

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

**TUESDAY, 21 SEPTEMBER 2010
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, chair
John Cluver
Nan Gutterman
Suzanne Pentz

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Ron Patterson, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Dave Schultz, DS Architects
Joanne Phillips, Esq., Ballard Spahr
David Fielos
Gene March, O'Donnell & Naccarato
Jeff Wyant, Wyant Architecture
Tim Geary, Friday Architects
Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association
C. Cohen
Linda Hwang
Frank Rapisarda
Dennis Cogan
Caryl Cogan
Judy Wicks
Tina Geary
Kirsten Ipe
Robert Powers, Powers & Company
Reed Slogoff, Pearl Properties
Jim Pearlstein, Pearl Properties
Guy Genhart, Architect

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. Mses. Pentz and Gutterman and Mr. Cluver joined her.

1200-02 CHESTNUT STREET

Applicant: Morris Clarke

Owner: William Isenburg for Ches 12 Partners

History: 1915, Horace Trumbauer, architect

Designation: individually designated, 9/9/2006

Proposal: Construct rooftop additions

OVERVIEW: This application proposes converting this former bank building into a billiard parlor and a facility for banquets and other functions. A retractable, greenhouse-like room is proposed for the roof. The roof would open and close, allowing it to be used as an indoor or outdoor space. An existing elevator penthouse at the front or north of the building would be enlarged and a second elevator and stair penthouse would be built at the south end of the building. The new rooftop structures would be minimally visible from 12th Street and perhaps from Chestnut Street. A screen would be added along the eastern edge of the roof to shield neighboring buildings from sounds and views.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Dave Schultz and Morris Clark, attorney Ron Patterson, and developer Paul Degrich represented the application.

Mr. Schultz described the building and its history. He explained that they plan to maintain and preserve the grand banking hall and second-floor boardroom. His client, who is considering purchasing the building, owns a high-end billiard club in New York City. He explained that the building would be ideal for a billiard parlor because it would need few interior alterations. The developer will seek historic tax credits because the project is difficult to make work financially. He explained that the use of the rooftop is critical to the financial success of the project. The existing roof is in good condition. There is an existing mechanical penthouse clad in a tan brick. There is an elevator at the front of the building, but it does not currently go to the rooftop. It would be extended to the roof. To accomplish this, the current elevator penthouse will be extended. It is set back from the front façade about 15 feet. A new elevator and stair tower will be added at the rear of the building.

Mr. Baron stated that the plans do not propose any new mechanical equipment. He asked if new mechanical equipment like HVAC units will be added to the roof. Mr. Schultz stated that the new mechanical equipment will be located inside the existing mechanical penthouse. Louvers will be added facing southward on the alley. Mr. Cluver stated that the Committee will assume that no mechanical units will be added on the roof. Mr. Schultz stated that none is proposed.

Ms. Hawkins asked about handicap accessibility. The applicants replied that the access will be located at the south or rear, at the entrance to the new elevator.

Mr. Schultz explained that the addition for elevator penthouses will be clad in tan colored brick. He described the wall that will run along the east or 12th Street side of the building at the roofline to shield neighboring buildings from noise and views. The wall will not be green, as originally proposed, but will be glass and will block noise from emanating from the new rooftop structure and disturbing neighbors. He explained that the glass screen wall will sit back 18 inches from the side façade of the building. The plans currently do not precisely match the renderings. They will be corrected.

Mr. Cluver asked whether the chimney at the rear of the building will be removed. The applicants stated that it will not be removed. It will be incorporated into the satir and elevator penthouse.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he considered this to be a thoughtful, careful proposal. However, he expressed concern that the addition would be more visible than suggested in the applicants' studies. He introduced his own photographs. He opined that a translucent glass wall along 12th Street at the roofline will minimize the visibility of the additions as suggested. He asked why it needed to be eight feet tall. The applicants responded that it was intended to attenuate sounds for the neighbors. Mr. Gallery voiced his support for the proposal.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the height of the front elevator penthouse, which will be enlarged to bring the elevator to the roof, should be reduced to minimize visibility. Ms. Gutterman stated that she was opposed to the addition of mechanical equipment on the roof. The applicants stated that they were not proposing new mechanical equipment on the roof. It would all be located in the existing mechanical equipment penthouse. Ms. Gutterman also suggested reducing the height of the front elevator penthouse. Ms. Pentz questioned whether the support structures for the glass wall would be extended down onto the side of the building. Mr. Shultz stated that they would not extend below the roofline onto the façade. He also assured the Committee that the structural engineer had verified that the roof could support the new loads.

Ms. Gutterman said that she could support approval of the application, provided no added mechanical equipment was added to the roof of the building, no ADA ramp was added at the front of the front of the building, and the front elevator penthouse was restudied to verify that its height could not be reduced. The applicants again stated that they were not proposing any mechanical equipment for the roof or an ADA ramp for the front façade. Mr. Cluver stated that the Committee supported the substitution of translucent glass for the green screen at the roof along 12th Street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval with a translucent glass screen wall held back 18 inches from the side wall instead of a green screen, provided the front elevator penthouse is restudied to determine whether its height can be reduced, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

2012-14 LOCUST STREET

Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Applicant: Gene March, O'Donnell & Naccorato

History: c. 1835

Designation: Contributing to Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Proposal: Legalize aluminum windows and shutters

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of aluminum-clad windows and the removing or covering of the historic clamshell frames. The new frames do not match the historic ones. The new dormer window is a square-head window; it does not replicate the original arched-head window. Inappropriate shutters have been installed at all front-façade windows. The application proposes to restore the dormer to its original appearance in exchange for legalizing the remainder of the work.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the proposed dormer restoration, with the staff to review details; denial of the legalization of the inappropriate windows and shutters, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Gutterman recused because she is working on a different project for the same property owner. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Gene March represented the application.

Mr. March acknowledged that the work was done without an approval or permit, but reported that the windows were high-quality Pella windows with exterior aluminum cladding. He explained that the violation was sent directly to the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, not the parish, which resulted in a delayed response. He stated that the windows cost \$12,000. It would be a disruptive and expensive to install a clam shell brickmold at this point. It would cost \$4,300 for the additional work. If required to replace the brickmold, he would like to replace it at one window first and then evaluate the change with the Commission. He said the shutters would be removed. Mr. Baron countered that, for \$4,300, one could replace all six windows with the correct wood windows instead of modifying the incorrect windows.

Mr. March stated the dormer window had originally been an arched top window, but was changed to a square-head window. He offered to restore the dormer to its original condition with a new arched window in exchange for legalizing the windows at the lower floors.

