Street and wraps around onto the north façade along Flagpole Park. Behind the tile walls, the building is comprised of numerous older structures that have been greatly modified and are not considered historically significant. The orange tile walls of the National Products building are in very poor condition. This application proposes to dismantle and precisely reconstruct the tile walls using new and salvaged pieces. The buildings behind the tile walls would be replaced, not reconstructed, with a six-story building with public facades facing N. 2nd Street, Flagpole Park, and Arch Street.

The Commission has reviewed several applications for the rehabilitation of this site since the orange tile façade was designated in 2002. The Commission approved in-concept applications for similar projects at this site in March 2003, August 2004, and November 2006. In March 2007, the Commission granted final approval of a project that included the complete disassembly of the orange tile wall and its faithful reconstruction, and the construction of a new residential and commercial building behind the tile facades that would have been six stories on N. 2nd Street and 10 stories on Arch Street. At that time in 2007, the Commission concluded that the orange tile walls, not the buildings behind them, was the historic resource at this site and, owing to its poor condition, the orange tile walls could be dismantled and faithfully reconstructed with replica orange tiles as an alteration, not a demolition. That approved development would have also included an underground garage and 10 townhouses. In October 2011, the Commission granted final approval to a project that would have retained the orange tile wall, demolished all other structures on the site, and constructed a six-story, mixed-use building behind the orange tile wall very similar to the one now proposed. None of the approved projects was undertaken.

As proposed by the current application, the orange tile National Products façade on N. 2nd Street as well as the return along Flagpole Park would be dismantled and faithfully reconstructed using new tile and salvaged marble reveals, storefront systems, and signage. The proposed building behind the tile wall would be clad with grey, white, and orange metal panels and anodized aluminum window wall systems. It would include a column of orange tile to tie it to the historic base. The proposed building would be visually separated from the tile base by a recessed band of glass and panels. The parking entrance would be located on Arch Street.

The applicants should present information regarding the foundation system for the new building to allow for an assessment of the impact of the construction on potential archaeological resources at the site.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided potential archaeological resources are protected, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 8, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Preservation consultant Jessica Senker, architects Tom Barton and Sylvia Deyé, and project manager Anne Fadullon represented the application.

Mr. Farnham reported that the Commission has approved several applications for the rehabilitation of this site since the orange tile façade was designated in 2002. The Commission approved in-concept applications for similar projects at this site in 2003, 2004, and 2006. In 2007, the Commission granted final approval of a project that included the complete disassembly of the orange tile wall and its faithful reconstruction, and the construction of a new residential and commercial building behind the tile facades that would have been six stories on N. 2nd Street and 10 stories on Arch Street. In 2011, the Commission granted final approval to a project that was almost identical to the project now proposed. That project proposed a six-story, mixed-use building behind the orange tile wall on N. 2nd Street with a six-story façade with garage entrance on Arch Street. Except for a few cosmetic updates and some interior revisions, that approved project was almost identical to the one now proposed.

Mr. Barton stated that the building he is currently proposing has the same height, volume, and FAR as the building approved in 2011. He added that the interior as well as the exterior cladding have changed since the approved design, but he confirmed that the overall massing is the same as that approved a few years ago. Ms. Hawkins noted that this fact is salient because the Architectural Committee determined that the views from Elfreth's Alley would not be adversely impacted during the last round of reviews. Mr. Barton stated that they intentionally maintained the massing, height, volume, wall locations, and other aspects of the earlier design because it had been widely vetted and supported. He stated that this project is very similar to that granted final approval in 2011.

Mr. Barton stated that the parking within the building has been reconfigured; the parking is now two levels, not one, and is located more toward the rear, away from 2nd Street. However, the exterior envelope of the building did not change for the parking. Moving the parking allowed residential units on the first floor as well as larger retail spaces. Also, the unit mix was changed to reflect the demands for rental housing. Again, the exterior envelope did not change.

Mr. Barton stated that the exterior of the building has been redesigned since the approval in 2011. He reported that they wanted the new building to be more understated and more "geometric." He stated that the proposed building is largely grey in color with orange and white accents. He noted that they are proposing a small amount of orange-tile cladding for new building to tie the new to the reconstructed. He stated that, owing to community requests, they have used a lighter color palette for the metal panel system on the rear of the building. He showed elevation drawings and renderings of all of the facades. He stated that the cladding material for the main facades is unchanged; it will be a metal panel system, Alucobond or an equivalent with thin seams. The window systems will be aluminum.

Mr. Barton stated that the new building is designed to float above the historic façade; the recessed area with the glass band at the third floor creates the separation between reconstructed old and new. The glass band will be in shadow during the day and lighted at night. In general, the proposed façades are very similar to those approved earlier, but with stronger, simpler, geometric forms.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the material of the garage door on Arch Street. Mr. Barton explained that the garage door will be a screen-like gate for ventilation. It will be set back from the façade to be in shadow. He added that there will also be louvered panels that will match the metal-pane cladding in the area of the garage entrance. He also noted that the façade will include a secondary residential entrance as well as some retail space. He explained that there is also a service entrance on Arch for trash as well as mechanical and electrical equipment. He explained that they are very constrained with the locations for the garage and service entrances owing to the historic tile façade on 2nd Street and Flagpole Park and the inaccessibility of the north and east façades.

