

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

**TUESDAY, 16 DECEMBER 2008
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DAVID AMBURN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

David Amburn, Chair
John Cluver
Rudy D'Alessandro
Shawn Evans
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

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

Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor

ALSO PRESENT

R. Brown, Louis Berger Group, Inc.
Gretchen Pfaehler, Ewing Cole
Michael Allietta, International Capital Management
Oscar Gomes, Ewing Cole
Michelle Mardenborough, International Capital Management
Andrew Jarvis, Ewing Cole
John Goodchild, Cancer Treatment Centers of America
Christopher E. Cummings, Esq., Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young
Sabra Smith, Preservation Alliance
Joseph Menkevich, Northwood Home Owners
Debbie Klak, Historical Society of Frankford
Joanne Clare, Friends of Greenwood
Leslie Potter, Esq.
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzberg & Ellers
Frank Kakos, Kakos Architects
Coretta Irrera
Adrian Paulus
Bruce Rogers
Lawrence Gilbert, Architect
Richard Thom, R.W. Thom Architect
Fred Mauerer
Brendan Kelley

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Amburn called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman and Pentz and Messrs. Cluver, D'Alessandro, Evans, and McCoubrey joined him.

800 ADAMS AVENUE

Owner: The Greenwood Cemetery Company

Applicant: Oscar F. Gomes

History: house c. 1830; cemetery c. 1865 for the Knights of Pythias

Project: Redevelop southern portion of the site, restore northern section with house

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to redevelop a portion of the southern half of Greenwood Cemetery for a cancer care hospital. The proposal includes two major components, the redevelopment of a portion the site and the restoration of the character defining elements of the site.

The southern half of the cemetery presents the most deteriorated conditions. It is also the least character defining portion of the site. A cancer-care hospital stands on the adjacent parcel to the south. The applicant proposes to expand its hospital facilities and create adequate parking. The expansion would involve selective disinterment of human remains. This process would be overseen by the Orphan's Court.

The proposed restoration work concentrates on the northern half of the cemetery. The applicant proposes an overall maintenance scheme in which the landscape would be cleaned to regain its late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century appearance. This would include the removal of overgrown vegetation, the re-exposure of paths, resetting of toppled monuments, etc. The application includes the demolition of non-historic out buildings, whose loss would not present any adverse effect to the historic integrity of the site. Most of the restoration work would be concentrated on the house at the main entrance to the cemetery. The applicant proposes exterior restoration. However, the notations for this portion are not specific enough to merit a final approval as presented. The staff contends that the proposed alterations do not adversely affect the historic character of the site and its historic significance. However, the final details of the proposed restoration should be reviewed by the staff prior to execution.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept of the redevelopment of the southern half of the site for the expansion of the hospital complex, provided the exterior envelope of the house is stabilized, the half-gable rear ell is retained, and a copy of the archeological report is deposited in the Philadelphia Historical Commission archives, with the staff to review all restoration details, pursuant to Standard 2, 4, 5, 6, and 10 and the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Sites.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Oscar Gomes, Andrew Jarvis, and Gretchen Pfaehler, developer Mike Galliano, and hospital representative John Goodchild represented the application.

Mr. Danta noted that the application lacks some details and asked the applicants if they were seeking an in-concept or final review. Ms. Pfaehler confirmed that the application was for an in-concept review.

Mr. Goodchild summarized the history and mission of Cancer Treatment Centers of America. He explained that the first hospital was founded outside of Chicago, Illinois. A second hospital was established outside of Tulsa, Oklahoma. The Philadelphia hospital is the third and its

geographical target area spans the northeastern seaboard. The Philadelphia hospital specializes in complex types of cancer. Mr. Goodchild noted that the organization prides itself in providing the highest quality healthcare available in a comfortable setting for the patients and their families. He also explained that the hospital is committed to the Philadelphia area and plans to increase its work force from 530 to 1000 employees by 2010. The proposed expansion is part of the organization's core mission to provide the highest possible cancer treatment and represents its commitment to the Philadelphia area.

