

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

**TUESDAY, 27 MAY 2014
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP
Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Suzanne Pentz
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

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

ALSO PRESENT

Jonathan Stavin, PMC Property Group
Keith Braccia, PMC Property Group
Frank Lutz, PMC Property Group
Joseph Kury, Varenhorst
Samantha Kane, Varenhorst
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance
Lorna Katz, Society Hill Civic Association
James Unkefer, Digsau
Nick Musser, Digsau
Bob Gilberg, Bourse Mall
Harry S. Murray, Campbell Thomas & Co.
Eric Horowitz, Campbell Thomas & Co.
Carmen Patrascu
Vesna Hess
Tuval Shlomo
Brian Johnston, Johnston Design Studio
Plato Marinakos, Plato Studio
Joseph Pungitore
Agata Reister, Landmark Architectural Design
Anthony Miksitz, Anthony Miksitz Architect
Bill Marsh, Anthony Miksitz Architect
Jonathan Auerbach
Deborah Cianfrani, Cianfrani Law, LLC
Nancy Bastian, Cecil Baker & Partners
Jenna Schuster, Cecil Baker & Partners
Dan Kelley
Brett Webber, Brett Webber Architects PC
Mark Nicoletti

Michael Cole
Stuart Rosenberg, SGRA
John C. Stortz
Eve Parrot, SGRA
Ryan Debski, SGRA
Dan Shapiro
Evan Bryant, Bryant Phillips Construction
George V. Baker, Baker Architects
Evan Shepherd, 5320 Germantown Avenue Associates, LLC

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mes. Gutterman, Pentz, and Stein and Mr. Cluver joined her.

ADDRESS: 250 N CHRIS COLUMBUS BLV

Project: Construct apartment building
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: 1 Water Street Associates Owner LP c/o PMC Property Group, Inc.
Applicant: Joseph Kury, Varenhorst PC
History: vacant lot; building demolished
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of an apartment building at 250 N. Christopher Columbus Boulevard, on a vacant site north of the Philadelphia anchorage of the Ben Franklin Bridge. The site is located in the Old City Historic District. A non-contributing building stood on the site at the time of the designation of the district in 2003. It was demolished several years ago with the Commission's approval. Owing to the building that stood on the site at the time of designation, the Commission has full jurisdiction over this project, even though the site is currently a vacant lot. The site is bounded on east by Christopher Columbus Boulevard; on the south by Summer Street and the bridge anchorage; on the west by Water Street and Interstate 95; and on the north by Vine Street. A utility easement, which cannot be built upon, runs east-west across the site at its northern edge along Vine Street. Although the 200 block of Water Street, which borders this property on the west, is paved with Belgian block, it is not designated as historic as part of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District.

In 2005, the Commission approved the demolition of the non-contributing building and the construction of a 30-story, 345-foot-tall building, provided a Phase 1 Archeological Study was performed prior to the start of construction (see attached minutes). The non-contributing building was demolished and the archaeological study was performed, but the 30-story building was not constructed.

In 2012, the Commission approved the construction of an 11-story, 134' tall building, provided the archaeological monitoring recommended in the 2006 report is undertaken, pursuant to Standard 9 (see attached minutes). The 11-story building was not constructed.

The proposed building would be composed of two sections, the shorter to the south and the taller to the north. The shorter would be 13 stories and about 145' tall. The taller would be 16 stories and 197'-7" to the highest point. The bridge anchorage to the south is approximately 160' tall. The proposed building would include 261 apartments and 74 parking spaces. The first floor would include lobby, bicycle storage, and fitness spaces. The building would be clad in white or light-colored metal panels and spandrel and clear glass. The garage would be hidden behind green screens. The building is set back from and above Columbus Boulevard because of floodplain restrictions.

The site is located in an area with very high archaeological potential. The remains of a seventeenth-century shipyard were discovered just to the north of this site, on the north side of Vine Street, during an archaeological excavation in the 1980s. The 2006 archaeological study of this site presented conclusions and recommendations that were based not only on the conditions at the site but also on the proposed building, especially its foundation system. That study recommended that an archaeological team monitor the drilling that was proposed for the construction of the support pilings for the foundation system. It also recommended the submission of a report on this monitoring to the Commission. A qualified archaeologist should review and, if necessary, update the conclusions and recommendations in the 2006 archaeological study to reflect the current construction proposal, especially its foundation system.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9,

1. provided a qualified archaeologist reviews and, if necessary, updates the 2006 archaeological study to reflect the current project, and
2. provided the archaeological monitoring and reporting recommended by the archaeological study are implemented.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Jonathan Stavin and architects Stephen Varenhorst and Joseph Kury represented the application.

Mr. Varenhorst used a model of the proposed building as well as a Powerpoint presentation of the plans and photographs to summarize the project for the Committee. He pointed out the 13 and 16-story sections of the building, the parking area for 73 cars, which would be screened, and other aspects of the proposal. He noted that the taller section of the building would stand at an angle to the street grid to allow for better views of the Ben Franklin Bridge anchorage as well as views of the river from the building. He pointed out the green space that would be available to the public. The building would be clad with aluminum panels and have aluminum windows. All mechanical systems would be hidden. The end walls would be curtain walls. He showed floor plans and discussed the locations of the lobby and other public areas. He explained the flow to the parking garage. He explained that they will be seeking zoning bonuses to allow for the extra height. He discussed the proposed landscaping with the water feature and benches.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicants had considered the archaeological recommendations for the site. Mr. Varenhorst stated that they had not yet, but would consider them. He stated that the foundation system would be a pile system. They will not excavate at the site, but will instead add about six feet of fill to bring the site up above the floodplain.

Mr. Cluver stated that the 12-foot green screen proposed to hide the parking would be too tall. Mr. Varenhorst responded that zoning requires that the first floor is fully screened. He offered to explore whether the zoning reviewers would reduce that requirement.

Ms. Pentz asked how the angled building would preserve views of the bridge. Mr. Varenhorst replied that the angle allows views from I-95 and I-676 as well as the residential neighborhood on the 300-block of Front Street.

No one offered any public comment.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the Committee adopt the staff recommendation with the provision that an archaeologist assist in selecting locations for the pilings for the foundations. Mr. Cluver agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a qualified archaeologist reviews and, if necessary, updates the 2006 archaeological study to reflect the current project including the locations of the foundation pilings, and provided the archaeological monitoring and reporting recommended by the archaeological study are implemented, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9.

ADDRESS: 313-25 RACE ST, UNIT PARK

Project: Construct seven-story, multi-family residential building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: 313 Race Associates, LP

Applicant: Kevin Towey, Eimer Design

History: parking lot

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a seven-story, multi-family residential building with terrace on the north side of the 300-block of Race Street in the Old City Historic District. The property extends north from Race to the south side of Florist Street. The property was vacant at the time of the designation of the Old City Historic District and is currently used as a surface parking lot. The wall and fence surrounding the lot are non-historic. The lot satisfies the Historical Commission's definition of an undeveloped site and, therefore, its jurisdiction over the new construction is Review-and-Comment only.

The building would be seven stories and 90 feet tall. Four and five-story loft buildings stood on the site historically. Parking would be located at the basement level and accessed from the rear at Florist Street, a service alley that runs along the approach to the Ben Franklin Bridge. The terrace would be located at the seventh-floor level at the center of the building. Mechanical equipment would be located on the roof, hidden behind the parapet. The upper front and rear façades and returns would be clad in fiber cement panels. The side facades would be clad in EIFS, a synthetic stucco. The front façade would stand at the sidewalk line. The front and rear ground-floor facades would be clad in stone panels. The ground floor of the front façade would be mostly glazed. Above the ground floor, the front façade would include two asymmetrical projecting glazed bays to break down the massing. The light color of the building would

correspond to the white buildings to the west, historic fire and police stations rehabilitated for residential use by the same developer.

