

**THE MINUTES OF THE 542ND STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**12 OCTOBER 2007
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18029
MICHAEL SKLAROFF, ESQ., CHAIR**

PRESENT

Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D., Vice Chair
James Brown, IV
Eileen Evans, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Vincent Rivera, AIA
David Schaaf, RA
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Erin Coté, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner I
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Assistant City Solicitor, Law Department

ALSO PRESENT

Thom Holden, Thom & Dave Marketing Design
Peter Dobrin, Philadelphia Inquirer
Christina Carter, John Milner Architects
Justin Detwiler, John Milner Architects
Jack Dundon, Alesker Dundon Architects
Elizabeth Warshawer, Curtis Institute
Sherman W. Smith, BJ& R
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Brett Webber, Brett Webber Architects
John Otto, Brett Webber Architects
Kathy Dowdell, AIA
Ben Sanchez, Esq., Ballard Spahr Ingersoll & Andrews, LLP
Richard DeMarco, Klehr Harrison, Harvey Branzberg & Ellers, LLP
Andrew Krouk
Eric Silverman
S. Schuchman
Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker Partners
Tom Hemmerick
John Milner, John Milner Architects
Thomas Chapman, Esq., Blank Rome
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzberg & Ellers, LLP
Ala Rabaday
James Keller, Vitetta

Nancy Goldenberg, Center City District
Charles, Loomis, Loomis McAfee Architects
Joe Schiavo, Old City Civic Association
Lonnie Hovey, AIA, Vittetta
Adam Laver, Esq., Blank Rome

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sugrue, the Vice Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 542nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:05 a.m. Commissioners Brown, Evans, Leonard, Merriman, Rivera, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, and Wilds joined Vice Chair Sugrue.

MINUTES OF THE 541ST STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Upon a motion proffered by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Ms. Merriman, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes, as corrected, of the 541st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 14 September 2007.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 10 SEPTEMBER 2007

Thomas Sugrue, Chair

1524 N. 17TH STREET

Owner: 17th Street Development Company, L.P.

Sherman W. Smith, III and Thomas Stafford, Principals

Applicant: Sherman W. Smith, III

History: 1886, Willis Hale, architect, demolished March 2007

Proposal: Rescind designation of 1524 N. 17th Street

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation recommended that the Philadelphia Historical Commission rescind the designation of 1524 N. 17th Street, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulation.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the rescission of the designation of the property at 1524 N. 17th Street, which is now a vacant lot. It proposes the rescission pursuant to §5.5.c.1.1 of the Rules & Regulations, which states:

The bases for the rescinding of an entry on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places are 1) the resource has ceased to meet the criteria for listing on the Register because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed...

The "qualities that caused its original entry" were "destroyed" when the building was demolished with a valid demolition permit. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued the permit on 19 March 2007 without referral to the Commission. The Department was unaware that it was designated as historic because it was not flagged as historic in the Department's computer. The building was demolished on or before 28 March 2007, when the staff visited the site after receiving a complaint call. The property had been vacant and in such poor condition that the Department considered it Imminently Dangerous. The current owners, who demolished the building, purchased this and several other properties from the Redevelopment Authority on 17 July 2006. They plan to develop a three-story, three-family residential building on the lot. The demolished building was part of an architecturally distinguished row of Queen Anne twins that lines the west side of the 1500-block of N. 17th Street. Noted architect Willis Hale designed the twins in 1886 for Peter A.B. Widener and William Elkins, streetcar magnates, real estate

developers, and Philadelphia's wealthiest men. The Commission designated the group of houses as historic on 3 March 1983.

The unique row of buildings includes bridges that connect adjacent twins across narrow pedestrian walkways. When the building at 1524 N. 17th Street was demolished, the bridge connecting it to its neighbor to the south at 1522 was completely demolished on both sides of the property line, leaving a gaping hole at the second story of 1522. The work to 1522, which is also designated as historic, was executed without a building permit or Commission approval.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the rescission application to the Commission. Sherman Smith, the attorney for the 17th Street Development Corporation, represented the rescission application.

Ms. Merriman asserted that the loss of the building was extremely unfortunate. She asked the staff what measures it was taking to prevent a similar occurrence. Mr. Farnham stated that the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places requires constant maintenance because addresses are always changing. He explained that the City now uses official addresses assigned by the Board of Revision of Taxes. The staff is working to ensure that the Register complies with the Board's official addresses, but it is a long and arduous task. The staff is devoting all the time it can to the task, which will take several more months. In the long term, the Commission must automate the maintenance of the Register. However, funding is not available to undertake that task at the moment. Mr. Sugrue acknowledged that the Commission does not have the resources to correct this problem immediately.

Mr. Wilds noted that this building stood at the end of the row of historic buildings and that its twin had been demolished before designation. He also noted that there are vacant lots, a later, very different apartment building, and a modern residential building to the north of this lot.

