

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

**TUESDAY, 26 APRIL 2011
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, chair
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

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Paul Steinke, Reading Terminal Market
Da'Ron M. Ravnell, Unique Metal Concepts, LLC
Stephan Salisbury, Inquirer
Matt & Mary Moyer
Sal D'Angelo
Inez Crocker, Office of Councilman Rizzo
Lorna Katz Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Will Newbold
Andy Lash
Allen W. Rubin, Spring Garden Civic Association
Andrew Curtis, Robitaille+Curtis Architecture and Landscape
Owen Carton
Salvador Guerrero, Boxwood Architects
John Weckerly, Boxwood Architects
Paul Palladino
Michael Karloutsos
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Architects
R. McGuffin, McGuffin Associates
Larry Cohen, Cuba Libre
James Kelly, PMJ Development
Miguel Santiago
Quinton Bosman, Maze Group
Ron Kalten
Lucy Strackhouse, Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust
Jessica Doheny, Walnut Street Theatre
Mark Sylvester, Walnut Street Theatre

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman and Pentz and Messrs. Evans and McCoubrey joined her.

ADDRESS: 1021 WAVERLY ST

Project: Reconfigure roof, construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Matt & Mary Moyer

Applicant: Mary Moyer

History: 1825

Individual Designation: 11/24/1959

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a second and third-story rear addition on this two-and-a-half-story building. The peak of the roof would be raised 3'-3" and the addition would extend out to the rear from this new roofline. The addition would be clad with stucco. The front and side elevations are visible from Waverly Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, and 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application. Property owners Matt and Mary Moyer represented the application.

Mr. Moyer stated that, after a meeting with Ms. Sell, he anticipated that the Committee might recommend denial of the proposal to raise the roof. He asked the Committee members to suggest appropriate ways to add to the buildings that would increase the living space. He proposed an alternative, "Option B," to add a second-story rear addition under the cornice line of the roof; however, he did not have drawings documenting this design. He explained that he and his wife are expecting a baby in September and need to expedite the construction. Ms. Hawkins agreed that a second-story addition that stays below the roofline is preferred. She asked Ms. Sell whether a revised application could be approved at the staff level. Ms. Sell explained that the addition would still be visible from the street through an open area. She stated that she would need to consult with her colleagues before providing a final answer about a staff-level approval. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he was in favor of the concept of the so-called Option B, provided the addition remained under the roofline and had a flat roof. However, he stated that the Committee should review architectural drawings for this new design. Ms. Hawkins asked if the side wall of the addition would be blank; she explained that she would not be opposed to window openings in the wall. Mr. Moyer responded that windows in the wall would be desired. Ms. Sell asked the Committee members if they thought that it would be appropriate for the applicant to provide revised drawings to the Commission at its meeting. Mr. Evans stated that, provided the applicants responded to Committee's suggestions, it would be appropriate to submit revised drawings to the Commission. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance disagreed with the Committee's alternative suggestion and stated that an addition, even if not visible, would include removal of historic fabric. He opined that such an application would exceed the staff's authority to approve. Mr. Moyer stated that the rear one-story section of the house was built in the 1970s and the existing second-story, rear window is unusable and non-historic. Ms. Sell confirmed that the rear of the property is not visible from the street. Mr. Evans stated that the plans are inconsistent regarding the existing stairs and addition. Mr. McCoubrey

stated that the creation of one new opening through the rear wall of the house would not have an adverse effect on historic resources. Ms. Hawkins noted problems with the drawings and stated that the structural details of the addition should be reviewed by an architect. Ms. Gutterman recommended that the applicant consult with an architect regarding a second-story addition. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the staff determine whether a revised proposal as described could be approved at the staff level.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, and 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

ADDRESS: 256-58 S 20TH ST

Project: Legalize awning with fans

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Salvatore D'Angelo

Applicant: Dennis Torres

History: 1860; 256: façade stuccoed, 1964, storefront, nd; 258: Queen Anne storefront, c. 1885

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the recent installation of an awning without approval of the Historical Commission or a permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The awning consists of a metal structure and a canvas cover with closed sides. The large awning spans across the facades of two buildings and covers a historic wood storefront cornice. Lighting and electric fans hang from the awning.

This property owner is aware of the Commission's jurisdiction over this property and its processes and procedures. In February 2000, this owner received a violation for alterations to the storefront undertaken without the Commission's approval or a permit. The owner submitted an application to legalize the alterations. After a lengthy review process and many meetings between the current applicant and the staff, the Commission approved a partial restoration of the storefront in September 2003.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application. Property owner and restaurateur Sal D'Angelo represented the application.

Mr. D'Angelo explained that he obtained a license for outdoor seating on the sidewalk where the awning is located. He hired American Awning to design and install the awning. He stated that the awning company obtained a zoning permit, but not a building permit. He stated that the company was not willing to rectify the violation. He explained that he would like to keep the awning because it is aesthetically pleasant, it enhances the dining experience, and he has received compliments on it from customers and neighbors. He stated that the awning is designed to indicate that the restaurant occupies both buildings. He claimed that he obtained an electrical permit for the fans. Ms. Sell noted that the Commission does not have the authority to review electrical permits. Mr. D'Angelo stated that he tried to use umbrellas, but that they are not practical for rain coverage and they tended to blow over. Ms. Hawkins acknowledged that the awning may enhance the dining experience, it is not appropriate from a preservation perspective. She stated that a continuous awning that runs across two building facades does

not respect the rhythms and scale of the individual buildings. She added that she is not aware of other awnings on historically designated buildings that have fans and lighting and that she is opposed to these features. Mr. D'Angelo stated that he would remove these features. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Hawkins and stated that, although the owner desires to tie the two storefronts together, it is not appropriate. Mr. Evans asked the staff if the applicant satisfied the terms of the 2003 approval. Ms. Sell responded that he had.