Ms. Stein stated that she has concerns about the Arch Street façade. She claimed that all of the other buildings on the block have cast iron or brick façades. She contended that the metal panels are not compatible with Arch Street. She also contended that the six-story height is not compatible with Arch Street. She opined that the character of the ground floor of the building on Arch Street is not compatible with the character of Old City. She asserted that the façade is “too branded” as the National and just “too much.” Mr. Barton responded that they have broken down the scale of the façade by dividing it into two sections. He agreed that the façade has a contemporary feel, but contended that it is compatible with the block, which is much more varied than Ms. Stein claimed.

Ms. Pentz asked Ms. Senker if they planned to reuse any of the tile in the reconstruction. Ms. Senker responded that they did not intend to reuse any of the tile. She informed the Committee that she has been involved in inspections of this wall for 10 years. She reported that they concluded and the Architectural Committee agreed in 2007 that the condition of the tile was too degraded to allow its reuse. She stated that, as a preservationist, she always seeks to repair and reuse first, but such a course is not possible in this case. Mr. Barton described the deterioration and fading of the tile. Ms. Senker noted that the tile was installed in two separate campaigns. Ms. Senker showed a full-size sample of a remanufactured tile, which matches the historic tile exactly. She stated that Boston Valley Terracotta manufactured the new tile, which is virtually indistinguishable from the original tile.

Ms. Hawkins stated that her overriding concern with the design is the “planar nature of these walls.” Historic façades in Old City are highly articulated. She stated that the planar nature is less objectionable on N. 2nd Street than on Arch. Quoting Ms. Stein, Ms. Hawkins stated that the Arch Street façade looks like “an alien spaceship landing.” She contended that the planar façade on Arch would have no depth. Mr. Barton disagreed and stated that the façade would have some articulation and depth. He reported that the windows would be recessed, not out at the plane of the façade. Ms. Hawkins stated that the façade should have some “three-dimensionality.” Mr. Barton replied that the primary characteristics of the historic façade are its planar nature and its bright color. He stated that those characteristics drove the design. He explained that they developed a series of more articulated designs and even shared them with the staff, but, in the end, determined that the flatter design was more appropriate for the primary resource, the orange-tile wall. He stated that he finds the “strong geometric forms” of the historic

wall appropriate for the new building. He remarked that they studied the facades on N. 2nd and Arch Streets extensively and explored various approaches before deciding that this was the most satisfactory in light of the orange-tile façade and the historic district. He contended that there is no right or wrong answer with the design of the Arch Street façade; preferences for one design or another are subjective. Ms. Hawkins asked him if he was willing to reconsider the design. Mr. Barton replied that he is willing to consider the Committee's comments regarding the Arch Street façade, but he does not have a response to those comments at the moment. He stated that he would be prepared to address them at the Commission meeting.

Mr. McCoubrey remarked that his only concerns with the Arch Street façade relate to the ground-floor part of the façade. He suggested replacing the metal panels with another material at street level because the metal panels will not wear well. He also suggested additional windows at the ground. Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. Barton why he did not include white panels on Arch Street. Mr. Barton responded that he wanted to differentiate Arch from 2nd and also felt like the white panels made the smaller Arch Street façade "too busy." Mr. McCoubrey opined that white panels would give the Arch Street façade "some life." Ms. Stein suggested replacing the orange panels with white on the Arch Street façade. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he preferred the planar quality of the street façades and contended that the window openings and other aspects of the facades had been appropriately designed. He observed that he had two questions about the 2nd Street façade, both of which he qualified as minor. First, he questioned the use of the replica of the tile from the original façade on the upper part of the new façade on N. 2nd Street. He stated that he appreciated the gesture, but suggested restudying it. Mr. Barton stated that he would never propose using historic tile on the new building. He contended, however, that he believes that it is appropriate to use a small amount of the remanufactured tile on the new part of building because the historic façade is being rebuilt with new tile and the use of the new tile on the new building gives a subtle clue that the historic façade has been rebuilt and nicely ties together the new and old. The tile will bring the "color and texture" of the old up to the new. He offered, however, to reconsider the use of the tile. Mr. McCoubrey stated that his other question relates to the depth of the setback above the reconstructed tile façade in relation to the thickness of the historic tile façade. He suggested that the setback above the rebuilt tile façade should be about equivalent to the thickness of the historic tile façade, which was just "slathered" over the buildings behind it. Mr. Barton stated that the historic tile portion of the façade varies in thickness between 12" and 18". The setback, as currently proposed, is three feet. Mr. Barton stated that he was willing to reconsider that setback depth. He stated that he wanted it deep enough to create a strong shadow-line, but was willing to reduce it from three feet to two feet. He stated that he worried that, if it were any shallower, it would look insignificant. Mr. McCoubrey agreed. Ms. Stein asked about the dimension of the recess of the windows from the plane of the upper façade. Mr. Barton replied that the glass is recessed six inches from the plane of the façade. The Committee members decided that that was acceptable. Mr. McCoubrey suggested removing the white panels in the setback area between the rebuilt tile façade and the new façade above it to make it more "neutral." He suggested spandrel glass instead of panels. Mr. Barton stated that he and his staff had been split about whether panels or spandrel glass was more appropriate. He noted that he preferred the spandrel glass option and stated that he was willing to revert to that option, as Mr. McCoubrey had suggested.

