

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

**TUESDAY, 26 OCTOBER 2010
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, chair
John Cluver
Shawn Evans
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

Kevin Rasmussen, Rasmussen/SU
Marilyn MacGregor
Lorna Katz-Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Bryan Seder
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Adrian Paulus
J. Lattig
Jeff Krieger, Krieger Architect
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch
Karen Wisniewski
Cheryl Durgans, Mural Arts Program
David Stein-Gottfred, Mural Arts Program
Judith Sullivan, Philadelphia Cathedral
Joe Brennan, Mural Arts Program
Shan Heush, Mural Arts Program
Amy Johnston, Mural Arts Program
Tuval Shlomo

CALL TO ORDER

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

341 PINE STREET

Owner: Bryan & Marci Seder

Applicant: Kevin C. Rasmussen AIA

History: 1968-69, Joseph Praissman, architect

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

Project: Construct addition on rear ell, glaze arched rear openings

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a third-floor addition on the rear ell of a Redevelopment Era townhouse in the Society Hill Historic District. The design proposed in this application is a revision to a previously approved design. The first design was reviewed and approved by the Commission in April 2010. The applicant has revised the proposed addition to address the concerns of a neighbor. The revised design proposes to construct a smaller third-floor addition with a small deck. In the first proposal, the addition extended the entire length of the rear ell. The current design proposes a shorter addition. The open space at the end of the shorter addition would be used for a deck. The design for the window on the addition has not changed from the previous application.

The second floor rear of the main block includes an open arcade. The applicant proposes to glaze the arcade openings with arched-top casement windows. The Commission previously reviewed and approved this alteration.

The first application proposed a parking space in the garden, which would have necessitated the installation of a garage door in the garden wall. This parking and door have been eliminated from the current application, which does not propose any changes to the garden wall along Pine Street.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect Kevin Rasmussen and owner Bryan Seder represented the application.

Mr. Rasmussen explained that the design for the bay window at the third-floor of the rear ell was the same as the design previously approved by the Commission, but it had been shifted in location to accommodate the smaller addition. He noted that the height of the addition and roof line would match that of the neighboring property.

Mr. Cluver asked if the Committee should review this application de novo or take the Commission's previous approval as the starting point. Mr. Danta replied that the Commission's previous approval must be taken into consideration; the Committee should review within the bounds set by that approval.

Mr. Evans reported that he had suffered from strong doubts about his advocacy of denial for this project after the last review. He acknowledged that he had been caught up in the intellectual debate regarding protecting Modern buildings during the previous review. He stated that this house was classified as Contributing, not Significant, to the district and that he would vote to approve the application today.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the relationship of the addition to the party walls. Mr. Rasmussen stated that the flashing details have not been designed yet. Ms. Gutterman stated that she was

glad to see that the addition had been reduced in size. She requested that the staff review the flashing details.

Mr. Cluver stated that he preferred this reduced scheme over the prior application.

Marilyn MacGregor, the neighbor at 343 Pine Street, stated that this revised design would have less of an impact than the design originally proposed, which would have blocked light into her property. She stated that she was still concerned with the drainage along the party walls. She noted that the addition is designed to slope onto her wall. She expressed concern that storm water may drain onto her property. She also stated that the house in question sits on an important corner directly across from St. Peter's Church. She stated that it was her understanding that the Historical Commission prefers roof decks to be shielded from public view in historical neighborhoods. She noted that the proposed roof deck would be conspicuous and asserted that the roof deck would be inappropriate for the neighborhood.

Mr. Cluver stated that the architect has an obligation to design an appropriate drainage system. He contended that drainage was not necessarily a preservation matter. The drainage design would be reviewed by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. He added that roof decks are typically allowed on rear ells. He stated that the proposed deck reads more as a parapet and stands out a lot less than the typical roof deck that is added after the fact. He noted that a roof deck is a logical addition over this flat roof, which inevitably would be used in this capacity. He opined that the proposed deck and railing is the most elegant way to accommodate this use. Ms. Gutterman stated that, if the Committee did not recommend approval of this deck, it is likely that a future owner would seek approval of a deck at this location in the future. Mr. Cluver agreed and noted that it would likely be a far less sensitive deck than the one currently proposed, which is integral to the overall addition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