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

ADDRESS: 266 S 03RD ST

Project: Construct rear addition, reconstruct roof and dormer
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Andrew Lash
Applicant: Andrew Lash
History: 1815, new front façade, 1964
Individual Designation: 9/26/1961
District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999
Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes several alterations to the exterior of this property. It proposes to demolish the roof and original dormers and reconstruct the front roof and dormer in kind. In a meeting with the staff, the applicant claimed that the roofing structure is severely deteriorated. He has received advice from several roofing contractors to demolish the roof and dormer in their entireties and reconstruct them. No documentation has been provided to substantiate the claim that the roof is failing. This building is part of an important row of contributing buildings within the Society Hill Historic District that retain their original 1815 dormers. The staff has suggested that the applicant should obtain an engineer's report documenting the level of deterioration to substantiate whether the complete demolition of the roof and dormer is necessary.

As part of the proposed roof reconstruction, the application proposes to building up the party wall between 264 and 266 S. 3rd Street. The party wall would be constructed of brick and extend one foot above the roof elevation.

The application also proposes to replace the cornice and windows to match their historic configurations and materials.

On the rear roof, the application proposes to construct a three-bay dormer with skylights and new chimney. These elements would not extend above the ridgeline of the gable.

A two-story, single-bay addition is proposed on the rear elevation. The addition would be clad in stucco. The rear of this property is completely landlocked and not visible from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the rear alterations and additions; approval of the roof and dormer demolition and reconstruction, provided the applicant submits an engineer's report that demonstrates the roof cannot be feasibly repaired; and denial of the party wall extension, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application. Architect Will Newbold and owner Andrew Lash represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant if he had obtained the suggested engineer's report. Mr. Lash responded that he wanted to be sure it was necessary before expending the funds. He explained that the roof sagging is visible from the street, fire has damaged the rafters, and six contractors have told him the roof has failed. He explained that the original shake is under layers of shingles and rolled roofing with cement patchwork. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the many layers of roofing have added a significant weight load on the rafters. She asked the applicants to explain the extent of roof work. Mr. Newbold explained that the entire roof will be removed and rebuilt to the same pitch and the dormer will be rebuilt in-kind. He stated he is consulting with a millworker that has worked with the Commission on other projects. Ms. Hawkins suggested the applicant explore sistering the rafters to repair of the roof. Ms. Gutterman explained that there may be sagging, leaks, and charring, but, without an engineer's report stating that the rafters are completely deteriorated, the Committee cannot recommend approval of the roof removal. She suggested repair and partial replacement of the roofing system as opposed to wholesale removal and replacement, especially at the dormer. Ms. Lash stated that repair is an option. Mr. Newbold stated that he fears that the repair work would commence, only to reveal conditions that necessitate the complete replacement. Ms. Gutterman explained that a thorough engineer's report would prevent such an occurrence. Mr. Lash acknowledged that repair and sistering is an option. He stated that they will have to remove the old roofing and sub-roof. Ms. Hawkins asserted that a new roofing system may be necessary, but not wholesale removal may not. Mr. Lash stated that the siding on current dormer is not appropriately; the dormer is currently covered with an asphalt material. He explained that there is significant deterioration at the dormer. Ms. Gutterman argued that it may only be the trim that needs repair and not the entire framing of the dormer. She explained that an engineer's report will answer these questions. Ms. Hawkins asserted that the applicant must demonstrate that the historic fabric is so severely deteriorated that it cannot be salvaged; a total replacement is an option only if it is determined that the roof cannot be repaired. Mr. Evans stated that the decision should be made over soundness of the material rather than appearance; original dormers will look old, not crisp and new.

Mr. Newbold stated that, after meeting Bill Kane, the millworker, that they are now only proposing sash replacement rather than wholesale window replacement on the front façade.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she agrees with the staff's recommendation of denial for the addition to the party wall. Mr. Lash explained that it appears that the building originally had a taller party wall, which extended above the level of the roof, but it fell at some point. Ms. Sell displayed a historic photograph of the buildings, prior to the 1960s refacing, which shows that the party wall did not extend above the level of the roof at that time. She noted that the two buildings were constructed at the same time.

Ms. Hawkins asked the staff if the rear of the building in question is visible from the public right-of-way. Ms. Sell confirmed that the rear is surrounded by the rears of other buildings and is not visible from the public right-of-way. Ms. Gutterman asked what rooms the rear addition will enlarge. Mr. Newbold explained that the first story will be an extension of the living room and the second story will be an enclosed porch. Mr. Evans suggested the addition should have a shed roof like historic additions. Ms. Hawkins asked if the rear was currently stuccoed. Mr. Lash confirmed that it was. Mr. Evans explained that he approves the rear addition, but finds the rear roof addition problematic. He stated that the historically significant row has intact rooflines. He explained this alteration would destroy the historic roofline and add weight to an already weak

roofing structure. Mr. Newbold explained that the large dormer would add space to a room on the fourth story.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the rear two-story addition with a shed roof, but denial of roof demolition and alterations and extension of the party wall above the roofline, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and 9.