Ms. Hawkins turned back to the Arch Street façade. She stated that the orange vertical section at the garage was insufficiently wide to give the impression that it was holding up the horizontal

above it. She suggested that it should be wider to create the appropriate rhythm of 20-foot wide units. Mr. Barton agreed to consider the suggestion.

Rob Kettell introduced himself as a resident of Elfreth's Alley. He reported that one will be able to see through a gate on the Alley into the rear garden at the Elfreth's Alley Museum and beyond the garden to the rear wall of this proposed building. He stated that the proposed building should recede, not "pop out." He stated that he assumes that the Elfreth's Alley Museum would be very concerned about this matter. Mr. Kettell stated that his second concern relates to the redevelopment of Flagpole Park. He asked the Committee to include a proviso in any approval that requires the applicants to submit their plans for the Flagpole Park to the Historical Commission for review. Mr. Farnham asked the applicants if they are proposing any work to Flagpole Park in this application. Mr. Barton stated that they are not proposing any work to the park in this application. He added that they are consulting with the Elfreth's Alley Association on the redevelopment of the park, but that work will be submitted as a separate application, perhaps by the Association, not this developer. Mr. Farnham advised the Committee that there is no need for a proviso requiring the applicants to submit an application for the park because they are not required to work on the park, but would be required to submit an application for the Commission's review if they chose to work on the park.

Joseph Schiavo, a resident of Old City, stated that he is concerned that the 2nd Street and Arch Street facades have similar architectural styles. He stated that large projects such as this can "overwhelm" Old City if they are done with one architectural style with the same vocabulary. He suggested that the architect use a "slightly different palette on Arch Street." He stated that he also concerned that the east and west facing party walls of the Arch Street façade are unfenestrated. He stated that he knows that it can be difficult to include windows on party walls at property lines, but the developer should negotiate with the abutting property owners for air rights that will allow for the fenestration of the party walls. Mr. Schiavo also noted that the proposed building appears to be five feet taller than the zoning height limit in the area. Ms. Hawkins asked if the project has its zoning approval. Ms. Fadullon replied that the proposed building has the exact building envelope as the one that was approved in 2011. The 2011 project obtained its zoning approval; this project does not have its zoning approval yet, but that zoning approval is expected to be forthcoming, in light of the earlier approval. If there is a zoning question, it will relate to interior modifications to the earlier approved plan, not exterior modifications.

Janet Kalter, a neighbor, reported that the Trenton China buildings at 2nd and Arch are currently being rehabilitated. The neighbors are very pleased that they are nearly complete. She noted that they are being restored as individual buildings. She observed that the National Products building is "unique" and "big." She concluded that "it would be nice if that could be taken into consideration."

Ms. Pentz asked about the foundation system for the proposed building. Mr. Barton stated that the engineers are still determining whether they will use caissons or spread footings. He stated that he hoped they could use spread footings because they require less excavation. He explained that the decision between the two foundation types cannot be made until additional test borings are completed and those cannot be undertaken until the existing buildings are demolished.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants about the timing of their project. Ms. Fadullon responded that they hope to have a zoning permit within about a week.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she would “make a motion of denial of the plan as presented with the recommendations to study the Arch Street elevation, developing the bays and trying to be reminiscent of the bays of the divisions of the buildings that exist on Arch Street as well as to look at the 2nd Street elevation for the tile that goes up at the stair, for the recess, for really developing and refining how the geometry works as well as looking at the issues of where there’s the white bands as well as the orange bands.” Ms. Stein agreed to second the motion. Ms. Hawkins asked Ms. Gutterman for some clarity. Ms. Hawkins asked Ms. Gutterman if she approved of the overall plan. Ms. Gutterman stated that she did approve of the overall plan. Ms. Gutterman stated that she would “like to get a better understanding of the height, which is more of an issue on Arch Street, as I see it, than it is on 2nd Street.” Ms. Hawkins explained that she was trying to make sense of the motion for the applicants so that they can address the forthcoming recommendation. Ms. Gutterman stated that the materials, vocabulary, and height on 2nd Street are generally acceptable in light of the comments provided. Ms. Hawkins stated that she was attempting to frame the recommendation so that the applicants could react and move forward. Regarding the view shed from Elfreth’s Alley, Ms. Hawkins stated that she remembered from the earlier review that the applicant had proposed a plain brick wall at that edge of the property to provide an appropriate backdrop to the garden. Mr. Barton stated that they had proposed such a wall to accommodate the Elfreth’s Alley Museum during the earlier proposal, which was approved, and are still proposing such a wall. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the applicants provide a photograph of that view for subsequent meetings. Ms. Pentz asked the applicants if they would be willing to provide archaeological monitoring if they need to construct the larger caisson foundation. Mr. Barton stated that they would be willing, but noted that “the devil is in the details.” He reminded the Commission that they did archaeological work at the National West site across 2nd Street when they constructed the buildings on the vacant lot. He stated that they would provide archaeological monitoring, but needed some assurances that the project would not be significantly disrupted if something is discovered. He asked about the details. Ms. Hawkins suggested that he work out the details of the archaeological monitoring before the Commission meeting. She then asked Ms. Gutterman and Stein if they would amend their motion to include Ms. Pentz’s archaeological requirement. They stated that they would. Ms. Hawkins restated the motion in a clear form for the applicants, saying that it was denial, based on a need for additional study and refining of the architectural details, with the archaeological requirement offered by Ms. Pentz.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, based on a need for additional study and refining of the architectural details and archaeological monitoring during construction if the caisson-type foundation is used.