STAFF COMMENT: The staff comments that the proposed building satisfies Standard 9. Although contemporary in styling and thereby differentiated from the older buildings of the historic district, it is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of its environment.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman commented that the proposed building would be too tall relative to its neighbors, which are primarily four and five stories. She also commented that the color palette of the exterior material should be reconsidered. It includes too many colors and could be simplified. Ms. Pentz agreed that the colors should be reconsidered. Mr. Farnham noted that the adjacent historic fire and police stations have very similar color palettes dominated by off white. He directed the Committee to images of the historic buildings in the application materials.

Ms. Stein agreed that the proposed building is too tall and should be reduced in height along Race Street. She stated that the height as proposed is acceptable along Florist Street. She suggested removing one of the two bays on the front façade. She also suggested that the projecting balconies on the west façade should be recessed into the building.

Mr. Cluver agreed with Ms. Stein about the bays and also suggested that the east façade, which would face an alley providing access to parking for an adjacent building, should be better articulated.

Ms. Gutterman asserted that any mechanical equipment should not be visible from the street.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Race Street ground-floor facade should have a rhythm like the surrounding storefronts. It is proposed as a very long unbroken wall of glazing. Ms. Stein also objected to the height of the lobby glazing. She stated that the horizontal line above the glazing should correspond to similar lines on nearby buildings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee voted to comment that the overall height of the building along Race Street should be reduced, the number of colors on the exterior should be reduced and the palette simplified, the number of bays on the Race Street façade should be reduced, the balconies on the west façade should be redesigned, perhaps recessed, the ground floor along Race Street should be redesigned to have the scale and rhythm of the nearby historic storefronts, and the mechanical equipment should not be visible from the street.

ADDRESS: 111 S INDEPENDENCE E ML, UNIT A

Project: Insert door in window opening; replace wall with railing

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bourse Mall Associates, LP

Applicant: Robert Gilberg, Bourse Mall Associates, LP

History: 1893; Philadelphia Bourse Building; Hewitt Brothers, architects

Individual Designation: 1/26/1971

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert an existing window along the 5th Street façade of the Bourse building into a new set of glazed, double doors with metal trim to match existing. The new entry, located in the first bay to the south of the main entrance, will mirror the location of an existing door within the bay to the north of the entrance. The proposed work will not require the demolition of any historic fabric, but will include the demolition of a partial height concrete wall and lower level canopy. The application proposes to construct a new entry landing paved in brick and bluestone to match the existing plaza, and to install a new metal guardrail along the entry landing and at the location of the demolished partial height concrete wall.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner's representative Bob Gilberg and architects James Unkefer and Nick Musser represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the design of the guardrail, which Mr. Gilberg noted was a simple, 42-inch-tall, picket rail. Ms. Stein asked if the proposed railing is related to any other railings at the Bourse. Mr. Gilberg replied that there are no other railings on the exterior of the building.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the extent to which the base of the building would be modified. Mr. Gilberg responded that the base of the building would not be modified, and that the existing bronze trim would remain. He noted that the new door would be inserted against the existing trim. Ms. Gutterman then asked what modifications would be necessary to attach the canopy structure to the building, and Mr. Gilberg responded that the new beams would be pocketed into the existing masonry, which, he noted, would be the one destructive impact to the existing building. Mr. Gilberg noted that the alternative would be to put a beam on the exterior and bolt it in. Ms. Gutterman asked about the material at the base of the building. She asked if it is brownstone that is painted. Mr. Gilberg responded that he did not know.

Mr. Cluver asked if the bluestone strip was picking up on the existing plaza pattern. Mr. Gilberg responded affirmatively, noting that the existing bluestone abuts the concrete wall that they presume was added in the 1980s. Mr. Gilberg noted that it is their intention to extend the existing paving pattern and match the existing materials.

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

ADDRESS: 319 S 02ND ST, UNIT 6B

Project: Construct ADA ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Carl Brown

Applicant: Carl Brown

History: 1970; Louis Sauer, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an ADA-accessible ramp into a private residence. The proposed ramp is of concrete construction, and rises 17 inches above the sidewalk. The existing concrete steps would be moved forward approximately one and a half feet to meet the new ramp. The ramp is designed to fit between existing entry steps to adjoining properties and to extend out from the front wall of the building no further than the line of planters along this block S. 02nd Street.

While this block of development exhibits a regular pattern of higher Unit A doors separated from lower Unit B doors by brick planters, the staff does not feel that the construction of the proposed ramp will disrupt the understanding of the block as a whole, nor will it damage significant historic fabric.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

Ms. Gutterman asked if the square items at the bottom of the front façade are electrical boxes. Ms. Stein responded that they appear to be vents, as they are louvered.

Ms. Hawkins noted that there would be no railing along the proposed ramp, which is very steep and would not comply with ADA requirements.

Ms. Stein expressed concern over the weep holes at the bottom of the front façade, which would be concealed by the ramp. She noted that, while there would probably be a way to extend dryer vents, extending weep holes would be more difficult. Ms. Hawkins noted that there also seemed to be weeps above the doorway.

Mr. Cluver questioned whether the front steps being moved forward would protrude past the planter. Ms. DiPasquale responded that, based on the plans, they would not. Mr. Cluver noted that there was no railing proposed along the steps. Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the applicant would need a rail; the landing at the top of the steps appears very small. Mr. Cluver noted that the ramp did not appear to be up to code. He asserted that a code-compliant ramp would be much larger. Ms. Gutterman noted that the landing was not the ADA-compliant minimum of five feet by five feet. Ms. Stein responded, asking whether a ramp for a private residence needed to comply with the letter of the law, as ADA is only enforceable by legal action.

Mr. Cluver noted that, aside from code issues, the ramp may simply not function properly. Ms. Gutterman concurred, noting that the turn at the top of the ramp would be difficult to navigate, depending on the wheelchair size.

Mr. Cluver commented that there is a very strong rhythm to the façade of the block, and that installing such a ramp in would disrupt that rhythm. He questioned whether there was an alternative route into the property that could be rendered accessible. Mr. Baron responded that the ramp is proposed for the front door, the most dignified and appropriate entry point. Lorna Katz Lawson, a member of the audience, noted that, although she was not certain about the particular unit, some units in this complex have rear entrances.

Mr. Cluver stated that he would be disinclined to approve this ramp without a discussion or understanding about the other routes into the building. Ms. Gutterman noted that it would have been useful for the applicant to attend the meeting, so that he or she could provide information about the accessibility needs and access from the rear.

Mr. Cluver noted that, aesthetics aside, he was concerned that, in reality, the ramp will need to grow in size and will exceed the depth of the planters. Ms. Gutterman commented that it is unlikely that the existing steps can be preserved and moved forward; they will most likely need to be rebuilt.

Mr. Cluver opined that the applicant would need a railing to satisfy the building code. Ms. Stein noted that the neighboring property's railing is a simple, painted steel picket, and that this railing should match that of the neighboring property.

Ms. Hawkins noted that, looking at an aerial image of the property, there appeared to be a rear courtyard from which the building is accessible.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment. Lorna Katz Lawson of Society Hill Civic Association noted that other municipalities help residents with temporary accessibility issues. She commented that she did not know the applicant's age, condition, or permanence of the medical condition that necessitated the need for a ramp, but contended that an individual owner's temporary solution to an accessibility problem may become a permanent alteration to the property and to the district. She noted that Philadelphia does not have an ordinance that allows for temporary structures, but was wondering if the Commission could devise a solution for this situation that would not be permanent. Mr. Cluver commented that, although a temporary solution would be the best, temporary structures often have a way of becoming permanent. Ms. Katz Lawson commented that the Art Museum and other historic buildings around the city have temporary ADA ramps. Ms. Stein noted that, in the case of the Art Museum, it is a public building that is required to have ADA accessibility.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance noted that their committee had commented that a plan of the ramp depicting the street tree was necessary to determine whether the tree shown in the photographs would be an obstacle to the ramp. He noted that the Alliance committee was concerned about the reversibility of the proposed ramp, and did not feel that the proposed design was created with reversibility in mind. He observed that the committee suggested that the concrete be tinted to be in keeping with the brick. Noting that the committee had discussed the pros and cons of facing the ramp in brick, Mr. Leech concluded that the committee ultimately deciding that that would detract from the rhythm of the planters.