1700 PINE STREET

Owner: JBCB Properties

Applicant: Michael Parsell

History: c. 1845

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

Project: Legalize alterations to front door

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize alterations to the front door of this apartment building in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The building was constructed in 1845 and it is part of a row of twenty Greek Revival Style townhouses. The subject building (1700 Pine Street) and its next door neighbor (1702 Pine Street) were converted into an apartment building in the first decades of the twentieth century. However, both buildings are separate parcels; they have not been consolidated. Both buildings received Colonial Revival alterations as part of the conversion to an apartment building from single family houses. The alterations have achieved their own historic significance. The front doors were changed at that time into wood doors with multi-light glazing. The Colonial Revival doors with Gothic-arched glazing were extant at both 1700 and 1702 Pine Street at the time of designation in 1995. The Historical Commission staff requested violations for the removal of both doors on 15 March 2010. The Department of Licenses & Inspections only issued a violation for 1700 Pine and did not cite 1702 Pine. The

same person owns both properties, which were purchased at the same time. The applicant is only seeking a legalization for the door at 1700 Pine Street, the property that was cited. Although no legalization is currently sought for 1702 Pine, the Commission should be aware of the full history.

The replacement door installed at 1700 Pine Street was a flush door with three square glazed panels. The door was inappropriate. The applicant claims in his cover letter that this door was only "temporary." The applicant appealed to the Board of License & Inspection Review. The applicant then withdrew the appeal as he had not yet applied to the Historical Commission. After the appeal had been withdrawn, the owner re-installed the original 1910s door and asked the Commission's staff to inspect the property to lift the violation. The staff observed at that time that the door with three glazed panels had been removed and the historic door reinstalled, but with a solid panel that eliminated three-thirds of the glazed panels, leaving only the Gothic-arched upper panels in place. The applicant proposes to legalize the alteration as installed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, 6, and 9.

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

Ms. Pentz asked about the failure to cite 1702 Pine Street for the illegal door replacement. Mr. Danta answered that he did not know why the Department of Licenses & Inspections cited on property but not the other. He stated that the staff hoped that the Commission would provide guidance regarding whether a new violation should be requested for the replaced door at 1702. He stated that the staff knew precisely when the door at 1700 had been replaced, but it was uncertain when the door at 1702 was replaced. However, the door at 1702 was replaced after designation.

Mr. Cluver acknowledged the owner's concern with security and asked if any alternative solutions had been discussed with the applicant. Mr. Danta replied that the staff had not met with the applicant to discuss alternatives. Mr. Cluver opined that a grill in the interior may help with the security while still retaining the historical integrity of the front door and the façade.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, 6, and 9.

1022 WAVERLY STREET

Owner: Adrian Paulus and Ashim Paul

Applicant: Adrian Paulus

History: c. 1830

Designation: individually designated, 11/24/1959

Project: Construct rear addition with decks

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition and roof deck, and rear decks to a non-historic rear addition of this house. The house faces Waverly Street at the front and Addison Street at the rear. The front of the house retains its historic appearance; the rear is non-historic. The Commission reviewed an application for this property in July 2009. At that time the applicant proposed a deck on the front portion of the roof that would have been visible from

the front, historic portion of the property. The Commission denied that proposal, but approved a deck on the back of the building:

Mr. Thomas moved to deny the proposed design, but to approve a deck, provided nothing is constructed to the north of the existing access hatch, with the staff to review details. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

The current design meets that condition. The deck would be south of the hatch and would not be visible from Waverly Street. The addition and decks would be visible from Addison Street, but would not impact the public perception of the historic portion of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Adrian Paulus and architect Jeff Krieger represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked how far the proposed addition would extend beyond the rear façade of the neighboring properties. Mr. Krieger answered that the addition would extend about 10 feet beyond the rear of the adjacent rear.

Mr. Paulus described the interior renovations. He stated that the addition would provide him with much needed interior space and also introduce light into the kitchen area.

Ms. Hawkins asked when the rear façade was altered from its historic appearance. Mr. Danta answered that the property was designated in 1959 and that the Commission had approved the rear façade alterations in 1973.