Mr. Sugrue asked about the building at 1522, which lost its half of the bridge during this demolition. Mr. Farnham informed the Commission that this property was recently sold.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance explained that the Redevelopment Authority had sold the property in question to the current developer. He noted that the RDA had neither notified the buyer that the property was designated nor required the buyer to retain or preserve the property according to the historic preservation ordinance. Mr. Gallery stated that the RDA had included other stipulations when it sold the property; it should have required its preservation and rehabilitation. He asked the Commission to formally request that RDA and other quasi-public agencies like the Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation consider historic designations when they transfer properties such as this one. Mr. Sugrue stated this was an excellent idea. He directed the staff to formally request that these agencies incorporate such notices and requirements into their disposition procedures.

Mr. Gallery stated the buildings on this block are historically significant. It is a "mini historic district." He asserted that any new construction on this lot should be appropriate to the character of the historic district. He contended that the recent construction at the north end of this block is not sympathetic to the historic character of the area. He stated that the Commission has refused to approve rescissions in the past to maintain control over new construction. He asked the Commission not to rescind this designation until the new construction is reviewed.

Mr. Wilds responded that the Commission does not have jurisdiction over most of this block. None of the properties on the east side of the street are designated. He disagreed that the block was tantamount to a “mini historic district.”

Mr. Smith, the developer’s attorney, explained to the Commission that his client demolished the building legally without any knowledge of its designation. He also disagreed that the area is a “mini district.” He noted that his client will rehabilitate, not demolish, 1532 N. 17th Street even though it is not designated.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and rescind the designation of 1524 N. 17th Street, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the Commission’s Rules & Regulation. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

300-318 N. 63RD STREET

Owner: North 63rd Realty Associates

Applicant: Hercules W. Grigos, Obermayer, Rebmann, Maxwell & Hippel, LLP

Proposal: Rescission of 300-18 N. 63rd Street from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation recommended that the Philadelphia Historical Commission rescind the designation of 300-18 N. 63rd Street, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the Commission’s Rules & Regulation.

OVERVIEW: Noted Philadelphia architect T. P. Chandler designed the Patterson Memorial Presbyterian Church at 300-18 N. 63rd Street. Built in two phases, the bell tower and parish house in 1884 and the main sanctuary in 1897, the building was designated to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places on 7 March 1974.

On 15 May 2001, the church filed a demolition permit application for the building. On 29 May 2001 the Department of Licenses issued a violation notice deeming the building unsafe. The Historical Commission referred the demolition permit application to the Hardship Committee on 13 June 2001. After a series of meetings, continuances, appeals and hearings, the Committee on Financial Hardship, at a meeting on 4 November 2002, voted to deny the Church’s demolition permit application based on financial hardship on grounds that the Church failed to demonstrate that it explored viable reuses for the property. On 8 November 2002, the Historical Commission voted to deny the issuance of a demolition permit to the Church and, following a rehearing on 12 November 2002, the Board of License & Inspection Review affirmed the denial of a demolition permit in a decision dated 27 November 2002. The Church appealed the Board’s decision. The appeal was heard in the Court of Common Pleas on 19 March 2003. On 1 August 2003, the Court issued an Order sustaining the Church’s appeal and ordering the City of Philadelphia to issue a demolition permit to the Church for demolition of the entire building. The City filed a Notice of Appeal to Commonwealth Court. On 2 March 2004, the Court affirmed the Order, reversing the decision of the Board of License & Inspection Review and ordering the City of Philadelphia to issue a demolition permit to the Church for demolition of the entire building. The building was later demolished to clear the site for a pharmacy.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the rescission application to the Commission. She noted that the minutes of the Committee on Historic Designation meeting had erroneously listed the City of Philadelphia as the property owner. The owner is North 63rd Street Realty Associates.

Mr. Sugrue lamented the loss of this building. He stated that its demolition was a tremendous loss to Philadelphia. He noted that there is nothing historic left at the site.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and rescind the designation of 300-18 N. 63rd Street, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1001-25 FILBERT STREET

Owner: 1001-1025 Filbert Street, c/o Criterion Group LLC

Proposal: Rescission of 1001-25 Filbert from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation recommended that the Philadelphia Historical Commission rescind the designation of 1001-25 Filbert Street, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulation.

OVERVIEW: The Harrison Building at 1001-25 Filbert Street, designed by Cope and Stewardson and built in 1893, was designated to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places on 2 February 1984. The building was destroyed by fire on 3 May 1984. A bus terminal has since been erected on the site.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the request for rescission to the Commission.

ACTION: Mr. Brown moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and rescind the designation of 1001-25 Filbert Street, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed voted unanimously.

401 W. JOHNSON STREET

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Proposal: Rescission of 401 W. Johnson Street from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation recommended that the Philadelphia Historical Commission rescind the designation of 401 W. Johnson Street, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulation.

OVERVIEW: The Mayfair at 401 W. Johnson Street, designed by Sugarman & Berger and built in 1925-1926, was designated to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in 4 February 1982. On 14 April 1999, the Commission approved the demolition of the building owing to financial hardship. The Commissions decision states: "approval of the proposal to demolish the Mayfair House on the grounds of financial hardship."