Mr. Baron commented that temporary wood ramps tend to look cheap. He reported that the applicant is willing to apply various facings to the ramp, depending on the Commission's preferences. Ms. Hawkins asked if Mr. Baron knew if there was access to the property from the rear, to which Mr. Baron responded that he did not know. He stated that the Commission had recently approved an ADA accessible entrance at 8th and Walnut Streets that required significant demolition of historic masonry, while this proposed ramp does not involve any demolition.

Ms. Gutterman suggested recommending denial, given the discussions about weeps, vents, concerns about its projection, and relationship to the planters and street tree, but observed that she would consider a future proposal with additional information. Ms. Hawkins added that she was concerned with the lack of a railing, and that the size of the ramp would increase greatly owing to compliance with code requirements. Mr. Cluver added that any ramp that is built should not project beyond the planter boxes.

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

ADDRESS: 513 SPRUCE ST

Project: Construct fourth-floor addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: D. Dragomir & C. Patrascu

Applicant: Robert Thomas, Campbell Thomas & Company Architecture

History: 1850

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks in-concept approval for the construction of a fourth-floor addition to an existing three-story rear ell. The existing residence is mid-block, three stories in height, and the main block spans the full width of the lot, with a narrower rear extension. The proposed addition starts approximately 17 feet from the front façade on Spruce, and will sit primarily over the lower, rear ell. The proposed addition would not be visible from Spruce Street. Behind the property is a private, gated alley, to the north of which is a private driveway, sometimes known as Manning Walk. The proposed addition would, however, be visible from approximately an 80-foot stretch of S. 5th Street. The proposed addition would be clad in stucco, with fiberglass shingle roofing. The roof of the existing rear ell would be leveled out from its current sloped configuration, and a corbelled brick cornice added along the perimeter. An existing chimney would also be raised and covered with a stucco finish.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of a fourth-floor addition, in concept, with details of the roof shape and height to be reconsidered, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Carmen Patrascu and architect Harry Murray represented the application.

Mr. Murray contended that the addition would have a minimal impact on the historic building. He explained that they chose the gable roofed addition because there are other gable roofs along the block. He noted that the main issue seems to be the visibility from 5th Street. He asserted that the addition is small, at 340 square feet, and would not be visible from Spruce Street.

Ms. Gutterman asked how much of the roof and rear wall of the main block of the house would be removed to construct the addition. Mr. Murray responded that nothing would be removed. He noted that the addition is high enough that the ceiling on the third floor will remain intact, while approximately five feet of the roof would need to be elevated over the stair hall.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the existing chimney on the neighboring property would need to be raised, and Mr. Murray responded that it would need to be, if the chimney is still in use, and if not, they will cap it.

Mr. Cluver questioned the choice of corbelled brick around the rear ell. Mr. Murray responded that the purpose was to give the addition a base, and to level off the brick at the rear. Mr. Cluver asked if the corbelled brick would be new brick. Mr. Murray responded that they would try to find a used brick that would be similar in appearance to the current brick, and if not, they could eliminate the corbel. He noted that the brick is negotiable, but the key is that they want to level the roof and create a little shelf so they can set the bulk of the addition back from the face of the existing rear ell. Mr. Cluver asked if some of the brick would need to be removed to build out the corbel, and Mr. Murray responded that the outside wythe would.

Ms. Stein asked Ms. DiPasquale to explain the staff recommendation for the applicant to reconsider the shape of the proposed addition. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff felt that the gable roof created a height greater than was necessary for the addition. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the staff also commented about the shingling on the gable roof. Mr. Murray responded that the shingling would be minimally visible, and is the most practical for a gable roof.

Mr. Cluver questioned the line around windows and doors on the EIFS finish. Mr. Murray responded that it was a slightly projecting articulation in the finish.

Ms. Stein asked Ms. DiPasquale if the addition would be taller than the neighboring properties' gable roofs. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she did not know. Ms. Stein commented that, with the addition, this building may be the tallest building on the block. Ms. Gutterman commented that it would be very visible from 5th Street, and that, if it was noticeably taller than the adjacent structures, it would set a bad precedent. Ms. Pentz opined that the addition would be minimally visible and inconspicuous. Ms. DiPasquale relayed the staff's belief that the addition would not necessarily read as part of the building.

Mr. Murray reminded the Committee that they were seeking an in-concept approval because they are still unsure of whether or not they will receive a zoning variance.

Mr. Cluver noted that the arch-topped window, although not visible from the street, seemed out of keeping with the district. Mr. Murray responded that the details of the addition are negotiable.

Ms. Hawkins commented that she had not heard great concern over the concept of the addition, so long as the height of the addition could be minimized. Ms. Gutterman noted that the staff

should visit the site and review a mock-up of the addition to see its relationship to the height of the neighboring buildings. She stated that they should confirm whether or not the chimney would need to be raised. Mr. Cluver added that, in his opinion, the EIFS projections should be eliminated, and that he would prefer a square topped window to an arched one, and that the windows on the addition should be aligned with those on the rear ell. Ms. Hawkins added that the corbelling should be simplified, as the level of detail shown in the current proposal is befitting to a primary building structure.

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

ADDRESS: 316 S 21ST ST

Project: Construct bay addition at front façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: William & Vesna Hozack

Applicant: James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co., Architects & Planners

History: 1860; mansard added 1880s; refaced 1949; rehabbed 1994 by Otto Sperr

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story bay on the second and third floor of the 21st Street elevation on this rowhouse in Rittenhouse Square. The bay would be clad in brick and would have a set of three grouped windows on each floor. The bay would engage the existing cornice and a matching cornice would continue around the bay creating a false sense that the bay is original to the building. A bay in this location would be inappropriate as it would create a false sense of historical development.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 3 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Vesna Hess Hozack, architect Eric Horowitz, and contractor Tuval Shlomo represented the application.

Mr. Horowitz stated that this property has a long history and has had a number of additions over the years. He stated that the whole front was condemned and rebuilt with inappropriately sized windows on the front façade in 1949. He stated that some historic elements were retained like the mansard roof. He stated that the buildings adjacent to it had also been rebuilt overtime. He opined that there is not a consistent style throughout the street. He stated that they would like to construct the bay to bring more light into the building with larger windows.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she had never seen a projecting brick bay. Mr. Horowitz stated that there are other examples of brick bays in Philadelphia, and some not too far from this location. Ms. Hawkins stated that this design for a bay appears not to have enough support visually. Ms. Pentz asked if the applicant considered just enlarging the second- and third-floor windows as opposed to installing the bay. Mr. Horowitz stated that they are also trying to gain more interior space as well as more light.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she agreed with the staff recommendation. She asserted that adding something that significantly alters the front façade is inappropriate. Mr. Schlomo asked if there was an approach that would be less intrusive. Ms. Hawkins stated that the proposal is dramatic and that she would not want to establish a precedent for modified buildings with bays and projections on primary street facades.

Ms. Gutterman stated that the bay is too big for the elevation. Mr. Cluver stated that there are two levels of comment. He stated that one is the appropriateness of any kind of bay on this façade; second, if the Historical Commission were to allow a bay, then he would encourage a wood element with a smaller footprint and tighter to the wall. Mr. Shlomo suggested a bay with chamfered edges. Mr. Cluver stated that that does not solve the primary issue of a bay to begin with.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance concurs with the staff recommendation.

Mr. Shlomo stated that the Architectural Committee has been helpful in the past during this process. He stated that they do not expect to be granted a full approval during the first round of reviews. He stated that they want to work within the guidelines and suggested that they will most likely redesign the bay, even if only in size, material, and shape. He expressed a desire to work with the Architectural Committee to develop a design that will make everyone happy. He stated that they have discussed a few options and that this is more or less the most extreme option. He stated that they are here for feedback. Mr. Cluver suggested that the applicant consult Standard 3 when redesigning the bay. Ms. Hawkins suggested that they do research into the historic design, material, and location of bays.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 3 and 9.

ADDRESS: 2225 PINE ST

Project: Replace one-story rear addition with three-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jennifer Boyle & John Tondera

Applicant: Brian Johnston, Johnston Design Studio, Inc.