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

1323 RODMAN STREET

Owner: Robert M. Boucher & Karen A. Wisniewski

Applicant: Rustin Ohler

History: c. 1835

Designation: Individually designated, 3/20/1964

Project: Legalize rear addition and alterations

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the construction of a one-story rear addition with roof deck and vinyl railing and installation of a fiberglass door with vinyl capping without a permit or approval. The addition is clad in siding. According to aerial photographs, the addition and rear alterations were undertaken sometime between 2004 and 2006.

In review of the aerials, it became apparent that incompatible façade alterations, including installation of a stucco base, red shutters, window grill on the first story, and door, also appear to have occurred without the Commission's approval during the same time period, between 2004 and 2006.

However, at this time, the applicant seeks legalization of the rear addition and door only.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Karen Wisniewski and architect Rustin Ohler represented the application.

The architect explained that the owner, Ms. Wisniewski, purchased the property in 2002 and hired a contractor to do some work a few years later. She thought that the contractor obtained the appropriate permits and approvals and recently discovered that he had not. There are no current violations on the property. Ms. Wisniewski approached Mr. Ohler to seek the legalization of the work. Mr. Ohler explained that, when he submitted his application for legalization of the rear alterations to the Historical Commission, he did not realize the façade had also been altered. He pointed to photographs of the rear that were taken with a zoom lens that demonstrates the rear is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. He stated that, at the time of purchase, the base was already stuccoed, there were shutter hinges, but no shutters, and the grills and metal handrail were in place. The contractor painted the base, installed new shutters, replaced the basement and two first-story windows with vinyl windows, and installed a new door.

Mr. Evans asked if a window was cut down for a door on the rear and if dryer vents were installed. Ms. Wisniewski stated that the window was cut down for the new door opening and that the piping for the vents was extant. Ms. Gutterman asked how the first-floor rear appeared before the addition was added. Mr. Ohler stated that the first story had a door and window that have been enclosed by the addition. No masonry was removed and the openings were not altered.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the guardrail is inappropriate and visually draws attention because it is white vinyl. She discussed painting the rail, but explained that painting vinyl is problematic and will be a maintenance issue. Mr. Cluver noted that vinyl railings tend to fail and could be a safety issue. He observed that the rear addition and railing are obscured. He explained that he would vote to legalize the rear alterations, provided that the railing is replaced with something more appropriate when this one fails. He stated that the Committee should focus on the illegal conditions at the front façade. He noted the incompatible vinyl windows on the façade and asked if the shutters are operable. Mr. Ohler responded that they are attached to the existing shutter supports. Ms. Hawkins added that they appear too narrow and do not fit properly into the opening. Mr. Cluver noted that the shutter dogs appear to be screwed onto the shutter and not the brick. Mr. Ohler agreed. Mr. Cluver restated that, if corrections are made on the front façade, then legalization of the rear alterations could be an option. The front façade is the most important elevation of the property. Mr. Cluver stated that the shutters could be removed rather than restored, considering the historic shutters were not removed. Mr. Ohler stated that Ms. Wisniewski is amenable to the replacement of the windows and the removal of the shutters, but would like to retain the front door. Ms. Wisniewski asked what makes the current door objectionable. Ms. Hawkins replied that stylistically this door is not compatible with the architectural style of the house. Ms. Hawkins requested that staff research the historic door configuration.

Mr. Evans opined that the rail is the most distracting element of the rear alterations. He suggested that its replacement be required at this time.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the legalization of the rear addition, provided the deck rail is replaced in

either wood or metal in a dark color, the shutters are removed, the base is painted a compatible color, and the front door and basement and first-story windows are replaced with appropriate elements, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Cluver excused himself from the meeting.

3725 & 3727 - 29 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: Cathedral Church of the Savior, Episcopal Diocese

Applicant: Jane Golden

History: 1889-1902, architect Charles M. Burns, Jr.

Designation: Individually designated, 5/7/1981

Project: Add mural

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a mural on the stuccoed west elevation of the three-story rectory building of the Church of the Savior. The double brownstone façades and side bay were designed and added to existing buildings by architect Charles M. Burns Jr. in 1902. In 1889, Burns extensively altered the existing mid-century church building, adding a tower and new Italian Romanesque façade. The church and rectory buildings were designated as a complex.