Mr. Galliano stated that he represented Greenwood Holdings of Philadelphia, which is an affiliated but separate entity from the hospital. He noted that Greenwood Holdings is now the majority share holder of the cemetery company. He explained that the current business agreement between the cemetery and the hospital benefits both parties and will finally provide the funds necessary for upkeep the property.

Mr. Jarvis presented the conceptual proposal. He stated the southern 24 acres no longer retain their historic significance. They are covered by overgrown vegetation. He stated that, in his opinion, only the northern section maintains the cohesive design of a mid nineteenth-century rural cemetery. He also noted that the southern half has the fewest number of burials and that the proposed hospital expansion would only disturb a small percentage of those. He explained that the intent is to relocate the graves to the northern section. The cemetery records show that few burials took place next to proposed site of the hospital expansion owing to the presence of a creek that ran through the property. He noted that this area is a low lying slope that would not be very suitable for burials. This area will be encircled by a green buffer delineating the perimeter of the proposed expansion and separating it from the northern half of the cemetery. Mr. Jarvis stated that the green buffer would block views of the proposed expansion from the cemetery.

Ms. Pfaehler described the proposed pathway restoration. She acknowledged that much more documentation and research must be undertaken on the house, and its date and ownership before the plans for the stabilization of the exterior of the historic house can be finalized. She stated that the receiving vault entrance is in good condition, but that the interior of the masonry vault shows signs of stress owing to the root system of an adjacent large tree. She noted that the intent is to stabilize the vault. She explained that the proposal includes the stabilization of the house and a restoration of its exterior. She noted that the porch windows are not real but are tromp'oeil paintings on plywood that very realistically mimic the real windows that survive behind the plywood planks. She added that the interior and foundations have been compromised and are deteriorating. The intent is to stabilize and stop interior deterioration but not to undertake a full restoration of the interior at this point. There is no proposed use for the building at this point. They propose to retain the stone perimeter wall and perform minor masonry and iron restoration.

Ms. Pentz asked why only half of the cemetery had been maintained through the years. Joanne Clair of the Friends of Greenwood Cemetery stated that years ago a highway was proposed to go through the southern section of the property and it appears that this plan caused the owner to stop selling plots on the southern half of the property and subsequently stopped maintaining it.

Mr. Cluver asked about the density of burials of the southern section. Mr. Jarvis answered that all burials have been mapped and coded by an archaeology firm that would oversee the disinterment and re-interment of all bodies. He noted that all headstones would be moved. The bodies would be re-interred in an empty section at the northeast corner of the cemetery. He

noted that the southern section shows a drastically lower density than the northern section where the historic house and vault are located. Mr. Evans asked about the treatment of the buffer zone between the hospital property and the cemetery. Mr. Jarvis explained that the hospital did not want the cemetery to be evident to the patients at the hospital for obvious reasons. He noted that the plan proposes to utilize the natural drop in the terrain where the creek once existed and the defined green edge created by the overgrowth as natural buffers. In addition a ring road is proposed for the hospital property that would further shield the hospital complex from the cemetery. He clarified that the road would not be obvious to visitors to the cemetery owing to the green buffer.

Mr. Cluver requested clarification on the proposed height and massing of the new buildings and garage on the hospital expansion site. Mr. Jarvis explained that the height of the new buildings would be equal to that of the existing hospital buildings, which currently stand at five stories high with a penthouse.