History: 1860; refaced 1938

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a non-historic one-story rear kitchen addition and construct a three-story addition in its place. This addition would span full width of the house and lot. Like the rears of all of the houses in this immediate vicinity, the rear wall of this house has been significantly altered. It is stuccoed and has non-historic windows in non-historic openings. Also, the property includes a garage at the rear along Panama Street, which would block some views of the addition. The addition would be parged in stucco and include aluminum-clad doors and windows detailed with Azek trim and panels.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 MAY 2014

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Brian Johnston represented the application.

Mr. Cluver stated that the one thing that struck him with the design was the paired windows with panels, almost like shutters, on the second floor, and then the two windows on the third floor with the panel in between. He opined that these rear facades tend to be very simple, with punched openings that are aligned. He stated that this design seems much busier. Mr. Johnston stated that the design is driven by the interior program. He stated that the owner would like a window seat on the second floor and that is why those windows are paired. Ms. Hawkins stated that one will not really be able to see those second-floor windows with the garage. Mr. Johnston pointed to some photographs to indicate that the tops of the windows may be visible.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the central panel be removed from the design on the third floor and make it two punched openings. He also suggested widening the mullion between the two windows on the second floor to look like two individual windows, which would provide a more historic look. He recommended that each window have a proper sill with apron.

Mr. Cluver stated that the Committee does not typically recommend approval of aluminum windows. Ms. Coté stated that the staff recommended approval of the metal windows because the windows are proposed for non-historic openings in a non-historic rear façade that is barely visible from the street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the central panel between the third-floor windows is eliminated, the second-floor mullion is widened, and windows include sills, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 1711 PORTER ST

Project: Remove siding at front bay & porch; replace rear porch with one-story addition; install vinyl windows; alter windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joseph Pungitore

Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural Design

History: 1906; John Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Girard Estate Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to make various alterations to this twin in the Girard Estate Historic District. The roof of the bay on the front elevation originally had slate shingles. This application proposes to install a standing-seam metal roof on the bay. This application also proposes to alter a window opening, cut a new window opening, and install six-over-one vinyl windows. It proposes to install a vinyl basement window. A one-story addition is proposed for the rear of the property. This would require the removal of the existing porch. The addition would be parged in stucco and have metal-clad windows and doors.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the standing-seam roof on the bay, which should be clad with slate or an asphalt shingle to replicate the appearance of slate; approval of the window

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 MAY 2014

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

opening alterations; denial of the vinyl windows, but approval appropriately-detailed wood or clad windows; and approval of the addition, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Joseph Pungitore and architect Agata Reister represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked why they are proposing a metal roof for the bay. Mr. Pungitore stated that the bay roof is weathered and ready for replacement. He stated that they prefer metal as it is more durable and they like the look. Ms. Pentz stated that the Committee's is concerned that a metal roof will not replicate the appearance of the original slate roof. The Committee members suggested that real slate, artificial slate, or an asphalt shingle that resembles slate would be appropriate.

Ms. Reister clarified that the existing vinyl windows in bay would be re-glazed because they have started to delaminate and become cloudy; new vinyl windows would not be installed in the bay. The Committee did not object to this, but agreed that any new windows should be wood or aluminum clad. Ms. Hawkins asked why the proposed windows in the addition have such a high sill height. Ms. Reister responded that the sill height results from the location of an entertainment center. Ms. Pentz asked if there were other rear additions in this area. Mr. Pungitore replied that there are four rear additions on the street. She asked if the porch was original. Mr. Pungitore stated that they were uncertain about the date of the porch.

Ms. Reister stated that they proposed to alter window opening owing to the interior bathroom layout and the window cut would match the altered opening size as the windows will be next to each other.

Ms. Hawkins asked if it would be possible to have a traditionally sized window on the side of the rear addition given the placement of the door and the likely location of the entertainment center. Mr. Cluver suggested two windows on either side; the television could be placed on the wall in between. Mr. Pungitore stated that he was open to these suggestions.

Ms. Reister asked if a vinyl window would be acceptable in the side basement window. Mr. Cluver stated that this window does not face the public right-of-way. He stated that he preferred a clad window, but would accept a vinyl window in this location.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the standing-seam roof on the bay; approval of the window opening alterations; approval of a vinyl window in the basement window opening, but denial of the other proposed vinyl windows; and approval of the addition, provided the side windows are designed with traditional, historical proportions, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 414 S CAMAC ST

Project: Add dormer; construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: William Marsh

Applicant: Anthony Miksitz, Anthony Miksitz, Architect

History: 1825

Individual Designation: 2/28/1961

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-story shed dormer addition. It also proposes to remove an existing rear CMU wall and wood frame roof and construct a one-story addition on its foundations. This one-story rear addition would not be visible from the public right-of-way. The dormer addition would be visible, but inconspicuous. Although none of the houses in this row had dormers originally, all but two, including this one, now have dormers. Some of the dormers were added before designation; others were added with the Commission's approval. For example, the Commission approved a similar application for a dormer addition at 421 S. Iseminger Street, which was by the same builder, in 2002.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Stein recused, owing to her husband's involvement in the project. Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner William Marsh and architect Anthony Miksitz represented the application.

Mr. Miksitz stated that dormers have been added to most of the houses of this type in the area because they are quite small. He stated that the top floor is almost like an attic. He stated that he lives in this row of houses and constructed a similar dormer addition in 1996, which was approved by the Commission. He stated that the proposed dormer would be 9' by 9' and would drain to the rear.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the rear addition. Mr. Miksitz stated that he is proposing to replace a non-historic rear addition with one that is better constructed. He explained that he is proposing to maintain the CMU on the sides, but remove the rear wall, cantilever to gain an extra foot, and construct a wood frame wall up from that point, and install a flatter roof that provides better ceiling height.

Ms. Pentz stated that the dormers in this area are rather large. She opined that she would call them something other than dormers. Mr. Miksitz stated that a mansard roof addition would look better but one would have to remove the historic roof structure and there is no precedent on this block for a mansard. He stated that he is proposing wood siding or fiber-cement board paneling for the dormer and flat trim casing around the windows.

Mr. Cluver observed that the trim on the side is very fat. Mr. Miksitz stated that that is partly due to the insulated sidewall. He stated that, with the proper window proportions, the dormer is fatter on the ends. Mr. Cluver suggested spreading the windows out slightly. Ms. Hawkins suggested articulating the sides. She suggested, for example, adding pilasters. Mr. Miksitz opined that a corner detail with a bead might be appropriate.

Mr. Miksitz showed the Committee a drawing depicting the entire row and noted that all but two houses have the dormer addition. Ms. Pentz asked if the dormers were reviewed and approved by the Historical Commission. Ms. Coté stated that, on this block of Camac Street, eight out of the ten houses have dormers; one was approved by the Historical Commission, one was constructed without a permit, and six were added prior to designation. She stated that, on Iseminger Street, a row constructed by the same builder, five out of the seven houses in the row have dormer additions, one was approved by the Historical Commission, one was constructed without a permit, and three were added prior to designation. Mr. Cluver acknowledged that a precedent has been established. He asserted that the dormers were appropriate, given the size of these houses and their lack of rear ell.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the architect consider revising the side trim on the dormer, either by giving it more detail or modifying the window sizes.

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

ADDRESS: 420 WOOD ST

Project: Construct four-story single-family residence

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Nguyen Thuc

Applicant: Plato Marinakos, Plato Studio

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a single-family residence on a vacant lot at the corner of 5th and Wood Streets, within the boundaries of the Old City Historic District. The exceptionally narrow parcel was vacant at the time of designation. The proposed building would be four stories in height plus an additional five feet of raised bays at the roof. Materials would include brick veneer on the facades, with aluminum tan Hardie panel clad projecting bays on 5th Street, which run from the second floor to the roof. The staff worked with the applicant prior to submission, which resulted in a rear yard and fenestration changes on the Wood Street façade.

STAFF COMMENT: The staff comments that the proposed building satisfies Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Plato Marinakos represented the application.