The main façade of the church is the west elevation. The proposed mural on the neighboring west elevation of the rectory building is incompatible in color, contrast, and scale with the subject and adjacent historic resources.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Cheryl Durgans and Cherie Hersch of the Mural Arts Program, artist Joseph Brennan, and Judith Sullivan of the Episcopal Cathedral represented the application.

Ms. Durgans introduced the project. She explained that over the past three years they have been working with City agencies on a series of mural projects related to mental health and recovery. She stated that this particular project is an interfaith project. They have been working with several interfaith groups in Philadelphia to create a mural design that would focus on how struggles with mental health and recovery are received and worked through in the interfaith community. This site was chosen because there are several interfaith community organizations that work within the building including the Arts and Spirituality Center of Philadelphia. She stated that they view this project as an opportunity to enhance the Peace Garden, a place of spirituality and meditation. It is also part of the Porch Light Initiative, a Robert Wood Johnson matched grant of \$500,000, which they recently received.

Mr. Brennan stated that he worked with two other artists to create the design. He had several community meetings with interfaith and cultural groups around the city. He stated the mural represents how faith helps people in recovery. He depicts this concept through symbols, color, and abstract design. The mural demonstrates that going toward the light and positive energy can help overcome obstacles in illness and substance abuse. The circle to the left is a mosaic of blues and greens and colors of nature running across the wall from the left to the right. The white stripes contain symbols from different cultures and faiths and religions. In the upper right

corner is another gold mosaic. The bands of gold will stretch across the wall. The idea was to relate the mural to other buildings on the site. He explained that some of the shapes and features in the mural have similarities with the cathedral windows and bell tower. St. Agnes is located across the street. The wall will lead the eye to both cathedrals. He opined that this is the perfect wall for this mural because of the garden in the front and beautiful buildings on either side.

Ms. Hawkins asked what relationship the trees will have with the mural. Mr. Brennan stated the tree will be trimmed, but when the leaves fall one will be able to better perceive the art. He stated that the upper right corner with the gold mosaic will not be obstructed by the tree. Ms. Hawkins noted that the mosaics will be mounted onto a board and then mounted onto the building and that the remainder of the painting will occur directly on the stucco. Mr. Brennan added that, depending on where one is standing on Chestnut Street, there are different ways to experience the mural.

Ms. Sullivan described the church's mission of healing and inclusion. They share their space with the Interfaith Center of the Greater Philadelphia and there are many interfaith activities and events that take place in the cathedral. Part of their vision of the cathedral is the building in the most historic sense; as a place of inquiry, theology, study, and celebration of the arts. There are many art exhibitions inside the cathedral and numerous artists in residence. They see themselves as a gathering place for not only Episcopalians, but for all people, and are moved by the idea of theme of "healing through spirituality." She stated that the garden will be improved and can be a tranquil place for people to come and meditate. She added that they are considering an outdoor labyrinth for the space.

Mr. Evans stated that it is obvious that the wall is a good opportunity for a mural and the concept is brilliant and moving. He explained that the color is extremely bold and, although it serves the purpose of the concept, it does detract from the historic buildings. He opined that it should be toned it down. He acknowledged that the mural will not appear as shown in the rendering without any trees in view, but noted that the Commission does not have control over the natural environment or the trees.

Ms. Durgans stated that their group has discussed the issue of color and vibrancy and they do want the colors to be bold. She stated that the renderings may not be entirely accurate; the colors may actually be more muted. Mr. Brennan stated that the gold color is important to the concept. He contended that and the streetscape along Chestnut Street will be improved visually with this color. Mr. Evans stated that he does not dispute that this mural will improve the streetscape, but that the Committee's mission is to protect the historic resources.

Mr. McCoubrey opined that, though this space is one of mediation, the colors are grabbing the visual attention away from the buildings. He explained that he can understand brightness toward the top right of the mural, but it should be carried throughout the mural because it is too commanding for the space. He added that a contextual representation of the mural would help with the presentation and review.

Mr. Brennan, the artist, argued that the mural needs to be bold with color to keep it from being dwarfed by the churches. Ms. Gutterman suggested that their presentation should depict the mural with the trees in place because the mural would never be perceived as it is depicted in the rendering. It might help the argument that the colors should be bold; however, the colors are strong and do compete with the architecture that the Committee is charged with protecting.