Mr. Cluver asked about the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission over the proposed new construction. Mr. Farnham stated that the current hospital site is not designated; the cemetery is. The Commission would retain jurisdiction over the entire cemetery and would review the new hospital buildings. He also explained the Commission and the cemetery entered into a memorandum of agreement at the time of designation that governs the review of applications for Greenwood Cemetery. He noted that the Historical Commission enjoys plenary jurisdiction over the house, receiving vault, perimeter wall and gate, and grounds, but agreed to treat the other buildings on the site as non-contributing. All of the buildings that the applicant proposes to demolish are considered non-contributing. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission agreed not to require reviews for burials, maintenance of the grounds, and repaving in kind. He reported that he has visited the site on numerous occasions and observed that the hospital is not currently visible from the maintained portion of the cemetery. Mr. Farnham noted that the staff supports this proposal as a great opportunity to save a historic resource. He noted that the house and grounds had slipped into grave disrepair during the years of internecine legal battles over the ownership. He stated that he had concluded that the house would be lost to neglect several years. He concluded, stating the he strongly supports the project, which will save the house and grounds while sacrificing an overgrown portion of the cemetery that has lost all integrity and holds no historic significance. Mr. Cluver asked if demolition by neglect proceedings had ever been initiated. Mr. Farnham responded that the neglect of the southern portion of the graveyard had occurred decades before the designation of the site. He reported that the Commission had inspected the property with the Department of Licenses & Inspections a few years ago and the Department issued numerous violations for the neglect of the house and other features, but that the violations were essentially unenforceable because the ownership was in question and the cemetery company was penniless.

Mr. Evans inquired whether the proposed stabilization would be reviewed by the Committee. Mr. Farnham stated that this was an application in concept and would not lead to the issuance of a building permit. He also noted that a faithful restoration of the house could be approved by staff and would not necessarily be referred to the Committee and the Commission. He concluded that the review process would depend on the final proposal.

Mr. Evans asked what would happen if new research showed that the apparently non-historic structures had historic value. Mr. Farnham assured the Committee that those structures had no historic significance. They are mid twentieth-century buildings are in very poor condition. He also reminded the Committee of the binding agreement that must be followed when reviewing

applications for the site. Mr. Evans suggested that the Commission not approve any demolition without additional documentation.

Joseph Mankiewicz, the president of the Northwood Association, distributed documentation and asserted that the property was the country estate of Benjamin Rush, a signer of the Declaration. He recounted the various legal and zoning battles over the property and presented a copy of court proceedings on the matter. He asserted that all of the necessary documentation and research for the site had already been completed. Ms. Pfaehler repeated that more research must be undertaken before they can determine the most appropriate stabilization plan for the house. She clarified that her research would focus on the material evidence present in the building, and not the literary evidence. Mr. Farnham reported that Benjamin Rush had owned the property in the late eighteenth century, but the house appears to date to the 1830s, after Rush's death.

Mr. Evans reiterated his concerns about the proposed stabilization or restoration. He felt this had not been clarified and opined that it would be of great importance to understand whether the house will be stabilized or restored. Mr. Galliano stated that the objective of the property owner is to stabilize the property and stop any further deterioration. He noted that the final plan would take into account all stakeholders, especially the community groups. He clarified that it would not be a full restoration owing to insufficient funding and a lack of a program for the house.

Joanne Claire noted that the cemetery is still in use. She stated that she has relatives buried in the southern section and is supportive of their re-interment in the northern section of the cemetery.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the buffer zone must be sensitively treated and stated that this area must be fully developed for the review of the final application. Mr. Amburn and Ms. Gutterman concurred.

Mr. Evans stated that he is hesitant to accept the plan as proposed. He noted he was not sure if the southern section had lost significance or if it needed to be restored in order to regain its significance.

Mr. Amburn stated that he agrees with the staff's recommendation, but adding that no demolition of the additions to the historic house should be undertaken until the historical research is complete. Mr. Cluver opined that the concept of allowing the expansion into the southern section of the cemetery is a trade off for saving and restoring the historically significant elements on the northern section of the site.

Fred Maurer objected to the name "Greenwood Cemetery" and noted that it should properly be called "Knights of Pythias Cemetery." Others stated that it has been called Greenwood Cemetery since its founding in the middle of the nineteenth century. He voiced his concern regarding the proposed construction of the garage, which would directly affect the drainage of the site. Mr. Mankiewicz also spoke about the water shed and noted his concern regarding drainage on the site. Mr. Evans clarified that issues such as drainage were beyond the purview of the Historical Commission.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the redevelopment of the southern half of the site for the expansion of the hospital complex, provided the exterior envelope of the house is stabilized, the

half-gable rear ell is retained, and a copy of the archeological report is deposited in the Philadelphia Historical Commission archives, with the staff to review all restoration details, pursuant to Standard 2, 4, 5, 6, and 10 and the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Sites.