ADDRESS: 4444 CRESSON ST

Project: Amend approved plan for new construction to add fourth story

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lincolnshire Equity LLC

Applicant: Luke Wolfrom, United Makers

History: 1880; demolished, 2013

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Manayunk Historic District, Contributing, 12/14/1983

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

OVERVIEW: The Department of Licenses and Inspections determined that the historic building at this site was Imminently Dangerous and ordered its demolition. The staff approved a faithful reconstruction of the three-story building. The owner now seeks the Commission's approval to rebuild the rowhouse with four stories, not three. In light of the context, which includes the elevated railroad track, and other demolition and new construction in the area, a four-story rowhouse is compatible with the area.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Developer Luke Wolfrom represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the proposed material for the cornice. She also inquired about shutters. Mr. Wolfrom affirmed that the cornice would be wood and that he would install shutters. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the cornice brackets should sit on a fascia board, but noted that the details could be worked out with the staff. Mr. McCoubrey asked why an architectural drawing of 4442 Cresson Street was included in the application package. Mr. Baron explained that it was included for context. Mr. McCoubrey suggested adopting the staff recommendation. Ms. Stein suggested that the recommendation include requirements for the wood cornice, fascia board, and shutters as had been discussed. Mr. McCoubrey agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a wood cornice, fascia board, and shutters are installed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 211 S SARTAIN ST

Project: Legalize windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Walter N. Gavula

Applicant: Walter N. Gavula

History: 1825

Individual Designation: 2/28/1961

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of vinyl windows on all three floors of the front façade of this early brick rowhouse. The owner claims that he installed the windows shortly after he bought the property in 2000. His argument to the Commission primarily regards notice.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 SEPTEMBER 2014

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

He contends that he did not know that the property was designated as historic and, in fact, the former owner did not disclose the historic designation to potential buyers including the current owner on the mandated disclosure form. However, the Commission has routinely held that property owners are responsible for identifying and complying with all regulatory restrictions on their properties before undertaking construction work at those properties.

Violations for inappropriate windows were issued to this property as well as five other properties on the block after another owner on the block complained about being cited for the installation of vinyl windows. That owner inquired why she was being singled out when many other properties on the block had vinyl windows. The complaint prompted staff to survey the block and to issue violations to all of the properties where vinyl windows had been installed without a permit after designation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Walter Gavula and Joseph Polinski represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the Commission requested window violations for five properties on the block after one owner on the block complained about being selectively cited for the installation of vinyl windows. He explained that the Commission would likely see legalization applications for the other properties at a later date.

Ms. Hawkins explained to the owners that the Architecture Committee looks rather narrowly at the design issues raised by applications and bases its recommendations on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Questions related to the appropriateness of the violation, the time elapsed since the work, and other potentially extenuating circumstances should be raised with the Commission, not the Committee.

Mr. Gavula explained that he has documents that indicate that he was not informed that the building was designated as historic when he purchased it. He claimed that neither the deed nor the home inspection report indicated that the building was designated as historic. The former owner did not disclose the historic designation on the state-required disclosure form. Ms. Hawkins replied that property owners have the responsibility to understand and comply with regulatory restrictions placed on their properties and to seek and obtain all necessary permits and approvals prior to undertaking work. She observed that seeking a building permit would have resulted in notification in this case. Mr. Polinski asked about requesting the rescission of the historic designation. Ms. Hawkins responded that the staff can provide information about that process outside the auspices of the Architectural Committee's meeting.

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

ADDRESS: 244-46 S 21ST ST

Project: Legalize sidewalk and steps, install railing

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 244-46 Associates LLC

Applicant: Alessandra Corso, 244-46 Associates LLC

History: 1882; James Spear House; Addison Hutton, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: The applicants seek the legalization of the demolition of the historic brownstone stair and bluestone sidewalk and their replacement in concrete. Recently the management of this building received a notice from their insurance company that their sidewalk and stairs were in deteriorated condition. They hired a contractor to make repairs and obtain all necessary permits. Unfortunately he did not seek a building permit and finished the work this August. The new stair is concrete rather than brownstone and does not follow the design of the old stair. Similarly the bluestone sidewalk has been replaced in white concrete. The staff recommends that the application be denied and that the stoop be rebuilt in brownstone and the sidewalk rebuilt in bluestone. The applicant may have recourse with the contractor.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5 and 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property manager Alexandra Corso represented the application.