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the request for rescission to the Commission.

Mr. Wilds noted that the Fairmount Park Commission has landscaped the lot and incorporated it into the adjacent park. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance explained that his organization had held an easement on the property and agreed to the demolition on the condition that the lot was incorporated into the park. He stated that the demolition benefited the public.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and rescind the designation of 401 W. Johnson Street, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulation. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 SEPTEMBER 2007

Vincent Rivera, Chair

1610, 1612-1616, AND 1618 LOCUST STREET

Owner: HFGLocust LP, The Lenfest Group LLC, H. F. Gerry Lenfest, Curtis Institute

Applicant: Seth Cohen, Venturi Scott Brown Associates

History: 1610: 1893, John H. Converse House, Wilson Brothers, architects

Individually designated 2/28/67, Significant in district

1612-1616: c. 1960, Non-contributing in district

1618: c. 1855, Charles Custis Harrison House, John Notman, architect

new façade, Wilson Eyre, architect, 1888

Significant in district

Project: In concept - demolish all but 1610 and 1618 facades, construct 10-story music and dormitory building; restore historic facades

RECOMMENDATION OF TWO MEMBERS OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE: Ms. Voith and Mr. Thomas recommended that the Commission:

1. consider the demolitions of all but the facades of 1610 and 1618 Locust Street as demolitions as defined in §14-2207(2)(f) of the Philadelphia Code;
2. deny the application as submitted, owing to incompleteness; and
3. require a report substantiating the public interest claim that documents but is not limited to:
 - a. the selection of this site and any consideration of other sites;
 - b. the Curtis Institute's need for new facilities and the establishment of this architectural program;
 - c. the architectural alternatives considered during the design of the proposed building, especially those that would allow for the preservation of some or all of the historic buildings; and
 - d. the proposed preservation of the facades at 1610 and 1618 Locust Street.

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to demolish the entirety of the Non-contributing building at 1612-1616 Locust Street and all but the front facades of the Significant buildings at 1610 and 1618 Locust Street. In their places, it proposes to construct a ten-story building to house practice spaces and residences for students and faculty of the Curtis Institute, a music school located on the 1700-block of Locust Street. It also proposes to fully restore the historic brownstone facades at 1610 and 1618.

The new building would present a four-story façade on Locust Street that would incorporate the two historic facades. The new facade would align with the cornices lines and planes of the historic facades, restoring the street wall lost with the construction of the Locust Club building in the 1960s. The six-story residential tower would be set atop the four-story base about 45 feet back from the front façade. Photomontages demonstrate that the tower would be inconspicuous from Locust Street. At the rear, the building would rise ten stories from Latimer Street. The building would house offices, a dining hall and kitchen, a student lounge, and a loading dock

accessed from Latimer on the first floor. The loading-dock driveway would double as a drop-off lane. A three-story rehearsal room large enough to accommodate a full orchestra would dominate the second, third, and fourth floors. Those floors would also house practice, teaching, recording, and instrument storage rooms. Dormitory rooms would be located at the rear at the third to ninth floors. The tenth floor would house visiting faculty apartments.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham explained to the Commission that the applicant has supplemented his application since two members of the Architectural Committee reviewed it without a quorum on 25 September 2007. The applicant requests that the Commission continue the review for one month and refer the supplemented application to the Architectural Committee for review on 23 October 2007.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asked that the record reflect that only two members of the Architectural Committee, not the three needed for a quorum, reviewed the original application at the Committee on 25 September 2007.

Richard DeMarco, the attorney for the Curtis Institute, requested the continuance and the review of the supplemented application at the 23 October 2007 meeting of the Architectural Committee.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to continue the application for one month to the Commission's 9 November 2007 meeting, at the request of the applicant, and to refer the supplementary materials to the Architectural Committee for review at its 23 October 2007 meeting. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, passed unanimously.

48-50 S. FRONT STREET, 103 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: Centra Associates, Cheswall LP, Robert and Harvey Spears

Applicant: Richard C. DeMarco Esq.

History: vacant lot, historic buildings demolished in 2007 under court order

Project: Convert vacant lot to parking lot

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes paving a vacant lot where, until recently, three historic buildings stood. It also proposes installing a landscaped perimeter and signage to advertise the parking. No drawings have been submitted to illustrate the signs or the planters.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron informed the Commission that the applicant has requested a one-month continuance to allow the Architectural Committee to review supplementary materials.

Richard DeMarco, the attorney for the property owners, reiterated the request and noted that the supplementary materials would be submitted shortly.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to continue the application for one month to the Commission's 9 November 2007 meeting, at the request of the applicant, and to refer the supplementary materials to the Architectural Committee for review at its 23 October 2007 meeting. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

503 S. 41ST STREET

Owner/Applicant: Ala Rabady

History: c. 1845; individually designated

Project: Legalize through-wall air conditioners

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

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for the legalization of eleven through-wall air conditioners. The sleeves for the units cut through the brownstone south façade. The application lacks a façade drawing or a photograph of the units that have been installed in the façade. The units would be more appropriately placed on the roof in an inconspicuous location.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Ala Rabady represented the application.