2420 GRAYS FERRY AVENUE

Owner: Naval Square Associates

Applicant: Charles Breder

History: c. 1830, Naval Asylum, William Strickland, architect

Project: Construct three low-rise condominium buildings.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the last phase of construction for the redevelopment of the former Navy Asylum. The redeveloped site is now known as Naval Square. The proposed new construction is located at the rear of the site away from Grays Ferry Avenue. The proposal includes the construction of three low-rise condominium buildings. The low-rises would be almost identical to the Biddle Hall addition and one other low-rise condominium building reviewed and approved by the Commission. The proposed design and massing is cohesive with the redevelopment of the site and the design aesthetic already established by the earlier phases, which have been completed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Philadelphia Historical Commission's approval of the previous phases of construction.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Chuck Breder and attorney Brett Feldman represented the application.

Mr. Feldman described the history of the redevelopment project. He noted that the State Historic Preservation Office had granted a preliminary approval on this last portion of the project but that it would not issue a final approval until the Philadelphia Historical Commission approved the proposal.

Mr. Evans inquired whether an archeological study had been done on the site. Mr. Feldman answered that an archaeological study had been done as part of the Section 106 Review of the project. Mr. Farnham stated that the federal government, which owned the site and sold it with a series of restrictions and covenants, required a series of studies before the redevelopment project began. He further explained that the Historical Commission had reviewed and approved a master plan for the redevelopment of the site in 2004 and this proposal is compliant with that plan.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Philadelphia Historical Commission's approval of the previous phases of construction.

1821 PORTER STREET

Owner: Theodore Irrera

Applicant: Frank Kakos

History: 1907, contributing to the Girard Estate Historical District, 11/10/1999

Project: Construct addition and ramp

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a one-story rear addition and ramp. The addition will connect to the existing kitchen and will include a bedroom and bathroom. The addition would be clad in vinyl siding with vinyl windows and shutters. A covered porch is proposed for the rear of the addition to access the back yard. The ramp, with landings, would run along side the proposed addition and the existing house and be constructed of pressure-treated wood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided more appropriate materials are substituted for the vinyl siding and shutters, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Architect Frank Kakos and property owner Loretta Irrera represented the application.

Mr. Kakos described the declining health of the co-owner and brother of Ms. Irrera. He stated that they are proposing to make the first floor handicapped accessible because Mr. Irrera will be using a wheelchair. He noted that the ramp would be simple, constructed of pressure treated wood, and allow for the retention of the existing hairpin fence in place.

Mr. Cluver asked if the Commission had approved other rear additions like the one in the Girard Estates Historic District. Ms. Cote recalled that the Commission approved a rear addition on the 1700 block of Porter Street; however, it was not built in compliance with the approval and the owner asked the Commission to legalize the addition. The Commission legalized the addition with some provisions. Ms. Cote was not familiar with the specifics of that approval. Mr. Kakos stated that there is a one-story brick addition several houses down the street.

Ms. Cote stated that all properties in Girard Estates are considered contributing and the yards are mentioned as character defining features in the nomination; however, the staff contends that the proposed addition would be minimally visible. When asked to explain the staff's recommendation, Ms. Cote stated that the staff considers stucco or wood clapboards more appropriate than vinyl siding. She added that no shutters would be more appropriate than vinyl shutters.

Mr. Evans was in support of the staff's recommendation. He stated that he was concerned about how the bay and roof of the addition would interface. He asked if the bottom of the bay would be modified. Mr. Kakos replied that the roof of the addition would be foot higher than the existing porch and that the bay would remain and the flashing would be used where the roof and bay meet.

Ms. Irrera informed the members of the Committee that she had spoken to neighbors on both sides and had not received any negative feedback.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the shutters are removed and more appropriate materials are substituted for the vinyl siding such as stucco or Hardiplank, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

1022 WAVERLY STREET

Owner: Adrian Paulus & Ashim Paul

Applicant: Adrian Paulus

History: c. 1830; individually designated, 11/24/1959

Project: Construct roof deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck on a later rear addition of this house. However, the access to the deck would be constructed on the front slope of the gable roof of the historic house, with a hatch and stair.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Adrian Paulus and architect Lawrence Gilbert represented the application.