ADDRESS: 2330 PINE ST

Project: Rehabilitate building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Owen Carton

Applicant: Andrew Curtis, Robitaille+Curtis Architecture and Landscape

History: c. 1855; major alterations, Charles Broudy, architect, 1962

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate a rowhouse at the southeast corner of Pine and S. 24th Streets. The rowhouse dates to about 1855, but was radically altered in a Modernist style in 1962.

This application proposes to remove most but not all of the Modernist elements added in 1962. Also, the stucco on the entire building would be replaced. The rehabilitation would neither restore the original 1855 Italianate appearance nor the 1962 Modernist appearance, but instead create a combination of the two.

On the Pine Street façade, the terra cotta pipe ornament would be removed, window openings reconfigured, and through-wall air conditioners removed. Five traditionally sized and proportioned window openings would be created and fenestrated with two-over-two, double-hung windows appropriate to 1855. The Modernist double-chimney added in 1962 would be retained. No cornice would be added.

On the 24th Street façade, the application proposes removing the terra cotta pipe ornament, infilling the Modernist reveals in the parapet wall and reconfiguring the Modernist strip windows below them, removing and infilling the Modernist triangular windows in the gable, removing jalousie windows, and reconfiguring the doorway with step. Traditionally sized and proportioned window openings would be created and fenestrated with two-over-two, double-hung windows. Two small awning windows would be installed in new openings. A six-panel door with transom would be installed in a new, narrower door opening.

At the rear façade, the Modernist reveals in the parapet wall would be infilled and windows would be replaced in existing openings.

Unlike the nominations for the Commission's other historic districts, the nomination for the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District does not define a period of significance. Deciding not to define a time period for the district's significance, the Commission asserted at the time of designation that history unfolds as a never-ending process and should not be artificially delimited. On its face, this assertion appears reasonable. However, when considered from a regulatory standpoint, the lack of a period of significance complicates the Commission's

oversight of this property. Without a period of significance, the Commission must decide whether the classification of this property as a contributing resource in the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District was intended to protect the Modernist elements added to this mid nineteenth-century rowhouse in 1962.

Without an explicit period of significance to resolve this question definitively, one can look to other aspects of the district nomination for clues. The nomination clearly indicates that properties of the mid and late nineteenth century and early twentieth century contribute to the district's historical significance. The nomination also clearly indicates that the 1920s Spanish Revival modifications to earlier rowhouses have significance; these 1920s modifications are analogous to 1960s modifications of the property in question. The nomination's one statement on Modernism is worth quoting in full:

The failure of International Modernism to receive the affection of any but the most aesthetically inclined, and the parallel trend toward suburban residence in the 1930s left few buildings of modern design in the neighborhood. George Howe's alteration to the Speiser house on the 2000 block of Delancey (1933) is the principal low-rise landmark.

The nomination indicates that the Modernist elements of the 1933 Speiser House can be considered historically significant to the district. But can a much later Modernist alteration, which was only 35 years old when it was designated, qualify as historically significant? The classifications of two important, similar, c. 1960 Modernist buildings in the district provide clues. The 1963 Modernist building designed by noted architect Norman Rice as his office, which stands across 24th Street from the property in question, is classified as non-contributing. The c. 1960 house at 307 S. Chadwick Street, which noted architect Frank Weise designed as his residence, is likewise classified as non-contributing.

Finally, the nomination contends that the "modern buildings that blend with the scale, material and details of the particular block on which they stand contribute to the significant architectural ensemble of the district." In this instance, it would appear that the term "modern" is used to mean "contemporary" or "recent," not "Modern." The statement seems to indicate that buildings constructed relatively recently can contribute to the district, and therefore merit preservation, if they harmonize with their more significant neighbors.

In light of the classifications of the Rice and Weise buildings as well as other assertions in the district's statement of significance, one can safely conclude that the property at 2330 Pine Street was classified as contributing to the district either because it retains enough fabric to allow for a restoration to its 1855 appearance or because it has the same scale and materials (three stories and stucco) as its neighbors. One can also safely conclude that the building was not classified as contributing with the intention of protecting its Modernist elements.

In light of these conclusions, it appears that the Commission is authorized to approve a restoration to the buildings 1855 appearance, preservation of its 1962 appearance, or the creation of a contemporary appearance that "blend[s] with the scale, material and details of the particular block." However, the application proposes neither restoration nor preservation, but instead the creation of an amalgam of the 1855 and 1962 appearances, which is conflict with 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."

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 3.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Owen Carton and architect Andrew Curtis represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the classification of the Norman Rice office building, which is across 24th Street from the property in question. Mr. Farnham stated that it is classified as non-contributing in the district. Ms. Hawkins asked about its date. Mr. Farnham stated that it was constructed in 1963, almost contemporary with the rehabilitation of the building in question. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the architect, who undertook the Modernist rehabilitation of the building in question. Mr. Farnham stated that the identity of the architect is unknown, but it is known that the building was rehabilitated by Penn Towne Homes, Inc. in 1962. (Since the Architectural Committee meeting, Mr. Farnham spoke to one of the partners of Penn Towne Homes, who identified the architect as Charles Broudy.)

Mr. Curtis explained that his client purchased the property in 2010 with the intention of making it his primary residence. It was subdivided into small apartments many years ago.