Mr. March stated that the new shutters were copies of shutters on the block. He acknowledged that the new shutters are too narrow for the windows. The Committee members suggested that he remove the inappropriate shutters.

Mr. Baron stated that the muntins of the replacement windows have the correct shape but are clad in aluminum. The Commission has typically not approved aluminum cladding in the past. Mr. Baron stated, however, that the moldings as well as the placement of the windows at the wrong locations in the openings concern the staff more than the aluminum cladding. Ms. Hawkins and Mr. Cluver both objected to a recommendation for approval of the aluminum cladding. Ms. Pentz asked if it would be possible to trade the retention of the lower, inappropriate windows for some other mitigation. Mr. March answered they do need a new roof and would be willing to consider a standing seam copper roof if not forced to replace the windows. Mr. Baron stated that a copper roof, while expensive, would be less authentic to the building than an asphalt shingle with a Timberline shape. He suggested that the applicant might consider the restoration of the doorway. Currently, a Colonial Revival frontispiece covers the original Greek Revival doorway. One could, in fact, restore the front doorway, which is more visible, at a lower cost than the replacement windows. The Committee members suggested that the Commission could consider possible compromises proposed by the applicant. However, they stated that they must respond to the application as submitted.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposed dormer restoration, with the staff to review details; denial of the legalization of the inappropriate windows and shutters, pursuant to Standard 6.

135 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: 135 S. 18th Street Associates L.P.

Applicant: Joanne Phillips Esq.

History: 1913, McIlvaine & Roberts, architects

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

Proposal: Alter masonry, add storefront windows, door, and awnings

OVERVIEW: The application proposes to modify several ground floor commercial spaces to house a restaurant. Originally the ground floor was entirely residential and had residential-scale punched openings which are still reflected in the voussoir and keystone stonework over the former window openings. A storefront and a door were cut into the original stonework prior to designation. This application proposes to move a remaining piece of the original wall to the south into the area of a door opening. This would allow the consolidation of interior areas to create a larger glazed storefront and the relocation of a door for a preferred circulation pattern in the restaurant. By removing the right jamb of one of the original windows, however, it further removes the building from its original residential character and creates the impression that this heavy building sits on a base of glass.

The application proposes a new frame around the storefront that would project out several inches from the stone. Awnings would be installed above the windows. The applicants have shown several alternate designs for treating the stonework above the storefront area. The preferred design would hide the stonework with opaque glazed panels. The second alternate would cover the stonework with clear glass and the third alternate would leave the stonework exposed.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Attorneys Joanne Phillips and Eileen Quigley, restaurateur David Fields, and architect Jeff Wyant represented the application.

Ms. Phillips explained that two take-out food establishments, Le Bus Bakery and Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream, most recently occupied this space. The building was extensively renovated recently. Her client would like to consolidate the spaces for a restaurant. To create a larger storefront opening and improve circulation in the restaurant, they would like to move a limestone panel to the south, from its original position to infill a newer door opening to the south. Some limestone was removed from this area many years ago to create the storefront; originally this building was solely residential and had no storefronts. She asserted that the proposal satisfies the Standards because no historic fabric would be removed. She noted that the staff had guided her architect toward this design. Originally, they considered removing the limestone panel altogether, but the staff dissuaded them. She stated that the application also proposes to add a storefront door and windows in a surround as well as an awning.

Mr. Wyant stated that the design is driven by some interior circumstances. He is proposing to locate a bar at the southern end of the space because the floor level rises about six inches in that area and cannot be changed. The location of the bar, which is driven by the floor, dictates the location of the interior circulation and the door. Also, there is an interior connection to the lobby that cannot be moved. The panel of exterior stone cladding will be relocated to the south, creating an enlarged opening for a main entrance. If the stone cannot be moved and the entrance created, the interior space will be unusable. The design must be very efficient because

the space is only 1200 square feet. Locating the arrival zone where proposed will allow for efficient circulation. If the entrance is relocated, the dining room would sacrifice four seats, a loss of 10%. Ms. Phillips noted that there are also ADA considerations in the locating of the door.

David Fields, the restaurateur, cited the need for the proposed arrangement of the interior and the efficient circulation for a successful business. He described the floor plan and locations of the restrooms and bar area. If the doorway cannot be moved, the restaurant will be inefficient. He explained that they have few options with a 1200 square foot restaurant. If the door is located in the existing storefront, customers will enter into the middle of the restaurant, which is awkward. He stated that his architect is attempting to retain historic fabric while creating the best traffic flow. He stated that the locations of the bar and the restrooms are given. The proposed design is the most efficient in light of the givens. He stated that he is working with a restaurant designer from New York City, who has designed more than 30 restaurants.

Mr. Cluver pointed out that the exterior cladding is finished to give the appearance of two keystones over the existing storefront area, where two smaller windows were once located. The two keystones indicate the locations of the two original windows. Some masonry cladding was removed between the two keystones to create the existing storefront. However, the masonry cladding at the outer edges of the two keystones was left in place, indicating the outer edges or jambs of the original windows. If the masonry is moved as proposed, the historic edge or jamb of the south window will be lost, causing the keystones to float in space. Mr. Cluver asked if the historic location of the jamb could be indicated by something solid, a masonry pier or a solid section of the storefront.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the storefront system, which stands proud of some sections of the historic masonry, but not others. Mr. Wyant explained that the building has a projecting stone base or watertable. The frame of the storefront system would stand proud of the masonry above the watertable, just as it does at the historic storefronts in the building. The door and windows would not stand proud, but would be within the openings. He noted that the windows would open to create al fresco dining. The Committee members objected that the frame would obscure views of the keystones. They asked why an opaque glass panel was proposed for the area above the storefront. Ms. Phillips explained that the proposed options were developed during discussions with the staff. She stated that her client is facing a deadline and hopes to finalize the plans with the Committee today.

Mr. Cluver asked about the side light next to the door. The applicants stated that it was an ADA requirement to provide sufficient space around the door. Mr. Cluver suggested reorienting the door so that it opened from the opposite side, allowing the sidelight to be removed. The applicants responded that the door could not be reoriented because the windows fold into that area.

The Committee members asked about the relation of the storefront frame to the masonry face of the building in Option 3. Mr. Wyant explained that the masonry watertable at the base of the building stands 3-½ inches proud of the masonry wall above. The frame must stand ½ inch proud of the watertable and 4 inches proud of the masonry wall above.