Mr. Marinakos explained that the developer originally wanted a front yard, but after Mr. Marinakos reviewed the project with Mr. Baron prior to submitting the application, it was decided that a rear yard would be more appropriate. Other changes also resulting from that meeting include the addition of a double door on the 5th Street elevation and the addition of a window. Mr. Cluver asked about the front door on Wood Street, and Mr. Marinakos confirmed that it enters onto a mid-flight stair landing in the interior because of the challenges of the narrow parcel. Mr. Cluver commented that the windows on the corners of 5th Street and Wood Street are very different, but will be seen together as a corner. Mr. Marinakos agreed that these

windows could be more similar in size and shape. Ms. Hawkins asked about the bays that are raised five feet above the roofline. Mr. Marinakos responded that the intention was to offer high ceilings on the fourth floor. Ms. Hawkins noted on the elevation that the brick wall continues up with the bays, which seems to be inconsistent with the vocabulary of the bays being a projection and the main block of the wall being a lower element. Mr. Cluver noted that the section in question is a closet, so it could have a lower ceiling to create a stronger exterior architectural statement. Ms. Pentz asked about the colors for the exterior materials on the rendering, to which Mr. Marinakos responded that the colors on the rendering are not exact, but that the red brick color will be more brown in color, and the Hardie panel will be more tan and yellow in color.

Ms. Stein stated that the limestone ledge severs the first-floor windows, and that it would be more appropriate if it were raised to the top of the first-floor window heads. Alternatively, Ms. Hawkins suggested that the ledge be lowered so that it sits at the door head on both streets, which would mean the head could be lowered on the corner window at Wood Street, which would also offer more privacy. Mr. Cluver offered that door openings often overlap water tables where you have entries at grade. He opined that breaking the water table with the door is acceptable in this case. Ms. Gutterman asked why there are entry doors on both façades. Mr. Marinakos responded that he originally proposed a door on Wood Street only, but later determined that there should also be a presence on 5th Street. Ms. Gutterman suggested that, given the narrow nature of the Wood Street façade, it may make sense limit the punched openings to two on that façade to make it less complicated. Mr. Cluver noted that there is no door to the back yard.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that the proposed building is generally compatible with the historic district, but could be improved with the implementation of the Committee's suggestions.

ADDRESS: 238-40 S 04TH ST

Project: Cut opening in wall, install gate, remove shed, add paving for parking

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Allan Domb Real Estate

Applicant: Nancy Bastian, Cecil Baker & Partners

History: 1765; Shippen-Wistar House; Norris-Cadwalader House; Mutual Assurance Co., 1912

Individual Designation: 6/26/1956, 4/30/1957

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Significant, 3/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to create a new parking area by cutting an opening in an existing brick wall, installing a gate, removing a rear shed and part of a garden wall, and adding paving. The two rowhouses in question, which were consolidated into one building for an insurance company office in 1912 and were most recently used as the headquarters of the Episcopal Diocese, will be subdivided and returned to single-family residential use. The application proposes removing a garden shed at the rear of 240 S. 4th Street; it was built in the mid-twentieth century. The opening for the parking will be cut into a brick wall along Locust Street. The section of the wall to the east with the wrought iron fence was built in 1912. The taller section to the west was built in the mid 1930s, when a building along Locust Street was demolished to extend the garden to the west. Currently, there is a pedestrian entrance with

wrought iron gate in the western section of the wall. The pedestrian entrance would be expanded for automobiles and a gate installed. Three options for the new gate are provided in the application, with two options showing a solid gate and one option showing a wrought iron gate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 1, 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Nancy Bastian and Jenna Schuster represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked the applicants to summarize the proposal including the relationship of the opening in the wall to the low section of the wall. He asked if there would be any screening of the views of the cars from the sidewalk. Ms. Bastian confirmed that the cars parked on the proposed parking area would be obliquely visible through the existing wrought iron fence when walking east to west on Locust Street. Ms. Gutterman suggested that we rid ourselves of cars altogether. Ms. Stein asked if the applicant would consider adding a screening wall to hide the parked cars. Ms. Bastian agreed to add a screening wall perpendicular to Locust Street to block views of the cars parked behind 238 S. 4th Street. Mr. Cluver stated that the proposed parking spaces are rather small and would be difficult to maneuver into and out of. Ms. Gutterman stated: "No Land Rovers. No Hummers." Ms. Bastian stated that the parking as designed meets the zoning code requirements. Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicants would propose covering the parking spaces with pergolas or garages in the near future. The applicants responded that they are not planning to propose garages. Ms. Gutterman asked: "What is happening to this lovely garden?"

Ms. Stein requested clarification on the history of the existing brick wall. Ms. Bastian and Ms. Schuster explained that the lower wall with fence along Locust Street was built about 1912, when the two rowhouses were converted to an insurance company headquarters. The taller section to the west was added in the 1930s when a building on Locust was demolished to add to the garden. Ms. Hawkins noted that these dates are within the period of significance for the Society Hill Historic District, so the wall is considered part of the contributing resource. Ms. Bastian stated that the existing pedestrian gate in the wall along Locust was added in the 1980s when mechanical equipment was installed behind it.

Ms. Bastian reviewed the three gate options that were part of the application, with one being wrought iron and two being versions of a solid gate. She also confirmed that the gate would be automatic, with the motor on the inside of the gate.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment. Dan Kelley, president of Bingham Court Homeowners Association, stated that the Homeowners Association generally does not support this project, owing to the number of parking spaces and visibility of the cars from the public right-of-way. Jonathan Auerbach, a resident of Bingham Court, stated that a parcel across Locust Street from the subject property was acquired by the developer of this project. Mr. Auerbach stated that he is concerned that the parking allowance on this subject property could pave the way for similar parking opportunities on the site across the street. It was noted that the lot across the street already includes several parking spots. Ms. Hawkins clarified that parking is technically a zoning issue, but that the Architectural Committee is interested in the visibility of the parked cars and the impact of the parking on the historic property.

Lorna Katz Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that she attended a presentation by the developer at which he discussed the potential construction of two garages where the surface parking is now proposed. She claimed that that plan with garages called for six parking spaces, not the five shown in this application. She asked the Committee to object to garages at this site. She stated that the developer owns a lot across Locust Street from the site in question and opined that she is very concerned about the developer's plans for the other side of the street, which may include garages. She noted that there are parking lots on this block of Locust Street, but only on the north side. She asked where the new mechanical equipment would be located when the current industrial-sized unit is removed to make way for the parking. She also asked what recourse the Commission would have if the developer removed the existing mechanical equipment, did not install new equipment, and thereby precipitated the deterioration of the buildings, which would be unheated. She also expressed her concern about the fact that the developer has not yet subdivided the property, even if the purported plan is to convert the two rowhouses back into single-family homes. She contended that "the timing of the whole thing is very suspect." Returning to the site across the street, she suggested that the Committee condition any approval for this parking with requirements for the new construction across the street. She also expressed concern about the potential removal of a wisteria vine and tree from the site. She claimed that the wisteria was a gift from John Bartram to the Wister family, for whom the species is named. Mr. Farnham reminded the Committee that it must base its current review on the merits of the application before it and not on a potential future application for garages at this site or on an unrelated development across the street. Ms. Hawkins asked where the heating and cooling equipment will be located once it is removed from its current location. Ms. Bastian responded that this application relates to the parking only. They have not yet determined new locations for the equipment, but noted that the new equipment would be much smaller and could be hidden away behind the buildings and out of view. She explained that the existing equipment supported an office building with 25 occupants. The new equipment will only support two single-family residences and therefore be much smaller and easier to hide.

Ms. Gutterman asked if any consideration had been given to materials other than asphalt paving for the parking area. Ms. Bastian responded that they would consider cobblestone or brick or other pavers.

Mr. Cluver asked about the status of the garden as it relates to the individual and district designations of these properties. Mr. Farnham explained that the wisteria vine is mentioned in the inventory, but its listing in the inventory is purely informational, not an indication of jurisdiction. He reminded the Committee that the Commission does not regulate gardening or landscaping, except in rare cases like Awbury Arboretum, where the Commission's jurisdiction is explicitly delineated in the nomination form.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant to show where the wisteria vine is located in the garden. Mr. Farnham pointed to its location on a site plan. Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance asked for clarification regarding the wisteria vine and its removal. Ms. Bastian responded that it is not proposed for removal. Mr. Cluver and Ms. Hawkins clarified that two trees are proposed for removal.