Mr. Evans stated that this building is not the work of an architect of Norman Rice's caliber. Mr. Evans remarked that he would accept changes to this building that were compatible with the district. He asserted, however, that the proposed design is neither a restoration to 1855 or 1962, but combination of the two. He rejected the current approach. Mr. Curtis stated that he and his client have only discovered one historic photograph, which is included with the application and which does not provide much information about the building's original configuration. He stated that they have no information about the historic 24th Street façade. Mr. Evans noted that similar buildings in the area can provide sufficient clues to rehabilitate the historic building. Mr. Curtis contended that their current proposal is in keeping with nearby historic buildings, which have been altered from their historic conditions, but still maintain their historic characters. Mr. Evans noted that the buildings in the photographs were altered without the oversight of the Historical Commission. He also noted that the current proposal does not return to the historic character of the c. 1855 building, but instead proposes a hybrid of the original and Modern features. Mr. Evans noted that the retention of the Modern chimney on the front façade creates an awkward juxtaposition of mid nineteenth and mid twentieth-century features. He contended that the owner could restore to one period or the other, but not create an amalgam of the two.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants if they had considered maintaining the Modernist style of the house, but altering with additional windows or other changes that would allow it to satisfy contemporary needs. Mr. Curtis explained that his client wanted to return the building to its historic appearance. He posited that they would be able to find and reopen original window openings on the north façade once they began the demolition. He stated that the west façade poses greater problems. He explained that the interior is currently a "rabbit warren" of small rooms created when the building was converted to apartments. He stated that they would need to "take more liberty" with that façade. Ms. Gutterman asked if they would retain the Modernist appearance. She contended that there is almost nothing left of the historic building. She claimed that the district nomination placed value on the Modernist alterations, which must be retained. Several on the Committee and staff objected to Ms. Gutterman's claim, stating that one could not conclude that the building was listed as contributing in the district owing to its Modernist elements. It was likely listed as contributing either because it held the possibility of a restoration to its c. 1855 appearance or because it is of the scale and materials of the neighboring buildings.

Ms. Hawkins explained that her objection was to the partial rehabilitation to the mid nineteenth-century style. She objected to the contrast of the historic double-hung windows with the Modernist double chimney on the front façade. She said that the proposal is “lost in between.” Mr. Curtis explained that it would be difficult and expensive to remove the chimney in question. He also noted that there is fireplace on the third floor that will be retained; it connects to the chimney. Mr. Curtis explained that costs played a factor in their decisions. He added that his client purchased the property for its location and not for its Modernist appearance. He said that the neighbors would like to see the building rehabilitated to a more compatible appearance. Ms. Hawkins stated that the juxtaposition of old and new in the proposal is “jarring.” Messrs. Evans and McCoubrey agreed. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that retaining and restoring the Modernist appearance would be the most cost effective. He posited that a restoration of the c. 1855 appearance would be very expensive. For example, the stucco is probably hiding many flaws in the brick. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he would support a c. 1855 or 1962 restoration, but not something in between.

Mr. Baron noted that the one historic photograph shows that the building had a storefront. He remarked that corner buildings of this era often had storefronts originally. He suggested that a restoration to the c. 1855 might necessitate a reconstruction of the storefront. He also noted that it is likely that the first-floor front façade is cinder block under the stucco.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance observed that most of the Modern style houses in the Rittenhouse Fitter Historic District are classified as non-contributing including the Norman Rice property across the street from the house in question. He reported that the Section 106 agreement regarding 2116 Chestnut Street included a provision that the developer of that site would fund a study to determine whether the Modernist buildings in the district should be reclassified. He contended that the house was likely not classified as contributing owing to its Modernist features. It was likely classified as contributing owing to its scale and massing. He agreed with the Committee that the proposed design is neither Modernist nor Italianate.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she would not be opposed to a proposal that retained the Modernist style, but altered or added windows. She also noted that she would not oppose the removal of the terra cotta pipe decorations, but thought that, if replaced, they should be replaced with a material that retained the contrast, variety, and texture. She said that the house should not be turned into a stucco box. Ms. Gutterman advised that retaining the Modernist features and altering them appropriately would be the best strategy. Mr. Curtis responded that his client prefers the nineteenth-century appearance and would like to move this building in that aesthetic direction. He asked if they could try to restore the building to its original appearance if it was feasible from a cost perspective. Ms. Gutterman replied that the historic documents do not exist to support a restoration. Mr. Evans disagreed and pointed out that this building was like many others in the immediate area. The Standards would support a restoration based on similar historic buildings in the area.

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

ADDRESS: 613 PINE ST

Project: Construct roof over rear yard

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Scott & Helga Levin

Applicant: Da'Ron M. Ravnell, Unique Metal Concepts, LLC

History: 1990, Stephen Varenhorst, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a steel and glass canopy over the rear yard. The canopy would be supported by steel columns and the existing concrete-masonry brick garden walls that line the rear of the property. The canopy primarily consists of structural steel I-beams, glazing on the sides, and a metal roof.

The Committee and Commission reviewed an earlier version of this application at recent meetings. The Commission tabled the application with a request for more information. Instead, the applicant submitted an entirely new application with updated drawings and more roofing information.

Note that the Commission was working with flawed information when it classified the property as Contributing to the Society Hill Historic District. The inventory incorrectly attributes the building to architect, David Proter for the Redevelopment Authority and dates it to 1983. It was, in fact, designed by architect Stephen Varenhorst and constructed for a private owner in 1990, after the end of the district's period of significance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Da'Ron M. Ravnell represented the application.

Mr. Ravnell stated that he provided the additional information that the Commission requested. The Committee members agreed that the additional information was adequate. They also agreed that the proposal was appropriate, given that the work would take place at the rear facing an alley and that the building and rear walls are non-historic.