Ms. Corso explained that they had the work done to the steps and sidewalk because their insurance company notified them that they were a liability. She asked the Committee members if the new stairs and sidewalk could be modified to make them acceptable. The Committee members opined that the stairs and sidewalk could not be modified in a way that would make them acceptable. Ms. Stein asked about the Commission's purview over sidewalks. Mr. Baron did not answer the question, but he did note that the sidewalk materials were listed in the inventory of the historic district. Ms. Hawkins said that the Commission had regulated sidewalks in Old City a number of times. Mr. Baron said that he would be happy to provide information about sources for new brownstone and bluestone. Ms. Gutterman agreed with the staff recommendation and suggested that the stairs and sidewalk should be rebuilt to the historic design. Ms. Corso informed the Committee that she was not authorized to agree to implement the recommendation, but stated that she would inform the owners of the recommendation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5 and 6.

ADDRESS: 2409 PINE ST

Project: Renovate building, construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Susan and Steve Solow

Applicant: Adam Solow

History: 1835

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story rear addition on a three-story row house located in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. There is an existing two-story rear addition, the majority of which would be removed. The proposed addition would result in the removal of the rear slope of the roof of the main block including the dormer, portions of the rear wall of the main block, and part of a chimney. The addition would extend to align with the rear façade of the neighbor's property to the east. The Historical Commission has approved similar rear additions on this block at 2403 and 2405 Pine Street, owing to the lack of visibility of the new construction from a public right-of-way; however, these additions do not rise above the ridgeline of the roof of the main block, as this one does. This proposed addition would not be visible from the rear or sides; visibility of the addition from Pine Street would need to be determined with the review of a mockup.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the application as presented, but approval of a rear addition that does not extend above the roof ridgeline, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Karen Anderson and Francesco Sgrazzutti represented the application.

Ms. Anderson noted that the addition and deck would not be visible from any public right-of-way. She stated that no work is proposed for the front façade, and the addition does not exceed the maximum zoning height allowance.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the roof access should be referred to as a pilot house, and noted that the Commission has approved pilot houses in the past and this particular pilot house is smaller than many of the pilot houses previously approved by the Commission.

Ms. Stein noted that there is no section through the deck, so it is difficult to determine whether the front of the railing would be visible from the street. Ms. Anderson explained that the deck is to the rear of the house. Ms. Hawkins stated that the drawings are confusing to the Committee and will therefore be confusing to the Commission. Ms. Anderson clarified that the existing building has a rear section with a flat roof. Ms. Hawkins urged the applicants to work with the staff to revise the drawings so that they require less verbal explanation. Mr. Cluver suggested that the applicants take the existing drawing showing the sightline and add the deck railing to it. Ms. Gutterman suggested showing the deck on the roof plan. Mr. McCoubrey asked for better drawings that show existing conditions at the rear.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that he is concerned with the deck occupying a main surface of the roof, when there is a rear ell that can conceivably hold the deck. Ms. Anderson clarified that there is a section off of the rear of the building with a flat roof with an existing deck. They are

proposing to replace what is labeled as “deck” on the Level 2 drawing with the proposed addition, on top of which is the proposed deck.

Ms. Hawkins commented that the Committee typically prefers to limit decks and access stairs to rear ells instead of main blocks of houses. It is not clear to her if that is possible in this case. Mr. McCoubrey stated that this is putting a deck on the back slope of a roof when there is already a flat area available for a deck on an ell. Mr. Cluver responded that the deck is partially on the addition. Ms. Anderson clarified that the existing rear dormer opens into the attic. Mr. Cluver suggested making the pilot house narrower to match the width of the stair.

Ms. Anderson reminded the Committee that several similar rear additions, which involved the removal of a rear dormer and rear slope of the roof, were approved by the Historical Commission on this block. She stated that this project is only different in terms of the access to the deck. Ms. Stein responded that there are no examples on this block of similar additions with a roof deck on top. Ms. Anderson agreed, but reiterated that the proposed deck is to the rear and is not visible from any public right-of-way. Ms. Hawkins commented that the building as a whole is considered a contributing resource to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, including the rear.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the mention in the cover letter of “weatherizing” the building. Ms. Anderson responded that they intend to repair the existing front façade windows and perform routine maintenance to the front façade, including shutter repair or repainting and gutter cleaning. There is no intention to replace any of the front façade windows. Ms. Gutterman asked about storm windows. Ms. Anderson responded that they may consider a storm window that is removable from the interior.

Ms. Hawkins summarized that the two main questions for the Committee to answer are whether it is appropriate to remove the rear gable of the roof, and whether it is appropriate to have a roof deck on top of the addition.