Mr. Cluver suggested using the keystones, which are strong architectural elements, to define the window system in the storefront. He suggested creating a pier that would define the south side of the jamb of the former south window. He claimed that the keystones could be respected

and the applicants' goals achieved. Mr. Baron stated Mr. Cluver's suggestion would maintain the line of the jamb of the window opening. In Mr. Cluver's proposal, some of the stone would be retained in place, but most of it would be shifted to the south. Mr. Fields contended that the narrow pier, perhaps 12 inches wide, would be awkward. Mr. Cluver stated that he was imagining a wider pier, perhaps 18 inches. Mr. Fields warned that the door cannot shift so far south that it places the entrance directly in front of the bar. Mr. Cluver stated that the architect should study the design to determine what width is most appropriate for the pier. He stated that they should think of it as a storefront and separate door. Ms. Hawkins stated that one could install an awning over the entrance door and a second awning over the storefront. Other Committee members suggested two awnings over the storefront, one for each keystone. They all agreed that the awning should not run across the pier. The applicant agreed with the suggestion. Mr. Wyant stated that, if the frame was not intended to extend above the openings and hold the awnings, it could be situated within the openings and not project out beyond them.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the Committee recommend approval in concept of the revised, negotiated design. Mr. Baron noted that an approval in concept would not allow for the issuance of a building permit, but would require a second round of review by the Committee and Commission. He observed that it appeared that the Committee was relegating the details to the staff, in which case a recommendation for final approval would be appropriate. Ms. Phillips advocated for a recommendation of final approval owing to her client's schedule. She stated that her architect could produce drawings of the revised design for presentation to the Committee. Mr. Cluver stated that he was comfortable with Ms. Hawkins advocating for the Committee's perspective at the Commission meeting. The Committee members agreed to recommend final approval of the revised design. Ms. Phillips stated her architect would provide the requisite drawings for distribution to the Commission.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the three proposed designs, but approval of a revised design that retains a 12 to 18-inch limestone pier at the northern edge of the limestone cladding in question, shifts the remaining limestone cladding to the south, creating a doorway separate from the storefront, and includes separate awnings over each of the keystones and the doorway, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

332 S. 24TH STREET

Owner: Judy Wicks

Applicant: Tina Geary

History: c. 1840, refaced c. 1960

Designation: Contributing to Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Construct roof deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck over the back slope of the main roof and flat roof over the rear ell of this property. The deck will have planters, an air conditioning unit, and a pergola, further increasing its massing on the roof. The deck would be visible from Panama Street and likely visible from Fitler Square.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Judy Wicks and architect Tina Geary represented the application.

Ms. Geary stated that the deck would be visible from Panama Street at an oblique angle. She was not sure of the visibility from Fitler Square. She noted that the proposed trellis would serve as a sun screen for the deck users. She introduced photographs from the street, which showed the visibility of existing chimneys above the gabled roof. She noted that the chimney on the rear slope was not visible from Fitler Square. She surmised that the trellis would probably not be visible from the Square given that it is the same height as the rear chimney. Mr. Danta stated that one of the main pedestrian axes of Fitler Square runs directly toward this property, which is the second property north of the corner of 24th and Panama Streets. He added that the trellis may not be visible, but that additional investigation would be prudent. Ms. Gutterman suggested a mock up with photographs that would show the visibility. She also asked for a site line study from both Panama Street and Fitler Square. Mr. Cluver added that photographs should be taken from all areas of public view.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a mock up of the deck proves that it will be inconspicuous from public rights of ways, with the staff to review details.

2132 SAINT JAMES STREET

Owner: Dennis J. Cogan

Applicant: Caryl Cogan

History: c. 1926

Designation: Significant in the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Legalize vinyl windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize vinyl windows on the front façade of this townhouse in the English Village. The windows in question are the second and third-floor windows. The third-floor windows were changed from an original casement design to double hung windows. The Historical Commission requested a violation in 2003 and again in 2006.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Owners Dennis and Caryl Cogan represented the application.

Mr. Cogan stated that they had not received a notice of the violation in 2003. Ms. Hawkins asked the Cogan's if they had obtained a building permit before installing the windows. Mr. Cogan stated that his wife is an award-winning interior designer and that she worked with the contractor, owing to her expertise. He also stated that the contractor who did the work recently died falling off a roof. He stated that they assumed that he had obtained all necessary permits. Ms. Cogan noted that the Commission just approved vinyl replacement windows for three neighboring homes. She stated that she believes that vinyl windows are acceptable. Mr. Danta disagreed and clarified that the Commission has approved aluminum-clad windows, not vinyl windows, for the English Village. He stated that the Commission requires replacement in kind; new windows must match the original windows in appearance. Ms. Cogan insisted that the Commission had approved vinyl windows for the house owned by Heather Ascher at 2137 St. James Street. Mr. Cogan asked Mr. Danta to explain what he meant by original windows. Mr. Danta stated that the new windows must match the original windows. Mr. Cogan asked if new windows must match the windows installed when the building was constructed or the windows

that were in place when the building was designated. Mr. Danta explained that non-historic alterations are grandfathered and may remain in place until altered or replaced. When the non-historic alterations is altered or replaced after designation, the Commission has the authority to require the restoration of the original feature. Mr. Cogan questioned the authenticity of the casement design. He asked how the Commission could be certain that it was the original window and not a later alteration. Mr. Danta explained that the Commission has photographs in its archive of the English Village at the time of construction in 1926. He noted that those photographs show that the original windows were casements. Other photographs in the Commission's archive show that the original casements or windows that looked just like them were still present at the time of designation.

Ms. Cogan claimed that there is no continuity in the English Village. Houses have glass block, jalousie, casement, and double-hung windows. She stated that most original windows are double-hung, not casements. They installed double-hung windows because they seemed prevalent in the development. She also stated that the next door neighbor has allowed her property to deteriorate, which has affected their property. She stated that water has infiltrated her property through cracks in her neighbor's walls and windows. She claimed that the vinyl windows would hold better with the existing water infiltration problem. Ms. Cogan also noted that the use of vinyl would eliminate the periodic maintenance of wood.

Mr. Cogan stated that he has been a resident of Center City for over thirty years. He stated that his home is the best maintained in the courtyard. He described his view across the courtyard as looking onto a junkyard. He noted he had complained to the City and nothing has been done about it. He stated that it "makes Sanford and Son look like the Taj Mahal." Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee's purview is limited. She sympathized, but told the applicants that the Committee's task is to determine whether the application meets the Standards. Mr. Cogan asked if the Committee took the Property Maintenance code into consideration. Ms. Hawkins stated the same rules are applied to all properties. Ms. Gutterman stated that the Committee's task is to determine whether this application satisfies the Commission's review criteria, not whether the neighbors are appropriately maintaining their properties. She stated that she agreed with the staff that this application should be denied. Vinyl windows do not meet the Standards and cannot be approved. Mr. Cogan again claimed that the Commission has approved vinyl windows for their neighbors.