Mr. Wilds stated that the application did not provide adequate information on the alterations proposed for legalization. He asked where the units are located. Mr. Baron stated that they are on the side of the building. Mr. Wilds asked if they are flush with the exterior face of the wall. Mr. Baron stated that they are flush. Mr. Sugrue agreed that the application was incomplete. He stated that, with no contextualizing drawings or photographs, it is difficult to assess the application. Mr. Schaaf asked if the photographs included with the application showed completed work. Mr. Baron informed the Commission that the work was stopped while underway owing to the lack of an approval or permit. Mr. Rabady stated that he was unaware of the need for a permit. He suggested that the Commission continue the matter to allow him to engage a draftsman to prepare the requisite documentation. Mr. Wilds noted that he had already engaged an engineer. He also stated that an engineer had designed the installation of the units. Mr. Wilds asked why he had not sought the Commission's approval and a building permit. Mr. Rabady stated that he was unaware of the procedure.

Ms. Leonard asked Mr. Baron if there was any alternative to mounting the units in the wall. Mr. Baron responded that this type of through-wall installation is unusual. Typically, one locates a condenser on the roof and runs ductwork into the interior of the building.

Mr. Rabady stated that removing the units would cause more damage to historic fabric than retaining them. He claimed that they are not visible from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Sugrue asked Mr. Rabady if he owns other buildings. He stated that he does. Mr. Sugrue asked him if he ever has been issued a building permit. Mr. Rabady stated that he has never undertaken major work before. Mr. Sugrue stated that he is troubled by the loss of historic fabric and the impact on mortar and rubblestone wall. Mr. Rabady explained that he will have a drain kit installed with every unit. Mr. Rivera noted that the units will be very noisy.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the owner may have sought an engineering solution, but he did not seek an architectural solution. He stated that the illegal work had distressed the entire wall. Mr. Rabady offered to make cosmetic changes to improve the appearance of the wall.

ACTION: Mr. Brown moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

119-121 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: Winig Partnership L.L.C

Applicant: Renee Gross, Albert Taus and Associates

History: c 1835, contributing to Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District

Project: Replace and add awnings with signage

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend the approval of the proposed awning for 119 S 18th Street, slightly reduced in scale to fit within the stucco band; and denial of the proposed awning for 121 S. 18th Street, but approval of a traditional shed type awning for location, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of two awning-like signs over the doors of the storefronts at 119 and 121 S. 18th Street. The awning over 119 S. 18th Street extends above the storefront.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission and informed the members that, since the Committee meeting, the applicant has submitted a plan for a traditional awning for 121 S. 18th Street that complies with the Architectural Committee recommendation.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve of the proposed awning for 119 S 18th Street, slightly reduced in scale to fit within the stucco band; and deny the proposed awning for 121 S. 18th Street, but approve a traditional shed-type awning for location, with the staff to review details. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

320 S. 19TH STREET

Owner: Salem Schuchman and Barbara Klock

Applicant: Christina Carter, Milner & Associates

History: 1895, Furness Evans, architects;

individually designated and significant to Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District

Project: Cut brick and terra cotta wall to make parking area and garage type gate.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised proposal with the painted-wood, sectional garage door, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This building, which was constructed as a single-family residence, has long been used for law offices. The applicants are considering the purchase of the building to return it to its single-family residential use, but will only purchase it if they can create parking at the rear. The historic carriage house and most of the yard were subdivided off many years ago. The application proposes cutting a parking entrance into an existing brick and terra-cotta fence wall and installing a mechanical painted-metal roll-up door. Other work includes removal of fire-escape and alterations to a stair well hidden behind the wall.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Thomas Chapman and architect John Milner represented the application.

Ms. Merriman asked if the application requested in-concept or final approval. Mr. Baron stated that the detailed drawings merited a review for final approval. He also noted that the applicant is willing to comply with the Committee recommendation and substitute a wood door for the metal door. Mr. Chapman agreed with Mr. Baron's assessment and confirmed that his client is now proposing a wood sectional overhead door.

Mr. Wilds asked about the character of this block of Delancey. Mr. Chapman stated that there are 12 garages and several parking pads on the block.

Mr. Schaaf commented that the proposed parking space is very small; the car doors may not be able to be opened. Mr. Milner stated that the prospective buyers are shopping for a new, smaller car.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance supported the application and the return to a single-family use.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and grant final approval of the revised proposal with the painted-wood, sectional garage door, with the staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1832 GREEN STREET

Owner: 1832 Green Street, LP

Applicant: Wayne Egolf

History: c. 1875; contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Install lighting fixtures and illuminate façade.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the windows and doors, owing to incompleteness; denial of the masonry painting at the front façade and the stuccoing of the rear facade, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9; approval of the proposed demolition and construction of side and rear additions, provided the rear additions are clad in wood, the historic rear bay is restored, and the paint is removed and the masonry at the front façade is restored, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize façade alterations including paint removal, powerwashing, pointing, and the painting of lintels, sills, watertable, and door surround.