Ms. Pentz stated she was in favor of approval as submitted and believes it will be a good enhancement to the streetscape.

Mr. McCoubrey observed a movement from earth to sky, brightness, and sunshine, left to right, and suggested a gradation of color making it less bright at the left and center and brighter toward the top right.

Ms. Hawkins opined that there is a clashing of color toward the middle and the sense of peace is not achieved sitting in the garden. She opined that it is rendered as seen from three blocks away rather than from the garden.

Mr. Brennan asked if the brightness should be focused up in the right corner. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the brightness could be in the right corner and then a tonal gradation down and across to the right. Ms. Durgans added that Mr. McCoubrey's suggestion would bring it back to the earth in the far left.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that, rather than issue a denial, the applicant should withdraw the application, make revisions, and return to the Committee. Mr. Evans suggested it would be helpful to the Committee to see a panel of the mosaic. Ms. Gutterman also asked for photographic depiction from three blocks away. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the applicants bring in paint swatches for color representation. Ms. Sell advised the applicants that if their intention is to withdraw and resubmit, that a letter will need to be submitted to the staff prior to the Historical Commission meeting. The applicants stated that they were withdrawing the application.

2123 PORTER STREET

Owner/Applicant: Emanuel Rucci

History: 1914, John & James Windrim, architects

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

Project: Replace tile roof with asphalt shingles

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the original terracotta tile roof and replace it with asphalt shingles. The house at 2123 Porter is a twin in a row of six California Mission style houses. The clay tiles are significant, character-defining features. The roof planes of the front cross gable as well as the roof of a side bay are visible from the public right-of-way, Porter Street; the rear sections of the roof behind the peak of the gable running parallel to the street are not.

The staff suggests the removal of the tile and the installation of the asphalt shingles on the rear sections only and the use of the salvaged tiles to make repairs to the front and side gables.

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

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

Mr. Baron advised the Committee members that the contractor for the project was present in the audience, but left the Architectural Committee meeting before his hearing owing to work

obligations. The contractor asked Mr. Baron to communicate that the owner cannot afford to do the work as proposed by the staff. The contractor claimed that others in the neighborhood have done what he is proposing.

Ms. Pentz asked why the replacement was necessary. Mr. Baron stated that the contractor did not offer that information. Ms. Gutterman stated that tiles can be pulled for repairs and reinstalled. She added that if there is tile breakage, there are tiles from the rear that can be used as replacements.

Mr. Baron stated that there have been people in this area who have done what the staff has suggested. He opined that repairs are likely to be more expensive than the installation of plain red asphalt shingles. Mr. Baron reported that he advised the contractor of the financial hardship process and gave him a copy of the Rules & Regulations, which describes the process and submission requirements.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and the Roofs Guideline.

1520 LATIMER STREET

Owner: Symphony View L.P.

Applicant: David Lerman

History: carriage house c. 1850

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

Proposal: Legalize garage doors, window infill, stucco

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize work on the front façade of this carriage house including the installation of a rectangular garage door, the removal and stucco-infilling of two windows, and the restuccoing of the façade. This façade was in altered condition at the time of designation in 1995, but the Commission's files contain a photograph of the original façade. In 2003, the designer-builder for the current applicant sought and received the Commission's approval for the restoration of the front façade to its original condition. The work to reopen the carriage door was begun but then abandoned. The staff requested a violation for the boarded up opening in 2008. More recently, the owner had this same contractor install a new garage door and infill the windows and stucco the façade without a permit. None of the work follows the approved 2003 restoration plans.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Contractor Vincent Massara represented the application.

Mr. Massara stated that the building has changed ownership since the time of the previous approval. He said that, although his brother prepared the earlier plans, he was not aware of that application. He said he is no longer working with his brother Carl Massara. He said that the new owner wanted to install new garage doors. He also said there was no arch above the garage but a lintel. He said he left the glass block in place above the lintel. He built out the stucco about two inches to create the look of an arch. He said the owner did not want to spend too much on a garage. He patched and recovered the broken stucco. He said that the brick on the inside face of the wall was Salmon brick and this is why the outside was originally stuccoed. When the

glass block was removed a little bit of the arch was revealed and he continued the arch outline in stucco.

Mr. Massaro claimed that his work greatly improved the streetscape. He called the area an alleyway strewn with trash cans.