Mr. Cogan noted that the wood windows that he removed had warped owing to the water coming from the neighboring property. He stated that they installed the vinyl windows because his wife, who is an interior designer, knew that the vinyl would survive the water infiltration. He explained that he attempted to repair his neighbor's property at his own expense without her knowledge. However, water is still getting into the house through cracks in her property. In 2006, he wrote to the neighbor about the damages he was incurring owing to her failure to maintain the property. He stated that there is no practical way to look at this in isolation. It should be considered in the aggregate. Her lack of maintenance is destroying his property. He restated that this cannot be considered in anything less than the whole picture. Mr. Cluver stated the Committee reviews applications; it cannot enforce the Property Maintenance code. Ms. Hawkins added that the issues they raise are valid, but not within the Committee's purview.

Mr. Cogan claimed that the Commission is selectively enforcing the law at his property because it knows that he can afford the replacement windows. He said that the Old Children's Hospital stood on the site of the English Village in the nineteenth century. He contended that he would happily reconstruct his portion of the façade of the Old Children's Hospital if the other owners in

the English Village were required to rebuild their sections. He claimed that the Commission's enforcement of this violation was not fair; it was selective. He added that the courtyard foundation was breaking apart because people illegally parked vehicles on it. He reported that he persuaded the residents to not park there and saved the courtyard. He stated that the Commission's enforcement action against him was "picayune" and "unfair." He stated that he lives overlooking a slum. He cannot sell his house because of the slum conditions of his neighbors' houses. He claimed that his house has lost \$400,000 in value because of the appearance of the courtyard neighborhood. He claimed that he cannot sell his house because of the appearances of his neighbors' houses. Ms. Hawkins asked him to keep to the topic.

Ms. Pentz stated that she agreed with the staff recommendation of denial.

Ms. Cogan asked if the Commission could issue violations to the neighbors. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission has had many violations issued for unpermitted alterations in the English Village. He reported that he has attended several Municipal Court hearings regarding violations in the English Village and several non-compliant conditions have been corrected. For example, he has approved historically appropriate windows to replace non-compliant windows. He also contended that vinyl windows have never been approved for front facades in the English Village.

Mr. Cogan stated he will pursue this legalization application to the full Commission and then to court, if necessary. He called the Commission's actions short-sighted and outrageous. He stated that this action may prompt him to leave the city. He also asked the Committee members to remember the following when making decisions. Every year, his neighbor appeals her property tax assessment with the claim that his house is worth more than hers and she cannot afford to pay her taxes. And every year, the City lowers her taxes and he pays more than she does. She is a former City of Philadelphia solicitor on a City pension. He claimed that the Historical Commission lets her get away with paying less in taxes. He asserted that it was outrageous.

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

161-63 N. 3RD STREET

Owner/Applicant: Linda Hwang

History: nineteenth-century granite sidewalks

Designation: individually designated, 12/31/1984

Significant to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Legalize alterations to granite sidewalks

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize incising grooves into nineteenth-century granite sidewalks that surround this corner property. The downspout troughs were also altered. The owner claims that she has been sued several times and hopes the grooves will prevent further slip and fall legal actions against her property.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Linda Hwang represented the application.

Ms. Hwang explained that the property is on the corner of 3rd and Race Streets and has extensive granite sidewalks. It is slippery when it rains or snows. She stated that she is facing two lawsuits related to slip and fall cases against her property, owing to the slippery condition of her sidewalk. Ms. Hwang intended the grooves to solve the problem of the slippery sidewalk by creating traction. She mimicked a sidewalk at a neighboring property, which has the same grooves. She said the work was done in frustration.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the depth of the grooves. Mr. Danta agreed that they are about 3/8 to 1/2 inch deep, enough to provide traction. Ms. Gutterman opined that there would have been ways to overcome the slipperiness without damaging the granite sidewalks. She noted that the damage is already done and there is no way to undo it now. Ms. Pentz asked about the alterations to the gutters incised into the sidewalks. She looked at photographs and concluded that the shoulders of the gutters had been removed, changing the shape of them. Mr. Cluver contended that this sort of alteration cannot be condoned. He worried that other property owners would undertake the same destructive work. Mr. Danta claimed that these sorts of alterations have been undertaken elsewhere in Old City. Ms. Pentz noted that this was a traditional way of altering granite sidewalks for more traction. Ms. Gutterman advocated for denial. She does not want to encourage other property owners to mar their historic sidewalks. Ms. Hwang stated that the grooves will increase traction, making the sidewalks safer to walk on, especially during winter when snow accumulates. She added that her insurance had increased, owing to the slip and fall suits against her property. Ms. Gutterman again stated that the Committee should recommend denial. Mr. Danta noted that the alteration does not meet the Standards.

Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association stated that he surveyed all the historic sidewalks in Old City 10 years ago. He stated that this is an important historic sidewalk. He observed that the granite has been polished by more than one century of pedestrians. He acknowledged that the slab is cold and slippery in winter. He added that it is slippery even in warm weather when it rains. However, there are more appropriate ways to address the problem. He stated that the Commission must send a clear message to property owners that a permit is required for such alterations. He also noted that the sidewalk is in the public way. He stated that these sidewalks are important to the history of Old City. He remarked that other property owners have put fluorescent tape and spray paint on hazards in the sidewalk. Mr. Baron added that textured tape can be applied to sidewalks to create the desired traction without damaging the historic fabric. Ms. Gutterman noted that granite can be honed or refinished to give it a rougher texture without damaging it. Ms. Gutterman stated that the sidewalk alteration does not meet the Standards and the Committee must recommend denial. She suggested that the applicant plead her case to the Commission.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9.

100 MARKET STREET

Owner: Rag #, Inc.

Applicant: Frank Rapisarda, Tackett Architects

History: 1886

Designation: Individually designated, 1976; contributing to the Old City Historic District, 2003

Project: Rehabilitate storefront, install awnings, and remove sign

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert this vacant building into a restaurant and apartments. Café windows and signage are proposed for the storefronts. The Commission previously approved similar café windows and signage. Awnings are proposed over second through fourth-story windows of the façade; they would cover Queen Anne multi-paned windows on the fourth-story. An existing neon sign that reads “Bar Grill” would be removed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of awnings at the upper floors; approval of all other aspects of the application, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Frank Rapisardi and Lauren Most represented the application.