This application also proposes the demolition of a later first-story addition on the rear ell and construction of additions on the first and third stories. The first-story addition would have modern French doors with transoms and a deck. The first-story rear is minimally visible from public rights-of-way. A deck would be added to the rear of the second-story bay. The third-story bay addition would be flush with the existing second-story bay with one-over-one windows. The entire rear elevation would be stuccoed.

An addition is also proposed in the side yard of the rear ell at the second and third-story levels. This addition would have no windows and would be stuccoed.

This application proposes all new windows and doors; however, shop drawings have not been submitted for review.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Architect Jack Dundon represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked if the staff had reviewed the additional information submitted to the Commission. Mr. Baron responded that the staff had reviewed it. He reported that it complied with the recommendation of the Committee, but additional information was needed on the

pointing and windows. Mr. Sugrue asked if the staff could review the additional information. Mr. Baron stated that it could. Mr. Dundon stated that the revised application complies with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the windows and doors, owing to incompleteness; deny the masonry painting at the front façade and the stuccoing of the rear facade, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9; approve the proposed demolition and construction of side and rear additions, provided the rear additions are clad in wood, the historic rear bay is restored, and the paint is removed and the masonry at the front façade is restored, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

217 CHURCH STREET, UNIT 4

Owner: Adam Schran

Applicant: Charles Loomis

History: 1835

individually designated 10/30/1974, contributing to Old City Historic District; 12/12/2003

Project: Expand roof deck

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the expansion of an existing wood roof deck about six feet closer to roof edge on the main block of a four-story building. The existing deck has two levels, an upper level toward the rear and a lower level toward the front façade. The deck would be rebuilt at one level, about two inches above the current height of the lower or front section. A painted metal guardrail, planters, and a spa are also proposed.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Architect Charles Loomis represented the application.

Ms. Sell explained that she reviewed a mock-up at the site, which demonstrated that the proposed deck will be visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Loomis stated that his client would like to expand the deck, but does not want it to be visible. He stated that he would revise the design to preclude public visibility. Mr. Wilds stated that the Commission would look forward to reviewing his revised submission.

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

100 S. BROAD STREET

Owner: LTB Limited Partnership

Applicant: Nancy Goldenberg

History: north building: 1897, D.H. Burnham & Co.; designated 8/2/1973

south building: 1902, D.H. Burnham & Co. and Horace Trumbauer; designated 8/2/1973

Project: Install lighting fixtures and illuminate façade

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of LED light fixtures at various levels on the façade of the Land Title Building. The lighting of these towers is one phase of the Center City District's Avenue of the Arts Façade Lighting project, which will light several buildings along S. Broad Street. The lights will be mounted into horizontal moldings and ledges with plastic and stainless steel anchors. The introductions of many mounting holes in the masonry and terra cotta will eventually lead to the failures of the materials.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Nancy Goldenberg of the Center City District and architect Lonnie Hovey represented the application.

Ms. Sell explained to the Commission that the applicants had submitted a revised proposal that addressed the concerns about attachment. Mr. Schaaf asked for a description of the proposed weather resistant board and its attachment. Mr. Hovey stated that the mounting board would be made of Trex. It does not rot or require painting. The light fixtures will attach to the Trex boards and the boards will attach to the building in the mortar joints.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance expressed concerns about the proposed the installation. He asked if the staff had referred the revised proposal to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Baron stated that the staff had not referred them to the Committee. Mr. Gallery noted that the Preservation Alliance holds a facade easement on the property. He reported that the plans had not been submitted to the Alliance. Mr. Sugrue asked for the staff's opinion on the revised installation method. Mr. Baron explained that installing into mortar joints is preferable. Mr. Rivera suggested that the revised plans be referred to the Architectural Committee at its next meeting. Mr. Wilds disagreed and contended that the project should be approved without additional review.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the revised application. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 1. Mr. Rivera dissented.

231-235 N. 2ND STREET

Owner: Zeev Shenkman

Applicant: Adam Laver

History: constructed c. 2004, approved by the Commission in September 2002

233-235: individually designated

Project: Construct one-story rooftop addition, alter side façades and storefronts

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised design, which retains the storefront pilasters.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a one-story addition, clad in vertical standing seam zinc and recessed from the front façade, on the roof of this parking garage. Also proposed is the enclosure of floors five through seven with an infill of translucent panels and a "green

screen” for the lowers floors on the side elevations. At the first floor, the wood panels and pilasters would be removed and replaced with metal and glass storefront with zinc panels and structural columns faced in stone veneer.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. No one represented the application.

Mr. Wilds noted that this building was constructed pursuant to a series of conditions established by the Commission after the historic buildings on the site were demolished. Ms. Evans asked about the purpose of the addition. Ms. Cote stated that the use of the building was changing from parking to storage.