Regarding the removal of the rear gable of the roof, Mr. Cluver and Ms. Stein opined that, while not preferable to remove the rear gable, it is acceptable owing to lack of visibility. Ms. Pentz opined that she prefers to see the original ridgeline maintained. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he is ambivalent about the rear slope.

Regarding the roof deck on top of the addition, Mr. Cluver opined that the proposed deck is over the back third of the property, and is acceptable if it is truly not visible from a public right-of-way. Mr. McCoubrey opined that it is not appropriate as proposed. Ms. Stein stated that she is concerned about the deck. Ms. Gutterman agreed with Ms. Stein and stated that the staff will need to review the details to ensure the ridge is not elevated during construction for raising the roof. She questioned if the roof line and the dormer could be saved if the deck is removed from the proposal. Ms. Hawkins opined that the proposed third bedroom is an opportunity for either a deck or a bedroom with no deck on top of it.

Ms. Gutterman proposed recommending denial and suggesting that the applicant revise the roof line based upon a denial of the deck. Mr. Cluver disagreed with his colleagues on the recommendation, contending the proposal was acceptable if it was not visible from the public right-of-way.

The applicants stated that they were confused by the recommendation. Mr. Cluver clarified for the applicants that the Commission may view a revised proposal that includes a third-floor addition but no deck as more palatable than both a third-floor addition and a deck. He noted that the Committee cannot speak for the Commission, and the Committee's recommendation is only advisory to the Commission. Ms. Hawkins clarified that the recommendation of the Committee is that the proposal as presented is a little too much for this building. She urged the applicants to speak with the owners and decide between an extra bedroom and a deck.

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

ADDRESS: 1701 WALNUT ST, UNIT 1

Project: Renovate and paint façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1701 Walnut Acquisitions LP

Applicant: Cassandra Ryan, Two One Two Design

History: 1910; Allman Building; Baker & Dallet

Individual Designation: 3/3/1983

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

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to paint the marble elements of a storefront at 1701 Walnut Street, also known as the Allman Building. The Allman building was designed by the architectural firm of Baker & Dallet and constructed in 1910. In 1928, the ground-floor storefront was reconstructed by Magaziner, Eberhard & Harris. The 1928 storefront survives and has marble panels between the storefront windows. This application proposes to paint those marble panels to match the remainder of the storefront. The staff has recently approved the painting of the metal trim of the storefront for this project, but declined to approve the painting of the marble. The marble is a distinctive feature of this storefront and, if possible, should be restored, not painted.

The Preservation Alliance holds an easement on the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 4 and 5.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the condition of the marble. Ms. Coté responded that it is her understanding that the applicant seeks to paint the marble to give it a uniform look. She stated that she visited the property and found that the marble warrants cleaning and polishing, but did not appear to be in bad condition. Ms. Pentz opined that the Committee would support retaining the marble. She questioned its condition. Mr. Cluver stated that the fact that the applicant is not asking to replace marble but asking to paint it implies that is in a salvageable or usable condition.

Mr. Baron noted that the pinkish maroon color of the marble at the east portal of City reappeared after it was buffed and polished. He suggested that this marble can shine again too.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 SEPTEMBER 2014

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance holds an easement on this property and this proposal requires the approval of the Alliance. He stated that the applicants have not sought the Alliances approval nor would the Alliance approve painting the marble as it is viewed as a contributing feature of the façade.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 4 and 5.

ADDRESS: 2034 FAIRMOUNT AVE

Project: Replace storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Neil & Sandra Patterson

Applicant: John Gibbons, KSK Architects Planners Historians, Inc.

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace an existing primarily non-historic storefront with a new Queen Anne storefront with a bay window and cornice. An extant sheet metal cornice, likely dating from the early twentieth century, would be removed and replaced with the Queen Anne cornice. The staff previously approved a design that would have fully reconstructed an Queen Anne storefront in keeping with the design of the building, and resembling that of several other historic storefronts along Fairmount Avenue. After receiving cost estimates for that design, the applicant decided to pursue a simplified bay window, but install the new Queen Anne cornice.

The staff contends that the metal cornice has acquired significance in its own right, and that it should only be removed for a fully reconstructed Queen Anne storefront. As presented, the design is an amalgamation of styles. The staff recommends retaining the existing metal cornice and installing a compatible storefront which would include a large flat storefront window with transoms or reconstruction a true Queen Anne storefront.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as proposed, but approval of a complete Queen Anne storefront storefront, or of a simple turn-of-the-century storefront in keeping with the existing storefront cornice, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Committee. Architect Philip Scott and owners Neil Patterson and Sandra Pierantozzi represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked the applicants if they proposed to remove the sheet metal cornice because it is in poor condition. Mr. Scott responded that the existing cornice is not in poor condition. He stated that his clients would like a storefront bay window, which will require a different storefront cornice.

Ms. Pentz asked about the note on the architectural drawings that stipulates saw cutting the existing party wall. Mr. Scott responded that they would be removing the stucco and

restoring/replacing the underlying brick; saw cutting the party wall would give a clean edge for the new brick.