Mr. Rapisardi explained that he had appeared before the Commission for another owner a few years ago and obtained an approval for the restaurant conversion. He is now proposing the project with some slight modifications for a new owner. The awnings at the upper floors and the removal of the old sign are the only aspects of this application that differ from the approved application. The Committee members asked him why he wanted to install awnings at the upper floors. Mr. Rapisardi replied that he wanted to tie the rest of the building into the character of the ground floor. The upper-floor awnings would be fixed; they would be retractable at the ground floor. Mr. Cluver stated that he could not recall seeing awnings on the upper floors of buildings in this area. He contended that the upper-floor awnings would be arbitrary and out of place. He also contended that there is not a strong argument for awnings on an east façade, which does not receive strong, midday sun.

Mr. Cluver stated that he did not object to the removal of the sign. Mr. Rapisardi stated that the sign will be removed, but salvaged. He noted that it must be removed to stay within zoning’s signage requirements.

Ms. Gutterman and Ms. Pentz agreed with the staff recommendation to approve the application with the exception of the upper-floor awnings.

Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association contended that there are few buildings in Old City with awnings.

Mr. Rapisardi stated that, considering the Committee’s comments, he will eliminate awnings on the upper floors from the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the awnings at the upper floors; approval of all other aspects of the application, pursuant to Standard 9.

1718-20 NORTH STREET

Owner: Don Doyle

Applicant: Michael Loonstyn

History: c. 1926

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

Project: Construct new building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story twin building with roof decks. The façade would be made of brick with four-over-four wood windows, second-story Juliet balconies, four-paneled, single-leaf doors, and a first-story garage. The rear elevation would be clad in stucco with balconies and casement windows. The side elevations would be clad in scored stucco with modern horizontal windows. The staff recommends that more compatible windows be installed in the side elevations.

In July 2010, the Commission reviewed an application to demolish an existing garage that was classified as Contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, and construct a three-story building in its place. The applicant had neither claimed nor provided the documentation to support a claim that the building could not be adaptively reused or that its demolition was necessary in the public interest. Rear sections of the building had collapsed and the Department of Licenses & Inspections had cited the building for Unsafe conditions, but the applicant had not claimed that the Department was requiring the demolition of the building to abate the Unsafe conditions. The Historical Commission voted to deny the application, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(j) of the historic preservation ordinance.

On 23 July 2010, the Department of Licenses and Inspections cited the garage as Imminently Dangerous. Per the memorandum of agreement with the Department, the staff approved a permit application for its demolition on 18 August 2010. The building has been demolished.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Michael Loonstyn represented the application.

Mr. Loonstyn noted that he is eliminating the windows on the side elevation from the application. He stated that he spoke with some neighbors, who disliked the side window design. He explained that there will be windows at the inset portion of the side façade and one window may change to a doorway. He stated he will have the redesigned drawings prepared for the Commission meeting.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the garage door was compatible with the Spring Garden Historic District. Ms. Sell stated that wood carriage house doors are prevalent in the district. Mr. Cluver disagreed, stating that the transom above the carriage house door is an incongruous element in the design. He asked if the window flanking the door on the front façade was necessary and if so, could the door and window be combined under a single continuous arch to tie the elements together. Mr. Loonstyn stated that he and his architect based this aspect of the design on a door and window at a neighboring property. He added that it was an element that the Spring Garden neighborhood association preferred. Mr. Cluver stated that the applicant should demonstrate how this design is based on precedents in the neighborhood. Ms. Gutterman noted that she would expect there to be more space between the door frame and the window frame. Ms. Hawkins suggested narrowing the window. Mr. Cluver commented that the application is lacking

in details such as cornice and window-frame drawings. Ms. Sell assured him that the staff would review these details as part of the final approval process. Mr. Cluver stated that the details of this application will be very important.

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

569 N. 20TH STREET

Owner: Bromley Investment Group

Applicant: Andy Barreras

History: c. 1886

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

Project: Construct rear addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-floor rear addition on top of a two-story rear portion of the building. The addition would be clad in stucco and the roofline would be flush with the existing building roofline. The proposed windows would be wood to match the historic windows.

In July 2010, the Commission reviewed a similar application to construct a rear addition; however, the roofline was proposed to be higher than the existing building roofline. The drawings provided did not include a rear elevation or plans. The Commission voted to deny the application, owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Kirsten Ipe represented the application.

Ms. Pentz noted some temporary wood shoring in some photographs and inquired if it was still in place. Ms. Ipe stated that the shoring is no longer there because the wall has been rebuilt. Ms. Sell clarified that the shoring Ms. Pentz noted was installed in response to an Unsafe violation. The wall was rebuilt with the existing brick over cinderblock in 2009.

Ms. Gutterman noted that the new submission is much improved from the July 2010 application. She asked the applicant how the cornice will be continued. Ms. Ipe stated that she was unaware of the plan for the cornice. Ms. Hawkins asked about the material of the existing cornice. Ms. Sell answered that it appears to be wood and supplied a photograph of the side elevation. Mr. Cluver noted that the cornice on the second floor is deteriorated and coming off. Ms. Ipe stated that the cornice needs repair throughout. However, she is unsure about the extent of the repair needed. Ms. Sell stated that the staff would ensure that the continued cornice would match the existing cornice. Mr. Cluver stated that the addition should be set back and the lower cornice maintained to show that the addition is new. He objected to "just filling in a box."

ARCHITECTURE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the addition is set back a minimum of four inches from the side facade, the lower cornice is maintained, and the main cornice returns and continues over the addition.

407 N. 20TH STREET

Owner: PIDC Granary Partners, L.P.

Applicant: Reed Slogoff, Pearl Properties

History: grain elevator, constructed by Reading Railroad in 1925

Designation: individually designated, 8/6/1981

Project: Rehabilitate building for mixed use

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate a grain elevator for commercial and residential use. The building is currently unoccupied. From the 1970s until recently, it was used as a nightclub and then as an architectural office and residence.

The granary would be rehabilitated and incorporated into mixed-use project that would include a large commercial and residential building on 19th and Callowhill Streets and a parking and valet area along Shamokin Street, a small street running between 20th to 19th Streets. Only the granary building itself is designated; the vacant land on which the other building and parking would be constructed is not designated and not subject to the Commission's review.