ACTION: Mr. Brown moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve of the revised design, which retains the storefront pilasters. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1838 GREEN STREET

Owner: Elinore Cataleno

Applicant: Kevin Clark

History: c. 1859; contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Install vinyl windows

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace three aluminum sash windows at the rear mansard dormer windows with single-light fixed vinyl windows.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. Kevin Clark of KC Contracting represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked about visibility. Ms. Cote replied that the windows in question are visible from N. 19th Street. Mr. Clark explained that the building originally had two rear dormers. In the 1970s, the dormer windows were altered and new windows were added. He stated that the sash are now deteriorated and need replacement. He agreed to amend his application to propose wood, not aluminum, sash. Mr. Wilds suggested submitting a new application proposing the appropriate windows to fill the historic dormer openings completely. He stated that the staff could review and approve such an application. Mr. Baron stated that the historic dormers should have two-over-two wood windows; the non-historic openings should be one-over-one wood windows.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Evans seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2500 S. 17TH STREET

Owner: Bill Bechtel

Applicant: Bill Bechtel

History: 1908; contributing to Girard Estate Historic District, 11/10/1999

Project: Install windows, construct second-story rear addition, replace concrete stairs

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of a cantilevered addition, provided the cantilevered section looks like a bay clad with clapboards, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a second-story addition at the rear of the property. This property is located on the corner of S. 17th and Porter Streets and the addition would be highly visible. The addition would be set back from the side elevation of the main block and cantilever over the rear garden, supported by columns that would stand on the rear garden wall. This proposal offers two options for the treatment of the rear wall of the main block. Option one proposes to place the addition one foot way from the rear wall of the main block. Option two proposes a six-inch reveal and infilling the second floor rear windows. The addition would be parged in stucco and topped with a simple brick corbelled cornice. This application also proposes to replace the concrete steps at the side entrance with an open concrete stair to allow light in the basement window. The installation of windows is proposed but no details are provided.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. No one represented the application.

The Girard Estates Area Residents submitted a letter opposing the submission. It was distributed to the Commission members.

Mr. Wilds noted that the revised drawings responded to the Committee's recommendation. He agreed with the Committee that the treatment over the extension of the addition as a bay was preferable. Mr. Wilds asked the staff to confirm that the stucco color was appropriate.

Ms. Merriman stated that the columns supporting the extension appeared inadequate. Mr. Wilds asked if the Department of Licenses & Inspections would require plans developed by an engineer. Ms. Evans stated that the Department would verify that the structural plans were appropriate. Mr. Wilds noted that the Architectural Committee's solution to design this extension like a bay was excellent.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the cantilevered addition, provided the cantilevered section looks like a bay clad with clapboards, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 5 to 4. Ms. Evans, Leonard, Merriman, and Schlotterbeck dissented.

5335 KNOX STREET

Owner / Applicant: Tom Hemmerick

History: c. 1890, attributed to George Pearson, architect; designated 3/29/1966

Project: Add screen porches, decks, and parking area at rear

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the parking area and screened porches; denial of the decks as submitted, but approval of decks with simple picket railings instead of the pents, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct rear screened porches and decks as well as parking. The proposed work would be at the rear of the property but visible from Penn Street. The screened porches would be attached to non-historic additions to the building. The proposed decks would be on top of these non-historic additions. However, access to the decks would require cutting down two historic windows at the second-floor rear. The owner proposes two detail schemes for the railings. One scheme proposes extending an original pent roof that delineates the ground and second floors to the two non-historic additions. This pent roof would block visibility of the railing. The other scheme proposes extending the pent roof only to the rear addition closest to Penn Street and installing a wood picket railing on the second deck. The proposed doors to both decks would be French doors with a light configuration reminiscent of the existing Queen Anne window. Finally the applicant proposes to construct a five-car parking area at the rear of the property. The property is encircled by a historic iron fence, which has a historic gate with granite posts. The parking area would use this gate as an access point along the fence and would not require any cuts into it.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Tom Hemmerick represented the application.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the architectural drawings were very difficult to read. Mr. Danta provided a more legible set of drawings to the Commission.

Responding to Mr. Sklaroff's question, Mr. Hemmerick stated that the proposed driveway corresponded to an existing opening to the historic fence, which has two stone pillars and a gate matching the fence. However, there is no curb cut at the historic gate. A curb cut would be added. Mr. Hemmerick stated that he would remove the pent eaves on the non-historic additions from the design. He also acknowledged that he would work with the staff to finalize some details.