Mr. Cluver asked if the amount of projection of the proposed cornice would be equal to that of the neighboring properties. Mr. Patterson responded that it would be equal to the projection of the cornice and bay that is four properties away.

Ms. Hawkins asked what tile they were proposing to use at the base. Ms. Pierantozzi responded that they would be making tile in their pottery studio in the building.

Ms. Gutterman asked if a new, flat storefront window with the existing cornice, which would allow them more visibility on the street, would be acceptable. Mr. Patterson responded that they would like a bay window to provide additional useable space inside the building. The bay window would allow display space for their finished work, he commented. Ms. Stein asked how a flat store window would be different from what they have today, and Mr. Patterson responded that it would eliminate a whole wall of shelving that exists currently. Ms. Gutterman noted that some shelving could be placed inside a flat storefront window. Mr. Scott explained that the space inside the storefront is very tight, and that the addition of a bay window would increase the amount of available floor space inside and would provide a display area. Ms. Hawkins asked if the pottery produced at the studio was small or large, and Ms. Pierantozzi responded that it is domestic-sized pottery.

Mr. Patterson opined that the addition of a Queen Anne cornice and a bay window would add a significant and beautiful storefront to the block. He noted that the cost of a full Queen Anne storefront, as previously approved, was beyond their budget. Ms. Hawkins noted that the current storefront proposal is problematic because the various elements from various styles conflict. Mr. Patterson contended that the building currently has a mixture of styles. Ms. Hawkins responded that the Committee is more concerned with the removal of existing historic fabric than with the new storefront design.

Ms. Hawkins asked if it would be possible to create the ideal, full Queen Anne design in a phased manner. Mr. Scott noted that they had not considered that, and Mr. Patterson responded that the grant funding they are seeking requires that it all be done at once. Ms. Hawkins replied that she understood that they would need to spend the grant money all at once, but asked whether all of the work would need to be done at once.

Ms. Stein noted that other things are also being done at the same time, including the removal of the stucco. She noted that the grant dollars seem to be spread across the whole façade instead focused on the storefront. Mr. Patterson responded that they would be happy to keep the stucco, but the funding from the Spring Garden Community Development Corporation requires the restoration of the brick. He noted that the difference between the restoration of the brick and the repair of the stucco was only a few thousand dollars. Ms. Gutterman asked if the underlying brick would be restored or replaced. Mr. Scott responded that it would be restored where possible, and replaced as needed. Ms. Hawkins asked whether whole bricks would be replaced, or whether a wythe of brick would be added, and Mr. Scott responded that whole bricks would be replaced in the existing plane.

Mr. Cluver asked whether it would be possible to push the existing cornice out, but noted that that might create a false sense of history. Alternatively, he noted, perhaps they could retain the

existing cornice and create a bay with a small roof component of its own. He noted that he could make an argument that there is a history of bay-style storefronts on this block, and that this would be a continuation of that tradition, albeit in a less literal version. Mr. Scott noted that it should be possible to construct a bay with a roof under the existing cornice. Ms. Hawkins noted that such a storefront might lend itself to a phased construction scheme.

Justino Navarro of the Spring Garden Community Development Corporation explained that his organization is aggressively working towards the redevelopment of Fairmount Avenue, and that the proposal, as presented, is a significant improvement over the existing condition. He noted that this is the only building on the block that has stucco, and that the cost difference between brick and stucco is only approximately \$1,200. He opined that he did not see an inconsistency with the creation of a new Queen Anne cornice that would be consistent with that of the third floor, and a new bay.

Mr. Patterson asked if a modern, straight glass window would be acceptable, and Mr. McCoubrey responded that a glazed system with transoms would be most appropriate. Mr. Patterson opined that what they are proposing is significantly more beautiful and keeps in the historical flavor of the neighborhood.

Ms. Stein asked what would be done with the low concrete wall next to the front door, and Mr. Scott responded that it would be tiled.

Ms. Hawkins noted that, in her opinion, the current proposal is a mixture of divergent styles and elements. She stated that the design should have consistency, perhaps a simple cornice and contemporary storefront window.

Mr. Cluver asked whether the sill of a bay window could be angled back, and Mr. Patterson responded that that would not allow enough space in the interior of the store.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that if the existing cornice were to remain, given that there is no evidence of the storefront that accompanied it historically, the applicant would have considerably more freedom to interpret the new storefront window. This, he noted, might include more use of ceramics.

Ms. Gutterman commented that a new storefront below the existing sheet metal cornice should be in a modern style. Ms. Hawkins agreed, noting that it would not need to be a full glass wall, but that there might be a way to incorporate more ceramics into the design, bringing them up higher on the storefront, rather than just at the base. Ms. Gutterman commented that the applicant should not pick and choose from various historic styles if they cannot undertake a full Queen Anne restoration.

Ms. Stein noted that, for a future application, it would be helpful to have multiple options for the proposed storefront.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 5 to 1 to recommend denial.

ADDRESS: 1831 DELANCEY PL

Project: Construct addition, alter rear ell, add roof decks and garage door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Barbara Eberlein

Applicant: Christina Carter, John Milner Architects, Inc.