The granary building would house commercial space at the first and second floors and residential space at the upper floors. A parking garage would be created at the basement level. The grain silos at the middle floors would not be altered or used.

A pedestrian bridge would be constructed across Shamokin Street at the second-floor level, linking the east or rear façade of the granary building to the new building, which would provide amenities for the residents of both buildings. The bridge would be a simple metal and glass structure.

New windows to match the historic windows would be installed throughout the granary. In many locations, infill would be removed from historic window openings and new windows installed. Infill and non-historic windows would be removed at the base of the north façade, along the railroad tracks, and new storefront systems for the retail space and louvers for the parking garage installed. Along 20th Street, infill and non-historic windows and doors would be removed and glass and aluminum storefront systems with signage installed. At the ground floor of the south façade, infill and non-historic windows would be removed and new windows would be installed; the new windows would be slightly taller than the historic windows to provide light to the second-floor level. Non-historic steps and paving would be removed and an ADA ramp installed along the south façade to provide access to the storefronts on 20th Street. New window openings would be cut at the upper floors of the middle bay of the south façade, where two balconies would be removed. Solarium structures at the upper floors, which were approved by the Historical Commission, would be removed and new, similar structures added. Railings for terraces would be added at the second floor and replaced at the upper floors. Garage and loading dock doors would be replaced at the east façade. The masonry cladding would be repaired and recoated. Mechanical equipment would be added at the north, where huge grain transporting machines once stood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details including window, door, storefront, railing, solarium, and signage details and shop drawings and masonry repair specifications, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developers Reed Slogoff and Jim Pearlstein, architect Guy Genhart, and historic consultant Bob Powers represented the application.

Mr. Farnham explained that he has been reviewing old permits, photographs, and architectural drawings related to the various renovations. The building ceased to be used as a granary in the 1960s. In 1970, it was converted to a “discotheque.” In 1982, designer Ken Parker converted it for use as his design firm’s offices at the basement and ground floor and his residence at the upper floors. In 1987, an architectural firm converted the building for offices at the lower and upper floors. The building is currently vacant and unused. Mr. Farnham explained that, in reviewing the documents, he has learned that nearly every window and door opening at the basement, first, and second floors has been altered from its historic condition. Many windows have been infilled. Some window openings have been reduced in size. Windows and doors have been added and removed. Mr. Farnham explained that many windows at the upper floors have been altered or replaced as well. He stated that in almost all cases, the applicants are proposing to return the windows and doors to their original conditions or closer to them.

Mr. Slogoff summarized the project. He stated that the granary will be rehabilitated to house retail space at the lower floors and 12 apartments at the upper floors. Parking will be added in the basement level. He stated that they will fully rehabilitate the exterior of the building including patching and repair the exterior masonry, which is in a state of disrepair. He explained that they will construct a new residential and retail building on an adjacent lot and connect that building to the granary with a bridge. He stated that the proposed work is relatively minor and is primarily repair work. The areas where windows will be added or altered are largely areas that have been already altered from their historic conditions. Their goal is to return this unused building to an active life.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants to describe the concrete repairs. Mr. Genhart stated that he had worked on the building in the 1980s. At that time, the concrete was in very poor condition. He stated that they are proposing to remove any spalling concrete, remove corrosion from exposed rebar, coat the exposed rebar, patch the spalled areas, and then coat the concrete with a sealer. Ms. Hawkins asked if the sealer would be breathable. Mr. Powers stated the sealer would be breathable, allowing moisture to escape from the concrete. He noted that the concrete was coated in the 1980s. Most of the sealant has worn off. Mr. Genhart added that the concrete is now unsafe in some places; large pieces have spalled off and fallen. The coating will give it a uniform finish. Mr. Farnham showed a 1981 photograph to the Committee, demonstrating that the concrete was in very poor condition at that time.

Mr. Cluver asked the applicants to walk the Committee through the overall site plan. Mr. Slogoff stated that the new building would be constructed along most of the 1900-block of Callowhill Street. He stated that Shamokin Street runs northeast from 20th Street to 19th Street, north of and roughly parallel to Callowhill. He pointed out properties that are not part of the project at 19th and Shamokin and at 20th and Callowhill. He explained that a bridge would be constructed across Shamokin Street, connecting the granary to the new building. Parking would be added at the rears of the buildings, along Shamokin Street. Ms. Hawkins asked if the bridge would be open or enclosed. Mr. Slogoff stated that it would be enclosed. Mr. Cluver asked about the extent of the Commission’s jurisdiction. Mr. Farnham stated that the new building is not within the Commission’s jurisdiction. He stated that the bridge, especially as it impacts on the granary building, is within the Commission’s jurisdiction. He suggested that the Committee concentrate its review of the impact of the bridge on the historic building and not the design of the new

building. Ms. Gutterman pointed to one of the drawings and asked about the person in the drawing standing on the bridge. She stated that she was confused. Mr. Slogoff explained that the person added to give the drawing scale was standing on the 20th Street bridge over the railroad cut to the north of the granary building, not the proposed bridge over Shamokin Street. He directed Ms. Gutterman to the appropriate drawing.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the elevation drawings of the bridge were included in the application. Mr. Slogoff replied that the bridge is shown in a rendering looking up Shamokin Street, in section at the east elevation, and in plan on the site plan. Ms. Gutterman stated that she was confused. She asked if the rendering showed the bridge looking west, from the east. Mr. Slogoff replied that it showed the bridge looking east, from the west. The rendering shows the bridge as it would be seen from 20th Street. Mr. Slogoff explained that the bridge will be L-shaped in plan and will extend from the north façade of the new building to the east façade of the granary building. Mr. Cluver suggested providing interior floors plans to the Commission. The Committee members did not object to the cut in the façade for the construction of the bridge. They noted that it was appropriately located on the east façade, away from the primary views of the building.

Mr. Cluver commented that the window replacement at the ground floor was appropriate. He asked about the storefront proposed along 20th Street. Mr. Slogoff stated that they would be glass and aluminum storefronts. Mr. Cluver stated that he would like to see more information about the storefronts. He asked if the storefronts were based on the historic windows. Mr. Genhart stated that he is proposing to remove the non-historic windows, doors, and infill at the four ground-floor bays on 20th Street and the westernmost bay on Shamokin Street to install clean, simple aluminum storefronts with small bases and clear glass. Mr. Farnham reported that all ground-floor bays along 20th Street and most on Shamokin have been altered from their original conditions. He introduced a photograph showing that the most of the bays had large industrial windows over small concrete bases. He noted that some of the bays have been altered repeatedly during the building's use as a bar and then architect's office. Mr. Farnham pointed out windows and doors with infill from the 1980s. Mr. Cluver stated that the non-historic alterations that are extant along 20th Street are very awkward. Ms. Hawkins asked where the storefronts would be located in the openings relative to the plane of the façade. Mr. Genhart replied that the storefronts could be set back into the openings to create a reveal. Mr. Farnham presented a photograph that showed the historic reveal.