ACTION: Mr. Brown moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the parking area and screened porches; deny the decks as submitted, but approve decks with simple picket railings instead of the pents, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9. Ms. Evans seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

231 S. 24TH STREET

Owner: Andrew J. Krouk

Applicant: Brett Webber

History: c. 1835, contributing to Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Restore main block, convert rear addition to restaurant, add signage

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, provided that the sign does not attach to the historic building and the blocked window is replaced with the historically appropriate window, frame, and shutters with the shutters latched in the closed position, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to largely restore the main block and alter a rear addition on this corner property. This property was historically used for commercial purposes and that use continues today. The applicant proposes to remove unsympathetic additions to the façade of the main block, such as a pent roof, window grills, air conditioned units and signage. The applicant proposes to install new shutters, a new attic window and a new door. Translucent film will be applied to two existing doors and one existing window. The proposed restoration details need some modifications, but the overall design is in keeping with the period of the property. The rear of the property currently has a non-historic wood-clad addition. The applicant proposes to replace the street-frontage of this addition with a new storefront system. The addition will be accented with a fiber cement rain-screen system and a decorative glass panel. Planters are proposed for the sidewalk and parapet level. A sign is proposed, which would extend both the addition and the historic main block. This sign would be metal and would attach to the historic main block at four attachment points.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Brett Webber represented the application.

Mr. Danta distributed two letters to the Commission regarding the proposal.

Mr. Wilds summarized the proposal; the application proposes to restore the historic portion of the building, remove the non-historic pent eave, relocate the entrance to the restaurant to the rear addition, and rehabilitate the non-historic rear addition. Mr. Webber stated that he is proposing to reconstruct the façade of the non-historic addition. He noted that the revised proposal incorporates all the recommendations of the Committee. He stated that he plans to clad the rear addition with terra cotta system, which is sympathetic to the surrounding neighborhood. He also noted that he reduced the size of the storefront window in the rear addition, as suggested by the Committee and neighbors. Mr. Webber stated that the sign will not attach to the historic building. He also explained that the existing roof deck on the rear addition would be retained and upgraded. A new parapet with a matte metal finish would be installed, essentially concealing the wood rail. Mr. Wilds asked about the proposed planter. Mr. Webber stated that he is proposing planter cover made of painted steel that would encapsulate a planter with a drain. The windows would operable and would be painted like the windows in the historic building.

Mr. Sugrue noted the letter from Jonathan Barnett, a neighbor. In the letter, he states that the existing luncheonette is a non-conforming use and asks if a zoning variance would necessary to use the space as a restaurant. Mr. Webber stated that the appropriate zoning permits would be sought.

Jim Keller, an architect and neighbor, stated that the storefront should be wood, not metal, which is inappropriate for the context. He suggested a more appropriate design that would relate better to the materials and scale of the surroundings. Mr. Webber countered that the window system has been significantly reduced in scale to better fit the neighborhood. Mr. Wilds noted the neighbor's objection to the proposed anodized finish on the storefront window. Mr. Webber responded that he is no longer proposing an anodized finish, but would paint the window instead.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the revised application, with the staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

6000-6002 GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Owner: Joseph L. Messa Jr.

Applicant: Joseph Paoletti

History: c. 1790, designated 5/28/1957

Project: Legalize vinyl windows, stucco side addition, repair trim

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the legalization of the vinyl windows, pursuant to Standard 6; denial of the cornice repair, owing to incompleteness; approval of the stucco repair, provided it has a smooth finish, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize vinyl windows installed throughout the building. This building is an important eighteenth-century house on Germantown Avenue. Owing to settlement, some of the window openings are not square and the new vinyl replacements were installed within new square openings that have been built-down from the original openings with framing lumber. However, most of the original frames remain. The application also proposes to stucco a side addition. This addition was stuccoed at the time of designation. Lastly, the applicant proposes to restore and repair the wood cornices, but has not provided any details. However, if the cornice repair is a strict restoration, then it can be approved at the staff level.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Joseph Paoletti represented the application.

Mr. Paoletti stated that, since the Committee meeting, he produced detailed drawings for the cornice repair. Mr. Wilds noted that a restoration could be approved at the staff level.

Mr. Wilds asked the applicant about his plans for the vinyl windows in light of the Committee's recommendation of denial. The applicant stated that he attempted to replicate the original windows as shown in a photograph. He now understands that vinyl windows are not appropriate. Mr. Wilds stated that the historic windows should be restored.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the legalization of the vinyl windows, pursuant to Standard 6; deny the cornice repair, owing to incompleteness; approve the stucco repair, provided it has a smooth finish, with the staff to review details. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

519 S. JUNIPER STREET

Applicant: Benjamin Sanchez, Esq., Ballard Spahr, Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP

Owners: Eric and Rachel Silverman

History: c.1835; individually designated 1984

Project: Alter and legalize alterations to windows, doors, lintels, and shutters

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposed alterations and legalizations, provided the door surround on Rodman Street is restored to its historic appearance, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: The application proposes legalizations and approvals for an early nineteenth-century rowhouse. It was constructed with a storefront with two corner commercial doors and a residence upstairs with a door from Rodman Street.

In 2006, the Commission's staff requested violations for work to a number of properties on Juniper Street including 519. The violation reached the new homeowner immediately after a sale. The terms of the agreement of sale however specified that the seller would correct any violations. The seller had installed aluminum-clad wood windows in the various facades of the building on all floors, decorative Fypon lintels with keystones above doors and windows where there had been none, and plastic shutters with incorrect panels where there had been none at the time of designation. Incorrect doors had been installed in the storefront doorways at some time after 1981. The seller installed a fluted pilaster door surround at the residential doorway on Rodman Street.