Ms. Hawkins summarized that she is concerned about the number of parking spaces, five for two single-family houses, and the view of parked cars from the public right-of-way. Regarding the various options, she stated that she prefers the low wall version with the solid gate. The

view of the cars should be blocked with a screening wall. She stated that the new location of the heating and cooling equipment should be resolved. She asserted that the gate mechanism should be located inside, not outside the wall. She also noted that every attempt should be made to retain the wisteria vine. Ms. Gutterman reiterated that the applicant should look into alternate paving materials.

Ms. Gutterman asserted that the Committee should recommend denial of the application because the designation status of the garden is unknown. Mr. Farnham disagreed, contending that there is no uncertainty about the history or designation status of the garden. He reiterated the history of the garden. It was created in 1912 and expanded in the 1930s. He clarified that the Commission has jurisdiction over the landscape garden as a feature of the built environment; it has walls, sidewalks, and a small circular fountain. Mr. Farnham explained that the designation of a property includes the building, its site and appurtenances such the garden and its walls. The appurtenances associated with the garden were constructed during the period of significance of the district. There is no more clarity that can be achieved as to the garden's designation status, as the property was individually designated at a time when nomination forms were not yet used. He again stated that the garden is a feature of the property and was created during the period of significance of the historic district. He cautioned Ms. Gutterman not to recommend denial owing to a contention that the designation status of the garden is unknown; it is known and documented. The real question is whether the proposed alterations to the garden satisfy the standards. Noting a precedent, Ms. Hawkins reminded the Committee members that the Commission approved construction in a portion of the garden at the College of Physicians building a few years ago. Ms. Gutterman contended that that situation was different. In that case, the Commission allowed alterations to the garden for a stair tower. In this case, the alterations would be for parking, which is inappropriate. Ms. Gutterman advocated for denial. Mr. Cluver agreed.

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

ADDRESS: 1816 DELANCEY PL

Project: Construct garage; replace windows; add balcony and deck; install star bolts

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mark Nicoletti

Applicant: Deborah Cianfrani, Cianfrani Law, LLC

History: 1855

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert a basement space into a garage, erect a rooftop deck with one-story addition, add a balcony along the rear ell, replace all windows and install star bolts on a row house located within the Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District.

The proposed garage opening would be located at the rear of the property on Panama Street. As proposed, the sidewalk would slope similar to the neighbor's at 1818 Delancey Place in order to accommodate the garage opening. However, it appears that Streets Department may

not allow this sidewalk slope, and the applicant indicated that they may come to the Architectural Committee meeting with a revision that shows what, if anything, would happen to the first floor rear windows to allow for the garage opening. The basement windows would be removed where the garage door would be installed.

The application proposes constructing a rooftop addition with deck on the main block of the house. To accommodate the addition, a chimney would need to be extended in height. The deck with four-foot tall wrought iron railing would be set back eight feet from the front façade. The rooftop addition would be set back six feet from the front edge of the deck. Two alternates for the addition itself are proposed. The applicant claims that a mockup shows that the rooftop addition and deck would be inconspicuous from Delancey Place; however a staff member was not present at the time of the mockup.

A steel deck with railing is proposed for the second-floor level along the rear ell. A ladder for egress extending from the roof to the second-floor deck is also proposed.

Replacement windows and star bolts are also proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the side deck with ladder, window replacement, and star bolts; denial of the rooftop addition as shown, but approval of a rooftop addition that would be set back far enough from the chimney so that the chimney would not be raised, provided a mockup demonstrates it is inconspicuous; approval of the garage as shown; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Mark Nicoletti, attorney Deborah Cianfrani, and architects Alvin Holm and Michael Cole represented the application.

Mr. Nicoletti provided background on his interest in this particular property, and noted his successful renovation of a historic property in Lower Merion.

Ms. Cianfrani stated that the rooftop deck was pushed back eight feet from the front of the house because having it on the main block allowed for more buffer room as a safety consideration. She then distributed an artistic rendering done by Mr. Holm of the rooftop deck and addition. Ms. Gutterman stated that she prefers a rooftop addition that is as small as possible, and that it is located on the roof such that it is not visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Cluver noted that the policy of the Architectural Committee is typically that rooftop additions be placed on the rear ell, if one exists, or on the back half of the main block, if there is no rear ell. He stated that the artistic rendering by Mr. Holm was more in keeping with those guidelines when compared to what was presented in the original submission. Mr. Holm asked about planting on a roof. Mr. Cluver responded that nothing should be visible from the street, whether built or growing. Ms. Stein noted that the raising of the chimney would be highly visible and is generally not approved by the Architectural Committee. The code requirement is that the addition be set back ten feet from the chimney so that the chimney does not require an extension in height. Mr. Cluver voiced concern that the artistic rendering showed the addition spanning the full width of the roof, instead of the preferred scenario where the footprint would be brought in from the edges. He also suggested that all plantings get held back from the edge, so that the roof edge is not raised artificially. He reminded the applicant that the roof would get built up about a foot in height owing to the addition of structure, which would mean that the parapet

would hide even less of the plantings. He suggested that the gazebo shown in the artistic rendering should be a roofless structure to minimize visibility. He summarized that the general rule that roof decks should not be visible from the primary street, but there is some tolerance for visibility from the secondary street, in this case Panama Street. Ms. Hawkins noted that the air conditioning equipment is not shown in the drawings, and clarified that the Commission does not regulate plantings, but that it requests that planters not be located near the edge of a roof. Ms. Stein cautioned that she believes that windows on a pilot house need to be set back five feet from the property line, but that the applicant should confirm the requirement with the City's zoning regulators.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant had submitted a revised garage proposal, since there was mention of that possibility in the project overview. Ms. Cianfrani stated that the garage proposal is as shown in the application packet, and would not require any alterations to the existing windows on the first floor rear, owing to the raising of the floor joists in the dining room. The sidewalk will not slope, she added.

Ms. Gutterman stated that the installation of star bolts and replacement windows was acceptable, with the staff to review details.

Ms. Stein asked about the purpose of the surface-applied ladder that leads from the second-floor balcony to the roof. Mr. Nicoletti explained that he wants to have the ladder as a secondary means of egress in the event of an emergency. He said that the ladder has a cage around it owing to code requirements, and noted that the visibility of the ladder is minimal due to its location. Ms. Stein stated that the Committee typically does not approve fire escapes. Mr. Cluver described several options for ladders that are chains or appear to be a downspout. He stated that he is in favor of the balcony, provided that the edge of it is held back about a foot from the edge of the building so that it is not flush with the back of the building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the side deck, provided that it is recessed one foot from the back edge of the building; approval of the window replacement and star bolt installation; approval of the garage as shown, provided the sidewalk and masonry openings of the first-floor rear windows are not altered; denial of the ladder; and denial of the rooftop deck and addition as submitted and revised; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 1708 DELANCEY PL

Project: Construct rear stair tower and deck, replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Banyan Family Limited Partnership

Applicant: Brett Webber, Brett Webber Architects, PC

History: 1850; mansard added

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear stair addition and roof deck. It also proposes window replacement and alterations to the rear façade related to the stair addition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 MAY 2014

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

The Architectural Committee reviewed and recommended approval of a rear stair addition that did not extend to the roof at its January 2014 meeting. That application was withdrawn before the Commission reviewed it. The current application proposes a rear stair addition that extends above the roofline to allow for access to a proposed roof deck. The public visibility of the stair addition is minimal from the rear on Panama Street. The proposed deck would be set back 17 feet from the front of the building and would align with a roof deck on the adjacent building at 1706 Delancey Place, which was legalized by the Historical Commission in 2001. The railing would be painted steel, and would be minimally visible from public right-of-ways.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, owing to inconspicuousness of the rear addition and roof deck, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline; approval of window replacement, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Brett Webber represented the application.