Mr. Gilbert stated that the hatch is existing and invisible from the street. He stated that the owner gained approval from the Board of Building Standards. Mr. Paulus provided a copy of the letter from the Department of Licenses & Inspections stating that the Board had approved the non-compliant access. Mr. Evans opined that the proposed deck and hatch do not appear safe and commented on the severe turn of the spiral stairs. Mr. Gilbert stated that a deck was started without a permit years ago and never completed. This application proposes building off of this deck; the existing deck cantilevers off the rear of the building. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested keeping the deck within the confines of the building. Ms. Pentz concurred.

Mr. Evans observed that the letter from the Department of Licenses & Inspections states that a landing at the bottom of the steps is required. Mr. Gilbert agreed to revise the plans to reflect the requirements from the Board of Building Standards.

Mr. Amburn asked for a mock up showing the required landing and steps. Mr. Cluver stated that the rail should not be visible.

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

401 S. 13TH STREET

Owner: Aimen Zaki Soudi & Fatima Soudi

Applicant: Bruce Rogers

History: 1840, individually designated

Project: Demolish storefront, install café windows and awning

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the existing storefront and side storefront window and door and install operable café windows with a canvas awing. This application also proposes to enlarge two second-story windows and install one-over-one windows.

According to the nomination form, this building is part of a row of four well-preserved mid-nineteenth century, Greek Revival houses. It retains its historic storefront with display windows and transoms. A 1928 photograph shows that it once had an ornately carved wood cornice.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Tenant Bruce Rogers represented the application.

Mr. Rogers stated that he had met with the staff on two occasions. He stated that he has a clear vision of the alterations he would like to undertake to optimize his restaurant, but the staff has contended that they are inappropriate for the building. Mr. Cluver stated that the application raises two issues: the demolition of the storefront and the enlarging of the second-floor windows. Both will result in the destruction of historic fabric. He asserted that nothing would be gained from the loss. Mr. Rogers stated that he planned to include seating upstairs in his proposed restaurant and needs more light; he therefore would like to open up the windows. He said that he would also like to create a mezzanine to allow customers to see from the first to the second floor. Mr. Amburn stated that all but the cornice of the historic storefront survives; the storefront should be preserved. Removing the storefront, part of the first floor brick walls, and enlarging the windows would result in the loss of historic fabric and would not comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

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

1803 AND 1805 PINE STREET

Owner 1803: Andrew Frankel

Owner 1805: Brendan Kelley

Applicant: Doug Whitfield

History: c.1850; contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Residential Historic District

Later rear additions at the backs of both rear ells

rear addition at 1803 constructed between 1860 and 1885

rear addition at 1805 constructed between 1895 and 1910

Project: Alter and add to rear facades for garages.

OVERVIEW: This plan proposes converting the rear ells of these two houses into two two-car garages. The work involves demolishing the rear walls and part of the side walls of the rear ells at the ground level. The rear ells would be widened into the side yards at the ground level to create the garages. A deck would be constructed on the garages between the ells at the second floor level. The drawings for the proposal show the windows incorrectly as four-over-four rather than six-over-six. The rears are visible from 18th Street because the properties. The plastic-coated metal garage door is out of character with the historic buildings. Painted wood doors would be more appropriate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, provided that the garage doors are painted wood and the rear ell windows outside the work area are not altered as drawn, with the staff to review details.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Brendan Kelly, the owner of 1805 represented the applications for both properties.

Mr. Baron reported that he had visited the site and noted that the rear is visible from 18th Street. Ms. Gutterman asked if anyone else in the nearby area had double-car garages. Mr. Kelly introduced photographs of the service alley that showed double garages at some houses. Mr. Kelley stated his request reflects the current need for parking in the area. He reported that there is sufficient space to make the turn into the proposed garages from the narrow alley. He said

that parking had become more and more difficult in the area. Mr. Kelley noted that he would submit an additional application for the removal of the fire escape on the rear ell. He explained that the new garage would be built from bricks salvaged during the project.