The application proposes a compromise in which the applicants would remove the plastic shutters and the Fypon lintels in all locations except over the Rodman Street residential door and restore the masonry. They would install correct wood shutters with real metal hardware. They would remove the inappropriate main storefront window and install the correct double-hung window. They seek the legalization of the upper floor aluminum-clad Pella Windows, the doors at all locations, and the surround at the Rodman Street residential door.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Eric Silverman and attorney Ben Sanchez represented the application.

Mr. Sanchez stated that his clients agreed with the Architectural Committee recommendation in most regards; however, they would like to retain the Rodman Street door with pilasters. He stated that it is very "dear" to his clients. They like the look of it. They are spending a large amount of money to correct the problems created by the former owner and do not want to remove the Fypon frame without knowing what is under it. They worry that they may need to invest significant amounts of money to restore the brick under the Fypon frame. Mr. Sanchez stated his client is in litigation with the previous owner, but is unsure of the outcome of that litigation. Mr. Wilds asked how the Fypon door surround was attached to the building. Mr. Sanchez replied that he does not know. He stated that the owners are concerned about deteriorating brick under the Fypon. He stated that the owners would not have purchased the property if they had known about the violations. Mr. Wilds disagreed with Mr. Sanchez regarding the potential cost of repairing the brick under the fake door surround. He opined that the brick may need some minor repointing. He again noted that his clients like the look of the Fypon door surround with decorative lintel. Mr. Sugrue stated that the Commission is concerned with history, not aesthetics. Mr. Sanchez stated that it would cost his clients \$20,000 to complete the proposed corrections.

Mr. Sanchez asked the Commission for additional time to make the necessary corrections. Ms. Evans stated that the owner would have six months to start the work once the building permit was issued. The permit would remain valid as long as the owner continued to work. She suggested that the owner could contact the appropriate building inspector and inform him that they are attempting to correct the situation.

Mr. Schaaf suggested that the owners remove all of the offending Fypon including the door surround. He stated that this building was a modest house originally. It would not have had such ostentatious ornament. She ornament would only be found on the house of a dignitary.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposed alterations and legalizations, provided the door surround on Rodman Street is restored to its historic appearance, with the staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 1. Ms. Leonard dissented.

219-229 SOUTH 18TH STREET

Owner: Rittenhouse Regency Affiliates

Applicant: Richard Stokes

History: 1929, Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects;
contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Alter storefronts

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the storefronts are one darker color, not two-tone; the window openings in the folding storefront doors are squared off; the awnings are reduced in size; and the signage is reduced at the corner, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter two facades on 18th and Locust Streets. The Committee reviewed a similar proposal to add a French bistro to this building last month. The applicant has made the following revisions to the proposal. The continuous retractable awning has been broken up into three sections on Locust Street, with gaps between the window openings, and three sections on 18th Street, with similar gaps. At the Locust Street side, the slate and wood panels have been removed. On the 18th Street façade, wood panels have been removed from above the doors at two openings, and from the two brick piers between the doors. However, two back-painted signs would be attached on either side of the larger pier. The application still proposes to install new folding painted wood doors with rounded glazing for all the existing openings.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. Business owner Stephen Starr, Michael Palermo of the Starr Restaurant Organization, attorney Carl Primavera, and architect Richard Stokes represented the application.

Mr. Stokes displayed a rendering documenting a design that incorporated the recommendations of the Committee. In the rendering, the storefront doors had been squared, the storefront had been painted one color, not two, and the width of the awnings had been reduced. Mr. Primavera emphasized that the architect had redesigned the restaurant facades to comply with the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds noted that the awnings on the 18th Street façade do not align with the second-story windows. Mr. Stokes reported that the signage at the corner had been reduced in size to expose the masonry piers, as the Committee had requested. Mr. Primavera stated his client had traveled to Paris and collected original objects and materials to

create an authentic Parisian café. He noted that the alterations to the exterior are reversible. Mr. Stokes remarked that he is proposing to undo the unsympathetic alterations to the corner, which were undertaken in the 1970s for the Sheraton Hotel. He stated that the window openings will also be restored. He will use salvaged brick from the building as well as new but matching granite. Mr. Primavera offered to remove the scallops on the awnings, but Messrs. Stokes and Starr asserted that the scallops were essential to the design. Mr. Starr described his philosophy for the design of the restaurant, stating that the décor must evoke an authentic French bistro.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the design had been greatly improved.

Mr. Primavera noted that the applicants no longer agree to remove the scallops from the awnings.

ACTION: Mr. Brown moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the storefronts are one darker color, not two-tone; the window openings in the folding storefront doors are squared off; the awnings are reduced in size; and the signage is reduced at the corner, with the staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 11:35 a.m., Ms. Merriman moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by

the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.