Ms. Pentz asked what second-floor windows were approved in 2003. Mr. Baron replied that they were wood four-over-four windows with arched glazing.

Mr. Baron also stated that softer brick was typically used on the interior wythe of walls and was not a good indication of the exterior brick. He questioned Mr. Massaro's claim that the outer brick was Salmon brick. He suggested that the original stucco was probably put in place because of the unmatched brick when the arches were infilled.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the changes to the lower level of the front facade were of concern. In the historic photograph, the windows are substantially taller than the faux arch windows created by Mr. Massara. The recreated arch above the garage is also too high and too rounded. She said it should be more flat.

Mr. Massara said the carriage house is now just an entrance to a property facing Spruce Street. He added that it has no rear wall and the opening has been widened to allow many vehicles to access the larger property. Mr. Massaro stated that the client lives and work in the space and can park six vehicles in the area. It was opened up larger to allow easier access and that is why the arch is disproportionate.

Ms. Pentz was less troubled by the garage door opening than the smaller windows. She contended that it would be unreasonable to expect someone to reconstruct the load bearing arch. Ms. Hawkins opined that it would be possible to install a more sympathetic garage door and to treat the arch to match this more appropriate door. She said a stucco panel is not the best answer. Mr. Baron offered to work with the applicant on a compromise. Mr. McCoubrey recommended that the applicant work with the staff to find a better solution.

Mr. Massaro stated the owner has security concerns about installing windows and noted in particular the recent graffiti.

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

127 N. 11TH STREET

Owner: Wai Man Law

Applicant: Huai Jen Hsu, YCH Architects

History: c. 1825, altered twentieth century

Designation: Individually designated, 4/25/1974

Proposal: Demolish rear, restore windows in front façade, remove paint, install storefront

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the rear of this house including the rear ell and the rear slope of the main roof. A large addition would be constructed at the rear. In exchange for the loss at the rear, the applicant proposes to install 6-over-6 windows in the front

façade, remove the blue paint from brick, and install a new, compatible storefront in place of mid twentieth-century brick infill.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of this compromise, provided the window openings are reopened to their historic dimensions, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Commission's approval of a similar project at 131 N. 11th Street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect Yao-Chang Huang represented the application.

Mr. Baron noted that much of the demolition of fabric the rear would not be visible. He also stated that the front of the building is quite altered, having neither its original residential front nor a mid nineteenth-century Victorian storefront. The façade has a parapet that rises higher than the roofline. He said that the building would regain value as part of this c. 1820 row if the dormer window was restored and the windows were reopened to match the size of the neighboring windows and a compatible storefront was installed. The proposal involves installing six-over-six windows, but not at their original sizes. When the blue paint is removed, the changes to the opening sizes will be more apparent. The store front is much like that recently approved by the Commission for a similar neighboring property.

Mr. Baron introduced photographs of the row to show the original window heights. He said that removal of the parapet is not part of the proposal. The windows as shown have smaller than original openings.

Mr. Evans pointed out that the building has been refaced with the new wall sitting out four inches beyond the old wall. He was concerned about creating a new face that is neither the original nor the modified structure. He said it is important to ascertain what is underneath the extant facade. Ms. Gutterman suggested taking the brick face off and exploring the original openings.

Ms. Hawkins asked if any of the buildings in the row have retained their original brick facades. Mr. Baron said that some they have. There are some with original facades, window openings and cornices. Generally, the changes have taken place at the ground level. This building is the most altered.

Mr. Hawkins asked if this was appropriate mitigation for the demolition of so much historic fabric behind the roof ridge. The architect described the condition of the building as being vacant for over 20 years. The building suffered a fire and was filled with more than two feet of water.

Mr. McCoubrey thought that it was important to know more about the historic fabric that would be lost. He asked for more information on the rear roof slope and ell. Mr. Baron offered to visit the site with the applicant to obtain more information.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to a lack of information.

Ms. Gutterman excused herself from the meeting.