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

ADDRESS: 802 S HANCOCK ST

Project: Construct side addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Samantha Giuliano and Paul Palladino

Applicant: Sal Guerrero, Boxwood Architects LLC

History: 1810

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a large three-story addition to the side façade of this freestanding house. The side façade is visible from the public right-of-way. The house is a very

rare example of a half-gable structure with the gable end as the street façade. It is even rarer because it is a wood-framed and clad building, not a masonry building. Several years ago, it was restored with the Historical Commission's approval. The applicants have shown two options for a proposed addition. One would be covered in board and batten siding, the second would be clad in brick. In both cases it would mostly demolish and encase the long side façade of the house and completely change the massing and roofline of the structure. The plans call for enlarging the chimney and moving the front door. It should be noted that the property has a rear yard, which may be an appropriate place for an addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Paul Palladino and architect John Weckerly represented the project.

Mr. Baron explained the two options proposed by the applicants; one is clad in brick and the other in board and batten siding. The Committee members asked the applicants about the possibility of building an addition on the rear of the house. The owner explained that the back yard is a rather nice courtyard, which he does not want to lose. He stated that the side yard is a long thin space, which would not make a good yard.

The Committee members explained that the side façade of the house is significant and highly visible from the public right-of-way. It would be demolished if these plans were executed. They also asserted that the change to the chimney and the door were not acceptable on this unusual house. The Committee members observed that the small front gable window would be acceptable as a restoration.

The applicants asked about decreasing the size of the addition to allow more of the façade to remain visible. Mr. Evans commented that a very small single-story addition to the rear end of the side façade might be acceptable. Other members opined that any addition should be located at the rear.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the unusual building has great significance. He asserted that this pristine structure should not be damaged with a visible addition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

ADDRESS: 1601 MOUNT VERNON ST

Project: Demolish and reconstruct side wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Miguel Santiago

Applicant: Miguel Santiago

History: 1859, Robert Purvis House

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Significant, 10/11/2000

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the rebuilding of the east wall of the rear ell, which faces 16th Street. Although an engineer had originally devised a bracing plan to stabilize the building, the engineer now recommends demolishing and reconstructing the wall, rather than bracing it

because water has infiltrated and deteriorated the wall. The architectural plans, which propose the retention of the wall, are not consistent with the application form, which proposes demolition of the wall. The plans are not correctly dimensioned and call for the installation of inappropriate lintels.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided hidden steel lintels are substituted for the exposed stone lintels, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the project. Property owner Miguel Santiago represented the project.

The Committee members asked Mr. Santiago if he had done any work or maintenance to the building since 2003, when the Commission approved his total rehabilitation plan. He said that he is working slowly. He installed a new roof in 2010 and put up external bracing according to the engineer's plan to stabilize the building. Mr. Baron explained that Mr. Santiago had removed several window frames that were structural and held up the brick above them. This resulted in some collapse of the brickwork. Mr. Baron also noted that Mr. Santiago did very little to keep out water out of the building; recent water infiltration resulted in additional damage. Mr. Santiago would now like to rebuild those walls. Mr. Baron explained that the architect who prepared the most recent plans did not measure the wall, but rather took his dimensions from an inaccurate drawing that was prepared for one of the previous proposals. In addition, the drawing proposes lintels that never existed historically. Mr. Baron contended that the drawing must be accurate if the wall is going to be demolished and then rebuilt accurately. Mr. Baron noted that the current architectural plans state that the wall will be retained, not demolished and rebuilt, even though the permit application form calls for the demolition and reconstruction. Mr. Santiago said he plans to rebuild the wall using salvaged bricks.

The Committee members questioned whether the wall could be retained rather than demolished. They observed that the engineer's letter is ambiguous about the retention or demolition. They noted that Unsafe violation for the wall had already been mitigated. The Committee members stated that the applicant should submit a complete, clear engineer's report with photographs of the problems. They also questioned how the applicant could propose reusing bricks when he also claimed that were turning to powder. The Committee members stressed the historical significance of this building.

Allen Rubin of the Spring Garden Civic Association attested to the poor condition of the wall.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance expressed his concern that the wall would be taken down and not reconstructed, leading to the demolition of the entire building. He stressed the importance of conditioning any building permit to have assurances that the finances and the contracts were in place to rebuild the wall before signing off on the demolition. Mr. Baron said that the Commission had conditioned demolition approvals in this way in the past. Mr. Evans said that the application did not include sufficient information. He stated that he could not support the application without the requisite documents.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, owing to the incompleteness of the application.

ADDRESS: 1910 SPRING GARDEN ST

Project: Construct building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1910 Spring Garden LLC

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Architects

History: 1886, building collapsed, 2005

Individual Designation: 6/29/1971

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a six-story structure on the site of an historic building that collapsed in 2005, after being undermined by adjacent construction. The new building would have a four-story brick façade topped by a two-story mansard. The front façade would have a large bay. Although the building is taller than the old buildings on the block, it aligns with the newer building to the east. The current application is compliant with the June 2010 application, which the Commission approved in concept. The architectural plans are not adequately annotated regarding material choices. The applicant must provide those details before any final approval.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Architect Rustin Ohler and developer Quinton Bosman represented the application.

Mr. Ohler distributed a new architectural plan that included annotations regarding materials. He stated that the front façade would be red brick, the watertable base limestone, and the bay an Azek plastic wood. The roof would be gray aluminum. He said he would provide the staff material samples for approval.