Mr. Genhart described the glass railings that would be installed at the parapets above the storefronts for a terrace. Mr. Cluver asked where the glass railing would be located relative to the inner and outer planes of the parapet. Mr. Genhart replied that it would be installed at the center of the parapet, which is 18 inches thick. The roof of the one-story section facing 20th Street will be used as a terrace. A window at the second-floor level will be converted to a door. The Commission previously approved a window-to-door conversion for this location, but it was not constructed. Ms. Hawkins asked if the new door would match the historic windows. Mr. Genhart stated that the new door would be the same width as and would match the historic windows.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the mechanical equipment shown on the roof of the one-story section at the north of the building. Mr. Genhart responded that they have not determined entirely how the mechanical equipment will be configured, but it will be set back at least 16 feet from the front façade. He stated that it is currently shown "diagrammatically" on the drawings. Mr. Genhart added that some mechanical equipment on the roof now will be removed. Mr. Cluver asked if

the unit closest to 20th Street would be removed. Mr. Genhart stated that it would not be removed. It is one of two pressurization fans added in the 1980s for the fire stairs that were installed at the east and west ends of the building. Mr. Cluver suggested that the mechanical equipment should be as low to the roof as possible. It was noted that, historically, this north roof area housed huge machines for the moving of grain.

Mr. Cluver asked about the new windows proposed for the north façade at the second-floor level. Mr. Genhart explained that some of the windows second-floor, north-façade windows survive; others were infilled with the office conversion. They plan to reopen the infilled window openings and restore the windows to allow light into the second-floor retail space. Mr. Cluver noted that the pressurization fans for the stairs may conflict with two of those windows. Mr. Genhart replied that they would not be reinstalling windows in those locations because of the stairs. Mr. Cluver stated that additional information should be provided on the mechanical equipment when the design is completed. Mr. Farnham noted that mechanical equipment is typically reviewed at the staff level.

The Committee asked about the proposal for the basement-level openings along the north façade. Mr. Genhart stated that they are proposing to reopen infilled openings and to replace non-historic windows. New windows would be installed in the openings closer to 20th Street and louvers for the parking would be installed in the openings away from 20th Street, to the east.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the window replacement at the upper stories of the west façade. Mr. Genhart stated that they intend to remove and replace several aluminum sliding windows in the towers that were installed in the 1970s or 1980s with windows that replicate the appearance of the historic windows. Ms. Gutterman asked about the new solariums that will be installed on the rooftop or fifth level. Mr. Genhart replied that they are proposing to remove the solariums and install new solariums that will be shorter but have larger footprints. He stated that the building would have green roofs. Ms. Hawkins asked about the handrails for the terraces. Mr. Genhart stated that the railings would replace existing, deteriorated railings and would match the glass railings proposed for the second-floor terrace. Mr. Cluver contended that a metal rail may be more inconspicuous. Glass reflects. Ms. Gutterman again observed that she was confused by the people shown on the drawings for scale; she contended that they look like ventilation equipment. Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission approved the solariums that were installed at the rooftop in 1987; they replaced solariums from 1982, which had decayed by 1987. Mr. Cluver noted that the solariums are set back significantly from the east and west facades, beyond the first bay of windows at each end.

Mr. Genhart turned his attention to the south façade. Ms. Gutterman asked about the two small balconies that would be removed from the center bay of the upper floors of the south façade. The balconies would be replaced with windows to match the historic windows. Mr. Farnham replied that the balconies are visible in photographs from the 1930s and are probably original. The Committee members asked about the purpose of the balconies. Mr. Farnham stated that their purpose is unclear. They may have been related to a fire stair. As shown in the 1987 rehabilitation plans, they have no apparent use. The doors and windows around them appear to be altered. Mr. Slogoff stated they are more like platforms than balconies. He stated that they are in very poor condition and do not meet code. Mr. Cluver agreed that they appear to be in poor condition. He agreed that their removal was acceptable.

Mr. Cluver asked about the window replacement at the upper floors. Mr. Genhart replied that many of the upper windows have been altered or replaced. He stated that the non-historic

windows will be replaced with windows that have the historic appearance. Mr. Cluver asked how the new solariums would relate to the windows to which they connect. He asked if the windows would have horizontal mullions. He noted that the old solariums were much taller and covered the entire window opening. Mr. Farnham noted that all of the windows at that level are non-historic. They were added in 1982. Some were again replaced in 1987. Mr. Genhart answered that they designed the new solariums to recede, be less visible, and not compete with the historic building. The old solariums were much taller and much more visible from the ground. Mr. Cluver asserted that the proposed design with the solariums running across the window openings would create the need for a complex flashing design where the solariums meet the windows. He suggested that the Committee should review that flashing design. Mr. Genhart stated that the existing solariums at the north elevation already run across the windows. Mr. Genhart stated that they would maintain that configuration at the north and replicate that condition at the south. He claimed that the solariums that they are proposing for the southern part of the roof will be much less conspicuous than the extant, two-story solariums. The connection to the building will not be visible from the ground. Mr. Genhart added that the solariums will be set back from the parapet.

Mr. Genhart explained that they are reworking the mezzanine or second-floor level, which sits within the 22-foot-tall ground-floor level. They would like to add windows at the new second floor to match the remaining historic windows at the ground floor. The new windows would be divided from the historic windows by horizontal mullions. Mr. Farnham stated that several of the ground-floor, south façade bays have been altered from their original conditions as sections of a second floor were added in the past. Also, at the westernmost bay, the window was altered for a door, which was later removed. Other original windows have been removed and smaller windows added with infill. Mr. Cluver asked why the new windows with the added upper section would fill the bays vertically, but not horizontally; he objected to the lack of symmetry. Mr. Genhart explained that the original windows did not fill the bays horizontally; they will maintain the original, historic window width. Mr. Pearl stated that the windows currently extend up to about knee-height at the mezzanine. Increasing their height as proposed would make the space usable. The Committee members stated that interior plans would be helpful for understanding the need for the windows. However, they did not object in principle to enlarging the windows.