Mr. Webber clarified that the proposed deck railing would align with the railing at the adjacent property at 1706 Delancey Place in both setback and in overall height profile. Ms. Hawkins asked about the exterior material of the stair tower. Mr. Webber responded that it would be a fiber cement panel in buff grey or buff limestone color. Ms. Stein asked about the location of the new condensing units on the roof. Mr. Webber showed the location of the three 30-inch high condensers, to be placed in a row, forward of the deck railing but behind the sightline. He stated that the units are hidden by the adjacent dormer in the oblique view. Ms. Hawkins asked if consideration had been given to tucking the condenser units back by the stair. Mr. Webber responded that there is only a small area by the stair, and the preference is to have the condensers in the front, to the extent that they are not visible. Ms. Gutterman asked about an exit door out to the roof from the proposed stair tower. Mr. Webber responded that it is a sliding monitor, which is essentially a roof hatch that is three-dimensional rather than being flat on the roof. It is only the height of the railing, and one panel slides from right to left to allow for egress.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the deck is inconspicuous and the mechanical equipment is invisible from Delancey Place, with the staff to review details including a mockup of the deck and equipment, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 208, 210, AND 212 VINE ST, 207, 209, AND 211 NEW STREET

Project: Construct four-story rear addition on rear; restore front facades

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John Stortz

Applicant: Ryan Debski, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects

History: 208 Vine, 1780, Contributing; 210 Vine, 1885, Contributing; 212 Vine, 1760, Contributing

207 New, 1940, Non-contributing; 209 and 211 New, 1925, Contributing;

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the renovation of the three buildings facing Vine Street and the construction of a large addition on garage or light industrial buildings at the rear of the site, facing New Street.

The application indicates that the Vine Street facades would be restored, but the plans do not define the scope, extent, or details of the work.

The application proposes the construction of a four-story addition on top of the garage-like structures facing New Street. The building to the east on New Street is classified as non-contributing in the district inventory, while the building to the west is classified as contributing. The facades of the garage-like structures would be retained. At the building to the east, the roll-down garage door would be replaced by a glazed entry and a new garage entrance would be inserted into its longer, east-facing facade. The addition would be clad in stucco and have punched openings with what appear to be casement windows with transoms. The staff notes that the proposed addition has no relationship to the historic buildings on Vine or New Streets. The staff suggests that an addition that incorporated more of an industrial aesthetic would be more compatible with the New Street buildings and immediate surroundings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner John Stortz and architects Eve Parrot, and Stuart Rosenberg represented the application.

Mr. Rosenberg presented axonometric drawings of the project. In response to questions from Ms. Hawkins, Mr. Rosenberg explained that the new building will sit on top of the two garage structures at the rear facing New Street. The brick facades will be preserved. The facades will have a stucco finish and clad wood casement windows. The muntins will be on the outside of the glass. The lintels and sills may be brick soldier courses and the building will have a tall 42" parapet to conceal rooftop decks and mechanical equipment. Mr. Rosenberg said that he would probably place the mechanical equipment towards the middle of the building.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the architect needs to detail the connection between the old and new facades on New Street. He thought that the new wall should sit behind the existing wall in plane. He also proposed eliminating the three small windows above the existing brick gable on New Street and preserving more of an opening on the side of 207 New Street by inserting a transom. He pointed out that the axonometric rendering of the buildings facing New Street show 207 and 209-11 reversed in placement. Mr. Rosenberg explained that this is a drafting error.

Mr. Rosenberg asked for comments on the new stair tower that he proposes at the rear of 208 Vine Street. Mr. Baron noted that this stair tower and some decks proposed for the Vine Street properties only appear on the roof plan and not on the elevations. He stated that he had missed these features during his initial review because they are left off some drawings. He noted that they will sit on the oldest parts of the buildings. He observed that the applicant provided no photographs to assess the impact of these elements on the older structures. He concluded that that portion of the application appears incomplete. The Committee members agreed that the plans were not sufficiently complete for a final approval.

Ms. Hawkins asked for public comment. Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance questioned the dates of the two garage structures on New Street and asserted that the garages should both be considered non-contributing; one is classified as contributing and the other non-contributing in the district inventory. He said that the design of the new building might be better if both structures were demolished.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the Committee should recommend denial, owing to incompleteness.

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

ADDRESS: 2111 DELANCEY PL

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dan & Rebecca Shapiro

Applicant: Ryan Debski, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects

History: 1865

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes an addition on top of and at the rear of the rear ell. The rear ell has already been added to and altered more than once. Although the proposed addition would large and visible from the rear alley, the staff contends that it would be appropriate because of the context, limited visibility of the existing rear ell, and the altered nature of the existing rear ell. Most of the rears of the nearby properties have been extensively altered, including the building to the east, which has a very large addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Dan Shapiro and architects Ryan Debski and Stuart Rosenberg represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that, although the addition would be large and visible from the rear alley street, the staff recommended approval because the streetscape would be improved with the establishment of the street wall. Mr. Baron contended that the addition would be appropriate

because of the context and limited visibility and altered nature of the existing rear ell. Most of the rears of the nearby properties have been extensively altered.

Mr. Rosenberg stated that he is proposing an addition to house a family room and other spaces. Ms. Gutterman stated that the addition would be very large. She asked about the height of the new addition in relation to the neighboring building to the west. She stated that “it looks very big.” Mr. Rosenberg referred her to a photograph of the rear in the submission package. He stated that the addition would be the same height as and in the same plane as the neighboring rear addition. In response to Ms. Stein’s request for clarity, Mr. Rosenberg stated that the addition would align with the existing parapet wall of the adjacent building. He referred the Committee members to a drawing in the application. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the chimney would need to be raised. She asserted that the proposed addition must be taller than the neighboring building. Mr. Rosenberg disagreed and stated that the roof of the addition would align with the neighbor’s parapet wall. Ms. Gutterman stated that she was confused by the drawings. Ms. Stein asked how the roof would drain. Mr. Rosenberg stated that it would drain to the west. The pitch of the roof would be minimal. Mr. Rosenberg acknowledged that the chimneys would need to be extended, but contended that they will not be visible from the streets. Ms. Gutterman stated that she was confused. Mr. Rosenberg explained that he will extend the chimneys, but that they will be the same height above the new roof that they are now above the existing roof. He stated that they will be the minimum allowable height above the roof. Ms. Gutterman asked about the other chimneys. Mr. Debski responded that they are not located on this property, but are on the adjacent property.

Ms. Hawkins and Mr. Cluver questioned the accuracy of some of the architectural drawings related to the railing design. Mr. Rosenberg explained that the railing will consist of 30 inches of parapet and 12 inches of black metal railing. The addition will be accented with panels and trim. Ms. Gutterman asked about the cladding materials. Mr. Rosenberg stated that the addition will be clad in brick veneer over a wood frame. Ms. Gutterman asked about the material of the panels. Mr. Rosenberg responded that it would be synthetic, but it has not been specified yet. Ms. Hawkins asserted that it is difficult to understand the design when so many of the design questions are open. Ms. Stein asked about the proposed windows. Mr. Rosenberg stated that they would be aluminum-clad wood windows with exterior muntins. He reported that some of the windows will be operable, some not. Ms. Hawkins asked if the operable windows would require guard rails. Mr. Rosenberg stated that they would not because they would be upper windows in a two-story space. He directed the Committee to a section drawing of the space. He pointed out where the French doors would be located. Ms. Gutterman asked about the roof in the side yard. Mr. Rosenberg explained that it will provide shelter for the kitchen entrance. It will run around the existing bay window. Mr. Cluver contended that they were proposing to remove the entire rear wall at the third floor. Mr. Rosenberg disagreed and explained that they are using an existing door opening at that level. Mr. Cluver stated that the drawings are hard to read, owing to their organization.

Mr. Baron explained that the staff supported this project because the addition would create a uniform street wall at the rear of this property along Cypress Street. He reported that this block includes a mix of fronts of smaller rowhouses and backs of larger rowhouses. Cleaning up and unifying the rears and thereby creating a uniform street wall will improve the overall streetscape. He noted that the rear of this building has been modified many times and much of it is invisible from the street, owing to the tall garage right at the sidewalk line. He stated that the staff

supports this project because it will improve the appearance of the much-altered rear of the building and unify the streetscape.