Ms. Pentz asked if the applicant wished to propose some sort of restoration on the front façade in exchange for this approval. He replied he could remove the now existing window bars and restore the deteriorated door. Ms. Pentz noted that the shutters do not fit the window frames.

Mr. Kelley stated he had great concerns about the safety and security of his property owing to the openness of the rear. He said that this proposal would close the rear and also eliminate the unattractive razor wire. It would improve the appearance of the rear of his building and the service alley.

Mr. Baron suggested a single-car garage in each building and a structure to stack one car on top of another in the side yard between the houses. Several Committee members dismissed the suggestions as unrealistic and more obtrusive than the garages. Ms. Gutterman suggested that any design should retain the arch top of the rear window as an artifact. Other members suggested that the building line of the existing ells be demarcated from the new wall between the ells with a change in plane or brick. Mr. Kelley agreed to modify the design to retain historic fabric and clearly demarcate the old from new.

The Committee members agreed that a single-car garage in each building would be preferable. They suggested that the applicant prepare alternate designs showing both single-car and double-car parking in each building. They suggested that he prepare plans that retain more historic fabric. They also suggested more appropriate doors.

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

200 MARKET STREET

Owner: Andrew M. Ullman & Sandra Schwalb, Trustees

Applicant: Richard Thom, architect

History: c.1860, altered with floor removed mid twentieth century, stuccoed. c. 2003

Non-contributing to the Old City Historic District, 2003

Project: Reface one-story diner, add floor and roof deck

OVERVIEW: The proposal for this non-contributing building involves adding a second floor and facing the building with metal siding and rustic brick. The addition would cantilever over the first floor and include a roof deck with plantings. The jagged-edged, multi-color, rustic brick veneer is not compatible with the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the brick is rectangular and a consistent red color set in the plane of the existing wall, with the staff to review details.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Richard Thom represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated the staff recommendation focuses on the materials because the Commission has approved the project in concept. The proposed brick is not appropriate because of its variable color and shape, which is not compatible with the historic brick in the neighborhood.

Mr. Thom stated that they removed a section of the Garden State brick-face stucco and found the underlying brick in those sections to be of good quality and condition. His client would like to do at least two or three more test spots. He said that, if those other samples seem to be in similar condition, then they would re-expose the old brick rather than covering it with new material. Mr. Thom had some concerns about the fact that the building consists of two adjoining structures that may be constructed of different brick. Mr. Baron replied that, even if the brick differs, the proposed design also consists of sections of different materials. Mr. Thom called it a Chelsea Market theme and stated that his client is seeking a rustic feeling. He called it an elegant and handsome piece for the corner. Mr. Thomas also stated that, if the removal becomes problematic, he will work with the staff on a color for the new brick.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the existing brick is retained or the new brick is rectangular and a consistent red color set in the plane of the existing wall, with the staff to review details.

ADJOURNMENT

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

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

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

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

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

Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.

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.

New Additions Guidelines: Recommended: Designing a new addition in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new. Not Recommended: Imitating a historic style or period of architecture in a new addition.

Entrances and Porches Guideline: Recommended: Designing and constructing a new entrance or porch when the historic entrance or porch is completely missing. It may be a restoration based on historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building.

Entrances and Porches Guideline: Recommended: Designing and installing additional entrances or porches on secondary elevations when required for the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the building, i.e. limiting such alteration to such non-character-defining elevations.

Setting Guidelines: Not Recommended: Introducing a new building or landscape feature that is out of character or otherwise inappropriate to the setting's historic character.

Roofs Guidelines: 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.

Building Site Guidelines: Recommended: Designing new onsite parking, loading docks, or ramps when required by the new use so that they are as unobtrusive as possible and assure the preservation of the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.

Site Guidelines: Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving buildings and their features as well as features of the site that are important in defining its overall historic character.

Windows Guideline: Not Recommended: Changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which noticeably change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of glazing; or the appearance of the frame.