Mr. Cluver stated that he found the overall proposal to be acceptable. However, he stated that he felt that many details were missing, such as the meeting of the mezzanine floor and the interior of the extended window, and the flashing details at the intersection of the solariums and the windows at the roof top. He stated that he could not determine the sizes of the solariums without a plan. Mr. Slogoff stated that he thought that they had provided adequate details for this very complicated project. He stated that, for example, the elevations describe the sizes of the solariums completely. He stated that it is a very complicated project, but most of it involves undoing non-historic alterations and returning it to its original condition. He stated that he anticipated that his architect and preservation consultant would work with the staff on the window and other details, which will primarily match the historic details. Mr. Cluver stated that he wanted to review interior plan and section drawings. He asked about, for example, the details of the mullion that would separate the original or restored ground-floor window from the new mezzanine window at the south façade. Mr. Genhart conceded that they had not yet detailed window connection, but had thought that they could work on that design with the staff. Ms. Gutterman noted that she needed to leave the meeting and suggested that the Committee recommend approval in concept to bring the discussion to a close. Ms. Gutterman stated that she wanted more information on the flashing between the solariums and the windows, information on the positioning of the terrace railings, and details on the bridge. Mr. Slogoff

stated that he would gladly work out the details with the Committee or the staff, but asserted that he needs a final approval to allow this project to move forward. Ms. Gutterman stated that she would like to see more information about the mezzanine floor and its relation to the south ground-floor windows. Ms. Hawkins stated that she would like to see a roof plan. Mr. Cluver asked the applicants how far along they are with the project. Mr. Pearl stated that they have completed their design development documents and are beginning construction documents.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she approved of the project and the major design decisions. She stated that she now wants to see the details before voting for a final approval. She stated that she wants to see the details of the railings and how they are positioned relative to the parapet, the details of the window mullions, and other details like flashing. She stated that she especially wants to see more information about the bridge. Mr. Slogoff again stated that they are happy to share any details, but will not have those minor construction details until they are further along in the development. He stated that they need to know that they have a final approval before they embark on this very large project that includes a new large building on Callowhill. Ms. Gutterman again stated that she agrees with the proposals, but needs to see the details before she can vote for final approval. Ms. Gutterman stated that they are not yet ready for a building permit. Mr. Powers noted that he has worked on many projects with the Commission and has typically worked out the low-level details with the staff after getting a final approval. Ms. Gutterman stated that the Committee could offer an approval of the design development. Mr. Cluver stated that the project looks great, but he also wanted to see more details. Ms. Gutterman stated that she is “turning them loose to develop it.” Ms. Gutterman stated that, rather than a “staff to review details” project, this would be an “Architectural Committee to review details” project. Ms. Hawkins stated that the applicants should provide a roof plan as well as floor plans for all levels and some section drawings. Ms. Gutterman again stated that she wanted to see drawings of flashing details. Mr. Cluver stated that he wanted to know the heights of the solariums. Mr. Slogoff responded that the elevation drawings provide those heights. Ms. Hawkins stated that the drawings should be at a larger scale. Mr. Cluver stated that the staff could review the molding profile details, but not other details, which the Committee should review. Mr. Genhart stated that the storefronts, solariums, and railings will be new additions. All other alterations, such as windows and doors, will be designed to match the historic elements. He contended that the staff can verify whether the replacement elements match the historic elements. Mr. Cluver agreed.

Mr. Slogoff stated that his team is working very hard to reuse a very difficult building. The vast majority of the proposed alterations are devised to return the building to its historic state. A few additional changes are required to make the rehabilitation feasible. The building cannot be reused for its original purpose. Mr. Cluver stated that he was in favor of the project. He stated that he was glad that they abandoned the proposed seven-story addition on the roof. Ms. Gutterman stated that she too approved of the project, but did not want to vote for a final approval until she had seen all of the details like the flashing details. She asked the applicants to generate the details and then submit an application to the Commission for final approval. The applicants stated that they need the assurances of an approval before they invest in the construction drawings.

Mr. Farnham stated that, before concluding the review, he wanted to poll the Committee on each major aspect of the project to confirm that Committee members agree that the proposals satisfy the Standards. He asked the Committee if it objected to the removal of the two balconies on the south façade and the installation of the windows in their places. Mr. Pearl observed that they cannot achieve a sufficient unit count to make the project profitable without removing the

balconies. He stated that they are proposing to spend an enormous amount of money to restore this building. The usable space is very limited, owing to the grain silos, which cannot be converted for use. Ms. Hawkins stated that she would like to the interior plans. The Committee members generally agreed that the proposed balcony removal was acceptable. Mr. Cluver asked why the solarium at the southeast corner appeared to overhang the parapet. Mr. Genhart stated that Mr. Cluver was misreading the elevation drawings. The southeastern corner of the building angles in. The solarium follows the angle of the building. Ms. Hawkins stated that she would prefer metal railings to the glass railings. Also, the railings should be installed at the inside of the parapet, not halfway between the inside and outside surfaces of the parapet. Mr. Farnham asked the Committee to address the major aspects of the application. He asked about the parking and storefronts. The Committee members agreed that the proposals met the Standards, but requested additional details. Mr. Farnham asked the Committee if it approved of the addition of the bridge, which would require a cut in the southern bay of the east façade at the second-floor level. Ms. Hawkins stated that the cut is indicated on Sheet SK-6, but the bridge itself is only shown in the rendering. Mr. Cluver stated that the bridge should connect to the east side of the granary, where it is proposed, away from the main views from 20th Street. Ms. Gutterman agreed that the east side of the granary, as proposed, is the appropriate connecting point for the bridge. Mr. Powers explained that the bridge would be limited to the infill area between the structural piers that define the bay. He also stated that most of the information that the Committee is requesting has already been provided. Mr. Farnham asked the Committee if the cutting of the opening and attachment of the bridge meets the Standards. They stated that it did, but they needed more information about the bridge to reach a final conclusion on it. Mr. Farnham asked the Committee to separate the details from the major alterations and reach a decision that would allow the developers to determine whether their project is feasible.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she would recommend approval in concept. The Committee members agreed that they should review the bridge, storefront, solarium, railing, flashing, and mullion details in the future. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Farnham if the Committee could convert the application from a request for final approval to an application for approval in concept. He noted that some contend that the Commission should not convert applications for final approval to in concept, but should deny those applications instead. Mr. Farnham stated that the conversion from final approval to approval in concept did pose an interesting legal question, but that question should be confronted by the Commission, not the Committee. He reminded the Committee that its recommendation is non-binding. He noted that the Commission may reject that recommendation and approve the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 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.