Allen Rubin of the Spring Garden Civic Association explained his concerns about the quality of construction materials and the overall height of the building. He asked if there would be any additional mechanical equipment or penthouses that would increase the height of the building. Mr. Ohler assured everyone that there would not be any additional height or visible mechanical equipment.

The Committee members stated that they were uncomfortable with the height of the proposed building. They noted that they had recommended a reduction in height of one story during their review of the in-concept application. They again asserted that it was important to limit the building to five stories. Mr. Baron reminded them that the Commission had already approved the massing of the building in concept. He advised them that they needed to work within the bounds set by the Commission's action. The Committee members acknowledged that the Commission had approved a taller massing in concept, but still contended that the proposed building would be inappropriate for the streetscape. Mr. Baron reiterated that that decision had been made and instructed the Committee to work within the Commission's in concept approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Committee voted recommended denial of the proposed building, owing to its height, but approval of the building without the top floor of the mansard, with the staff to review details.

ADDRESS: 1519-21 N 16TH ST

Project: Construct side addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: James Kelly

Applicant: Danilo Vincencio

History: 1886, addition, 1893

Individual Designation: 7/1/1982

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a large addition in the side yard of this mansion. The addition would stand free of the existing house except for a connection at the intersection of the main block and the rear ell. The new structure is based on the design of the historic house that stood on the lot to the south, but has been demolished. A non-historic two-story porch would be demolished and several openings closed to add the link connector between the mansion and addition. This porch is a much later addition and the side façade will not be visible from the street. The front section of the addition should be shifted south and/or east, away from the historic bay, to preserve public views of it.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the New Additions Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. McCoubrey recused himself from the discussion and left the meeting. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner James Kelly represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained to the Committee that he had initially suggested to the applicant that he replicate the historic house that once stood on the lot to the south of the house in question as an addition. He explained that he had been confused about the lot lines and believed that the addition would be erected on the site where the neighboring designated house had once stood. That house fell into disrepair and was demolished. He reported that, at his instruction, the applicant's architect had prepared a plan showing the reconstruction of that lost house as an addition to the house in question. However, upon reviewing that plan, Mr. Baron realized that the addition would not be built on the location of the lost historic house, but instead in the large side yard of the house in question. After understanding that the site of the lost house was not part of this project, Mr. Baron recommended to the applicant and his architect that they devise a new plan for the addition. Replicating a lost house that once stood nearby as an addition to a historic house would not meet the Standards.

Understanding the genesis of this project, the Committee members reviewed the proposal to erect an addition in the side yard. They opined that the addition was too large and too close to the historic building. They asserted that it was important to keep the front portion of the side yard open. They contended that the demolition of the non-historic side porch was acceptable. Although reproducing the house next door would have been acceptable if it was on the lot to the south where the house had stood, it was not acceptable to reproduce it in this location, the Committee members contended. They suggested that any addition in this location should be set back to the line where the rear ell joins the main block of the house. They said it should be simpler than the existing house, but complementary to it. The addition should not mimic the house that stood next door. They discussed using stucco as a cladding material. Several members said that stucco might be acceptable, depending on its detailing. Mr. Evans suggested that the addition might be enlarged by one story to regain some of the space lost with the

setback from the front block. The Committee members suggested that the applicants provide a landscape plan for the garden. They explained to the applicant that they could not recommend approval of a replication of the nearby building that had been demolished as an addition, but that they would look favorably on an application for an addition that was set back to the starting point of the rear ell and that was compatible with the historic house. The applicants explained that they did not have time to submit a new application because, for the project to be viable, it needed to be completed and ready for tenants by the start of the school year in September. They asked the Committee to recommend approval of a revised plan as described, especially in light of the misunderstanding regarding the lot lines and location of the lost house. The applicants stated that they would redesign the project as the Committee had recommended and present the revised design to the Commission for consideration.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the New Additions Guidelines.

ADDRESS: 3500 S BROAD ST

Project: Convert park building to restaurant

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Michael Karloutsos, Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust

History: 1916, boathouse, League Island Park, now FDR Park

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Franklin Delano Roosevelt Historic District, Contributing, 8/9/2000

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to enclose the upper deck of the boat house in Franklin Delano Roosevelt Park. The park was designed in 1914 by the Olmsted architectural firm. The boathouse was built in 1916 and served as the “Russian Tea Room” during the Sesquicentennial Exposition in 1926. The boat house is prominently situated on the lake’s edge in close proximity to the monumental gazebo.

The proposed enclosure would encapsulate the open arcade of the boat house in a glass addition. The glass addition would also enclose the upper deck around the arcade. The glass enclosure would have a prominent entrance facing the park. On the lake side, the enclosure would encapsulate not only the decks and the arcades, but also the terracotta roof over the boathouse.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application. Lucy Strackhouse of the Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust, architect Chuck McGuffen, and restaurateur Michael Karloutsos represented the application.

Ms. Strackhouse stated that the Trust began marketing the park property for lease three years ago. She noted that the proposed use as a restaurant would be the same as the original use of the building. She noted that the proposal is in its early stages of development; it is still a concept.