1802 DIAMOND STREET

Owner: David Rosenberg

Applicant: Tuval Shlomo

History: 1889

Designation: Contributing to Diamond Street Historic District, 1/29/1986

Proposal: Replace door, basement windows, and brickmold, reset windows in opening, legalize windows and masonry repairs

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the correction and partial legalization of work to this rowhouse. The former owners sought a permit to demolish and rebuild the façade of this rowhouse. The staff approved that application with the stipulation that the applicant submit shop drawings for the door and windows and masonry samples for the brownstone repair for review by the staff. and the details and samples were never submitted. Incorrect windows and a door were installed and the masonry was inappropriately repaired. The applicant proposes to install a new, appropriate door and reset the windows in their appropriate locations in the openings, and install the correct brick molding. The basement slider windows would be removed and correct six-pane windows installed. The applicant seeks to legalize the clad windows and masonry work. The staff contends that this is an acceptable compromise because the windows are square head in square openings and the masonry was partially painted prior to the commencement of the illegal work.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Property owner David Rosenberg and contractor Tuval Shlomo represented the application.

The applicants explained that the owner, who purchased the property in February 2010, is attempting to correct the problems that he inherited from the previous owner. The door will be replaced and the windows will be pushed back into the openings to allow for the appropriate brick mold. The brownstone was repaired with cement, which was painted brown. Mr. Baron explained that the applicants are seeking to legalize the clad windows and the method of repair of the brownstone. Ms. Hawkins said that the cement will damage and detach from the soft brownstone. The applicant said that he would repair the brownstone correctly when it needs repair. Ms. Hawkins advised the applicant that the Committee cannot legalize inappropriate windows, but can make a recommendation to the Commission on the appropriateness of the compromise. Mr. Evans stated that he was uncomfortable with the brownstone repair and advised the applicant to bring more detailed photographs to the Commission meeting.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, particularly the brownstone repair.

1834 DIAMOND STREET

Owner: David Rosenberg

Applicant: Tuval Shlomo

History: 1889

Designation: Contributing to Diamond Street Historic District, 1/29/1986

Proposal: Replace door, basement windows, and brickmold, reset windows in opening, legalize windows and masonry repairs

OVERVIEW: The current owner bought the property with violations in place and is now proposing a compromise to legalize some of the work and correct other elements. This application proposes replacing an illegal door and basement windows, resetting windows in openings, replacing brickmolds, and legalizing windows and masonry repairs. The new owner proposes to remove the current single door and install double doors that do not match the historic doors that were present at the time of designation. He proposes to install new brick molding but leave the current square metal windows in the arched openings. He proposes to remove the vinyl sliding basement windows and replace them with the correct six-pane windows. He seeks to legalize the improper brownstone repair at the base of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the basement windows and brickmold; denial of the windows, door, and masonry repairs with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Property owner David Rosenberg and contractor Tuvo Shlomo represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that, although this property was altered by the same former owners who altered the property reviewed in the previous application, there are several differences in circumstances. This façade was historic; it was not rebuilt like the previous facade. It retained its original door and windows. The owners had no permits for any façade work. The façade has arched rather than square window openings. The brownstone repair is less accurate in shape than the other one. A photograph of the work was distributed to the Committee.

Mr. Shlomo reported that he was told to use the door at 1828 Diamond as a guide. For safety reasons, he proposed a paneled rather than glazed door and a single door that appears to be a double door. He suggests that it is possible to add details to the door to more accurately represent the historic door.

Ms. Hawkins was comfortable that a reasonable compromise could be achieved for the door. She was less comfortable with the square windows in the arched openings. Mr. Shlomo stated his client is concerned about the cost of new windows. He asked if an arched brick mold could be added to the windows to give the desired appearance. Ms. Hawkins thought that that would not work and suggested replacing the top sash with an arched one. Mr. Baron said this would be difficult because of the square subframe. Ms. Pentz objected to retaining the windows. She noted that this is an original façade, not a rebuilt one. Mr. McCoubrey said that the Committee must base their recommendations on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He said the Committee could not recommend approval of such work. He also said that the brownstone repair was done poorly. Ms. Hawkins said the Committee cannot support the applicant's compromise. Mr. Baron advised the applicant of their options, saying that they could continue to the Commission meeting or withdraw the application.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

Standard 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: Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs—their functional and decorative features—that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. This includes the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features such as cupolas, cresting, chimneys, and weathervanes; and roof material such as slate, wood, clay, tile, and metal, as well as its size, color, and patterning.