History: 1858

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes numerous alterations to the building, including:

- Replacement of all windows, including front and rear facades;
- Reconfiguration of several rear windows to create uniformity;
- Addition of a window on the first floor of a rear addition;
- Cutting down of one rear third-floor window and installation of a door for a new deck;
- Partial infill and partial cutting down of a fourth-floor window for the installation of a new door for a new deck;
- Addition of French doors to the existing first-floor west wall facing the courtyard;
- Re-siding of the kitchen wing with new 5.5" Hardi-siding;
- Removal of a rear chimney;
- Addition of one story onto an existing two-story rear elevator wing and cladding of the wing with new 5.5" Hardi-siding;
- Removal of an existing CMU garden wall along the alley and replacement with a roll-down garage door/gate for a new courtyard parking space;
- Removal of portion of the first-floor side and rear walls of the rear ell to accommodate the new courtyard parking space, and addition of new windows along the new inset wall.

As submitted, the details of the proposed replacement window are not appropriate. However, the staff should be able to work with the applicant to define appropriate replacement windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the front windows, but approval of all other aspects of the application, provided the garage door is solid, not transparent, and provided the chimney at the rear of the rear ell is retained and the deck is set back from the chimney, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Committee. Architect Christina Carter, designer Kara Litvinas, and owner Barbara Eberlein represented the application.

Ms. DiPasquale asked Ms. Carter if they had revised window details. Ms. Carter noted that the window replacements would be made by Lepage, and would include a very narrow subframe rather than a simple sash replacement. The frame would be oversized to sit behind the casing, so that the dimension inside the casing to daylight opening would remain the same. The depth from the plane of the glass to the plane of the facade, however, would change by approximately half an inch deeper, owing to an added stop. Ms. Carter noted that they would also be cutting out part of the wood sill. Ms. Hawkins asked if they could match the existing muntin profile, and Ms. Carter confirmed that they could. Ms. Hawkins expressed concern about the proposed replacement windows for the front façade. Ms. Carter noted that they would be willing to pull the front façade windows from the application and work with the staff to develop more appropriate details.

Ms. Carter noted that the only proposed work to the front façade is the window replacement, while there are several alterations proposed for the rear including the replacement of the windows. Ms. Carter noted that they had revised the rear window details and presented a new rear elevation showing the previously proposed six-over-six windows changed to two-over-two for all rear window openings. Ms. Carter noted that the proposed replacement windows, also Lepage, would sit more cleanly in these openings. Ms. Hawkins noted that she would be comfortable with the rear windows being two-over-two or six-over-six, and Mr. Cluver agreed, noting that consistency would be key, as opposed to a particular number of lites. Mr. Cluver commented that a six-panel door may be more appropriate with six-over-six windows, as opposed to two-over-two. Ms. Carter responded that the doors would not be visible from the public right of way once the gate was installed.

Ms. Carter also noted that the revised rear elevation included a solid roll-down metal slat gate. Ms. Stein asked about the material around the garage door, and Ms. Carter responded that it would be painted steel posts with a metal-clad hood housing for the roll-down gate. Ms. Gutterman asked if most of the garages along the block are similar, and Ms. Carter responded that many entries to courtyards are roll-down metal, while some garage doors that enter into the buildings are wooden, carriage-style doors. This property, she noted, would require a roll-down metal, as there is no building for protection.

Ms. Stein noted that there is an electrical cable that comes across the property, and that some of the windows and door might interfere with that cable. Ms. Carter responded that the contractor has been alerted to that, and he is exploring how much he will be able to move or lift the cable.

Ms. Hawkins questioned the visibility of the various proposed decks from the public right-of-way. Ms. Carter responded that the lower deck is visible along the alley, as is the front of the third-floor deck.

Ms. DiPasquale noted that the staff was concerned about the removal of a rear chimney, and that the staff recommended setting the deck back slightly and retaining the chimney along the exterior of the building.

Mr. Baron commented that he would like the staff to work with the applicant to develop the appropriate window details, and proceeded to describe the windows he thought would be appropriate. Ms. Hawkins noted that the Committee had already expressed their concerns as well, and that the applicant had already proposed to pull the front windows from this application.

Mr. Cluver asked why the second-floor rear window in the new elevations seemed shorter than the existing window. Ms. Litvinas noted that the ceiling in that room had been lowered to accommodate mechanical equipment. Mr. Cluver asked whether it was necessary for the HVAC equipment to extend the entire length of the room, as it was causing the window opening to be closed down. Ms. Carter responded that, if that was deemed critical by the Committee, they could attempt to find an alternative solution to retain the window size. Ms. Hawkins noted that, since this portion of the building is an addition to an addition to an addition, she did not object to the alteration of the window opening, but noted that the proportions were somewhat strange. Ms. Carter responded that it would be possible for them to create an even two-over-two window

instead. Mr. Cluver suggested altering the design of the ceiling in the interior to retain the existing window opening.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the front windows, but approval of all other aspects of revised application, provided that the rear chimney is retained and the third-floor deck is set back from the chimney, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

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

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

Standard 8: Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

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.