Mr. McGuffen explained that their philosophy behind the design was to address the program without doing anything to the building that could not be reversed. He stated that he is proposing to create a large dining room overlooking the lake and a smaller dining room below with kitchen

facilities. He noted that some service facilities would be located outside the footprint of the historic building. He explained that transparency is important in the conception of the project. Therefore, they are proposing a glass enclosure. He acknowledged that shading and reflection issues remain to be worked out. He noted the relationship between the tea house and the gazebo as well as the Swedish Museum.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the reversibility of the proposed glass structure. She stated that such a structure would be damaging to the historic fabric of the building. She also noted the tremendous heat gain with such a design. She noted that sun exposure would have to be worked out even at the concept level. She asserted that seasonal outdoor tables would be much more sympathetic. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Gutterman. He stated that the building appeared large as it is. Ms. Strackhouse clarified that the historic building is not large and that has very limited seating space. Ms. Hawkins stated that she thought that this building would best be used seasonally. She stated that January would not be a perfect time for dinner at this site. Ms. Strackhouse clarified that the program also includes an events catering component as well as the destination restaurant. Ms. Hawkins stated that a tent-like structure would be best.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she is very familiar with the site and that she is concerned with the negative effect the proposal would have on the historic pavilion. Mr. Karloutsos stated that the structure is currently not used. Ms. Gutterman agreed that it was underutilized, but she asserted that the structure could be given new life without radically altering it.

Mr. Evans stated that he thought the proposed functions could be achieved in the existing space. He observed that, if additional space is needed, it could be added without the radical intervention that is proposed. He reiterated that the proposal is very aggressive. Ms. Gutterman stated that the addition, if necessary, could be done to the side, rather than encapsulating the entire building.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the proposed entrance calls too much attention to itself. She described it as dramatic, but too intrusive for the historic building. Mr. Evans noted that the cost of the proposed glass enclosure would probably be astronomical. Ms. Strackhouse clarified that the budget for the project is about \$5 million.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that, originally, the lower level was used for dining. Ms. Strackhouse agreed with the observation. Mr. Evans asked if the lower level could accommodate more dining than is proposed. Mr. Karloutsos stated that it would not work from an operational point of view. He stated that the upstairs would make the investment profitable, but otherwise it would not work. He clarified that he does not intend to have a seasonal restaurant.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the profitability of installing a tent. Mr. Karloutsos stated that a tent would not work. He asserted that a tent would distract more from the architecture of the historic building than glass would. He reiterated that the historic building is very small and would not serve as a restaurant in its current configuration. Mr. Evans stated that he recalls the same discussion for the Waterworks Restaurant, but that, in the end, the project went forth and worked well without major alterations. Mr. Karloutsos responded that the Waterworks site is very different and the building type is also very different.

Mr. McCoubrey asked how many people he expected to use the upper deck. Mr. Karloutsos answered that about 300 people could use the proposed space. Ms. Hawkins asked how many without the glass enclosure. Mr. Karloutsos answered 100 people, plus 150 downstairs. He

explained that a wedding or other large event would not be possible on two separate levels; it would only work in one unified space.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the proposal is the wrong approach. He stated that the arches are such character defining that any covering or altering them would be wrong. He stated that, in his opinion, there was no such thing as clean glass; it would always be dirty. He stated that the arches have to be expressed on the exterior, not covered up. The addition is out of scale and inappropriate. He acknowledged that the building should be used and not allowed to sit vacant. Mr. Gallery encouraged the idea of a tent or an addition to the side. He reiterated that the proposed addition is not the right solution.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10.

ADDRESS: 10 S 02ND ST

Project: Install projecting sign and lights

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Strawberry Holdings Inc

Applicant: Ronald J. Patterson, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP

History: 1820, third story removed, 1977

Individual Designation: 10/7/1976

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes signs, lights, and sconces on two properties in the Old City Historic District. The two properties have different classifications in the district's inventory. The property at 10 S. 2nd Street was constructed in 1820 and altered in 1977. It is classified as contributing. The other property, 12-14 S. 2nd Street, was constructed in 2000 in an eclectic Spanish Colonial Style and is classified as non-contributing to the district. The applicant has combined the alterations to these two separate properties as one single application.

At 10 S. 2nd Street, the application proposes the installation of a nine-foot tall illuminated sign at the second floor. The sign would protrude from the face of the building by four feet. The sign would be aluminum with neon letters. The edge of the sign would be lined with exposed light bulbs, which would not flash. The applicant proposes two sconces and a second sign on the glass of the storefront at the ground-floor of the building. The application does not include details for the sconces on this building.

At 12-14 S. 2nd Street, the application proposes to install sconces in the ground-floor, presumably to match those proposed for 10 S. 2nd Street; no details were submitted. The second floor has arched-top windows and a balcony that spans the entire width of the building. The application proposes to install light strings in the arches above the windows and below the decorative swags. The application does not clarify whether these light strings would flash.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Restaurant owner Larry Cohen and attorney Ronald Patterson represented the application.

Mr. Patterson clarified that the three buildings in question were combined as a unity of use for zoning purposes and the interiors of the buildings were connected, but that the buildings were

still individually decided. Mr. Patterson noted that the Art Commission had supported the lights in the arches and all other aspects of the application. Mr. Cohen explained that the proposed sign is a trademark for the restaurant and that the three other restaurant locations all have the same sign.