Mr. Cluver stated that the window proportions are too vertical and differ from the typical proportions of the neighborhood. Mr. Rosenberg disagreed and asserted that there is a huge range of window types in the neighborhood, especially at the rears of buildings. Mr. Cluver asked about the changes to the rear ell at the first floor at the kitchen. He noted that panels would replace some brick. Mr. Rosenberg noted that none of the first-floor rear is visible from the street. He explained that they are proposing the panel system because the rear ell in this area has been added to three or four times and the brick is in bad condition at several points. The panels would cover the bad brick. He again noted that none of these changes would be visible to the public, owing to the tall garage. Ms. Hawkins asked about the material of the panels and if it would be paintable. Mr. Rosenberg stated that it would be Azek and it would be painted. The Committee discussed the installation of the panels and their locations relative to the planes of the existing facades. Mr. Rosenberg stated that he planned to install a cast stone bandcourse to transition from the brick to the panels. Ms. Hawkins objected, stating that any panel system should be recessed into the brick, not stand proud of it. Mr. Rosenberg stated that his stone sill plan would be successful. He also offered to forego the panel system. Ms. Gutterman stated that “there seems to be a lot going on in the window openings and the panels and there is pre-cast and in my mind it doesn’t gel.” She added, “I can’t quite understand how all of the details work and how they go together and how things are being applied and attached and how this new roof meets your base and goes under some bays and things have to get flashed and other places it looks like it terminates. I’m just not clear on how all these materials are going to work and be detailed and that it is going to look cohesive at the end when it’s all done and I’m concerned about the height of this and how it relates and how the chimney sort of The ideas are there but it needs to be developed further for us.” Mr. Cluver stated that there are inconsistencies in the design. He opined that he finds the concept of the addition acceptable, but the details lacking. Mr. Rosenberg asked the Committee to recommend approval, subject to the review of the details. Ms. Pentz stated that she supported the staff recommendation of approval, with the staff to review details. Ms. Gutterman responded that she was not comfortable with the staff recommendation. She stated that she approved of the massing of the addition, but wanted more information about the details. Ms. Stein stated that she too finds the details lacking.

Mr. Rosenberg asked about amending his application for in-concept approval only. Mr. Baron explained that he could downgrade the application to request an in-concept approval only, but he warned Mr. Rosenberg that he could not obtain a building permit with an in-concept approval, even if the staff reviewed and confirmed all of the details; he would need to submit a second application and undergo a second round of reviews for the final approval and building permit. Ms. Hawkins suggested that Mr. Rosenberg revise his application for the Commission to provide the missing details. Mr. Rosenberg stated that he can update the drawings to provide the details that have been requested for the Commission meeting. Ms. Hawkins noted that he has not provided the details for modifying the bay. Mr. Rosenberg stated that he would not modify his application to seek in-concept approval, but would remain on the final approval track and provide updated drawings with the details to the Commission.

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

ADDRESS: 5320 GERMANTOWN AVE

Project: Legalize alterations to storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 5320 Germantown Ave. Associates

Applicant: Marianne Baker, Baker Architects, Inc.

History: 1865; Bank Hotel; altered 1900

Individual Designation: 1/25/1966

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of alterations to a storefront. The building had a storefront as early as the mid nineteenth century. The storefront was reconstructed with beaded board siding in the mid twentieth century. In November 2012, after that storefront was hit by a car and damaged, the staff approved a plan to replace a small section of the storefront with matching beaded board. Although the proposal did not constitute a restoration, the staff approved it because the applicant only proposed to replace a small portion of the storefront to match the remainder of the existing, legal, non-historic storefront. After obtaining the staff approval for the small repair, the contractor greatly exceeded the permit, demolishing the remainder of the storefront and replacing it in its entirety with an even more incongruous siding and small door. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation for the work which deviated from the permit. A restored storefront should have a paneled design in keeping with the period of the building and the second-floor bay.

Although not part of this application, the windows in the upper floors are in violation. The upper-floor windows were replaced with vinyl windows without a permit or approval in 2002. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation at that time. The owner submitted an application to legalize the windows in 2003, but the Commission denied it. The owner twice obtained permits to install the correct windows and clear the violation, in 2004 and again in 2006, but the replacement was never undertaken. A new violation was recently issued for the vinyl windows.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Aaron Shepherd and architect George Baker represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that the proposed change to the transoms, elongating them, was inappropriate. Mr. Baker spread out his drawings and photographs on the Committee's table. He stated that he is not proposing any changes to the transoms; he noted that the transoms are marked "E" for "existing" on his drawings, meaning that they are not being changed. Mr. Baron held a photograph up to the drawing and noted that the existing transoms in the photograph do not have the proportions of the transoms in the drawings. Mr. Baker asserted that he is not proposing to change anything above the transom bar including the transoms. He stated that he surveyed the existing storefront, but then acknowledged that his drawing might be inaccurate.

Mr. Baker stated that his client obtained a building permit to make the repair to the area damaged by an automobile accident. He noted that the area requiring the change was to the left of the entrance door. When the contractor started the work, he realized that much of the wood at the storefront was rotten. Therefore, he removed and replaced the entire storefront below the

transom level. Ms. Hawkins asked if the contractor sought a new permit when he realized that the scope of the work had increased. Mr. Baker stated that he did not. He added that he was not involved in the project at the time, but was brought in after the work had been done. Ms. Gutterman asked if the contractor rebuilt the storefront exactly as it had been before the work commenced. Mr. Baker stated that he did rebuild it exactly. Mr. Baron explained that the existing storefront was non-historic and inappropriate, but was legal because it was grandfathered. The contractor obtained a permit to repair the non-historic storefront, but instead exceeded the permit and replaced the entire storefront. If the contractor had informed the Commission's staff that he intended to replace the entire storefront instead of simply repairing it, the staff would have informed the contractor that he needed to replace it with a replica of the historic storefront. Mr. Baron stated that the historic storefront dated to about 1905. Mr. Baron pointed out the problems with the current proposal.

Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Baker if he would install a custom door that fits the opening to avoid leaving an empty space above the door. Mr. Baker stated that he would install a custom door. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Baker if he was willing to replace the beaded board with appropriate panels. She noted that the staff could assist with the details. Mr. Baker stated that he was amenable to that suggestion. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Baker about his plan to replace the beaded board under the display windows. He stated that he would implement whatever Ms. Hawkins recommended. Ms. Hawkins noted that the pilasters have significant bases and she suggested continuing the base design under the windows. Mr. Baker stated that he liked the idea because it would save money over the panels. Ms. Hawkins stated that all of the requirements for the front façade should also apply to the storefront on the side façade. Mr. Baker asked if he could keep any of the beaded board. Ms. Hawkins replied in the negative, stating that it was all inappropriate. For the areas below the windows, Ms. Hawkins suggested that they extend the mullions down visually with pieces of trim across the panels. Ms. Hawkins noted that the sidewalk slopes from the corner of the building and the design of the storefront will need to account for that slope. Ms. Hawkins reiterated that the custom door must entirely fill the opening, with no panel or transom above. She stated that each door should have a single pane of glass and a kick plate panel at the bottom. Ms. Gutterman asked about the detail at the corner. Mr. Baron explained the corner detail. Ms. Hawkins directed Mr. Baker to work closely with Mr. Baron on the details. Mr. Cluver asked about ADA access at the door. He stated that the double-door will not meet the ADA requirements. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the applicants work out the door details with the staff.

On the issue of the windows, Mr. Shepherd stated that the former owner installed the windows. He stated that he would look into the problem and then seek to rectify it. Ms. Hawkins said that the Commission has allowed owners to replace windows on a schedule. She also stated that the owner can apply for an exemption owing to financial hardship. Mr. Baker offered to work with Mr. Shepherd to develop a plan to rectify the window problem.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the storefront as submitted, but approval of the storefront scheme set forth during the Committee meeting, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:48 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

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

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

Standard 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.

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.