Mr. Patterson stated that the Art Commission had requested solid illumination, not flashing, and a reduction in size of the sign. Ms. Gutterman noted that, even with the reduction in size, the sign would still be nine feet tall. She asserted that the sign would be too big for the building. She asked whether the sign could be attached to the non-contributing building. Mr. Cohen answered that he doubted the façade could hold it. He also noted that the proposed location is at the entrance to the restaurant. He stated that there is currently a banner in the location. Mr. Evans stated that the restaurant is very busy and well-known. He questioned whether an illuminated sign would make a difference for the very successful establishment. Mr. Cohen stated that the restaurant is celebrating its 10th anniversary and attention is focused on the original Philadelphia location. He noted that there is great competition among restaurants in the Old City area and it is difficult to remain successful without constantly updating and revising. Mr. Cohen also noted that patrons often associate the restaurant with its branded signs and that the proposed sign would bring the Philadelphia location in line with the other three locations. Ms. Hawkins stated that nine feet is typically the floor to ceiling height in an early nineteenth-century building and that is a substantial height for a sign. The scale of the sign relative to the building is “enormous.” Ms. Gutterman concurred. Mr. Patterson stated that objection to the height had not been expressed by other City boards such as the Art Commission. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the size of the sign could be reduced to make it more compatible with the historic building. She stated that the sign, as proposed, would overpower the historic façade. Mr. Evans stated that the sign is meant to be big. He compared it to a movie-theater sign. He expressed hesitation about shrinking it while maintaining the current design. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the sign could be made smaller; the external illumination would offset the size reduction. Mr. Cohen expressed his desire to maintain the same brand for the Philadelphia location as they have in the other three locations. Ms. Hawkins noted that the three other locations are not historic nineteenth-century buildings. She noted that the Washington DC restaurant is located in a very tall building with very different massing and scale. Mr. McCoubrey observed that the Washington sign was appropriate to that location, but he hesitated to support it for the historic Philadelphia building.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the design for the sconces. Mr. Cohen answered that he had not yet chosen the sconces. Ms. Gutterman asked about the proposed locations of the sconces. Mr. Patterson stated that they had not finalized the locations yet, but that the storefront occupies most of the ground floor and that the sconces would likely be placed on the corner piers.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the lights and sconces, with the staff to review the details; and denial of the illuminated sign, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 245 S WARNOCK ST

Project: Construct rear addition
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: John B. Kelly III
Applicant: John B. Kelly III, Runyan & Associates Architects
History: 1830
Individual Designation: 1/31/1961
District Designation: None

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-floor addition at the rear of the house, which has a two-story rear ell. The file for the property contains evidence that the rear façade of the property was reconstructed in 1954. There is physical evidence at the house to support the documentation. The roof of the ell connects to the roof of the main block in a crude manner and it does not appear to retain its original configuration.

The property is situated on the east side of Warnock Street between Spruce and Irving Streets. The rear of the property faces a private alley. The alley is gated and only property owners have access to it. The public can not access the alley. The subject property has a smaller footprint than its neighbors to either side. The public can not view the rear of this property from any public rights-of-way.

The proposed addition would sit below the ridge of the roof over the main block. The addition would not extend beyond the rear wall of the existing ell; as such it would not be visible from Irving Street. The front façade of the property on Warnock Street would not be altered at all by the proposed addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application. Sean Kelly represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the flashing at the ridge should be done in a way that does not create bulk or increase the height of the ridge. She stated that the staff should review those details. The Committee members agreed that the proposal was appropriate, owing to the alterations at the rear and its lack of public visibility.

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

ADDRESS: 827-31 WALNUT ST

Project: Replace doors
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Walnut Street Theatre Corp.
Applicant: Mark Sylvester, Walnut Street Theatre
History: 1808; new front façade, 1828, John Haviland, architect; restored, 1971; Walnut Street Theater
Individual Designation: 4/30/1957
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the main entrance doors of the Walnut Street Theater, a National Historic Landmark. The existing doors are metal frame with full glass and

were installed as part of the 1970 renovation. The applicant proposes to adapt the design of the existing eight-light casement windows on the second story into the new door design. The proposed doors would be metal-frame, double doors with four glazed panels on each leaf.

Currently, there are no known images of the historic doors. The exterior was altered from the original design in 1920 and then restored in 1970 to the 1828 design by architect John Haviland. Although the historic door design is not known, doors on similar Greek Revival buildings were typically wood paneled doors.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application. Mark Sylvester and Jessica Doheny of the Walnut Street Theater represented the application. Ms. Gutterman excused herself from the meeting.

Mr. Sylvester introduced the project and explained that an important feature of the 1970 renovation remains important today, the transparent doors connecting the theater to the street. He added that the current doors are not energy efficient. Budgetary issues had prevented the replacement of the doors, but they must now be replaced because one is broken. While researching to facilitate the repair or replacement of the broken door, he discovered that the door manufacturer no longer exists and replacement parts are no longer available. Mr. Sylvester stated that a custom door would be too expensive. He explained that they looked at examples of historic theaters around the country and found that, although the doors would have been many paneled wood doors historically, they had been replaced with glass doors. He explained that the theater had been completely altered from its original design in 1920. The 1970 renovation was inspired by John Haviland's 1828 design, but that it was not a faithful restoration. For example, there are differences in numbers of steps. He stated that they based their design for the new doors on the windows above; the glass would allow for visibility. Mr. Evans asked if the windows are wood or metal. Mr. Sylvester responded that they are wood. He added that the color of the molded decorative pieces above the windows would be matched. Mr. Sylvester explained that the new doors would be set into the stonework and nothing would be visible except for the doors themselves. He added that these are only exit doors. Ms. Hawkins contended that the proposed doors would not be confused for the historic doors; they would frankly reveal their non-historic nature.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if there was a transom panel above the proposed doors. Mr. Sylvester directed the Committee to Photograph 1, which shows that there is a panel above the second-floor windows. He explained that the panel above the doors picked up on this feature. He stated that the current doors are unusually large and, when opened, release a lot of air conditioning. He explained that the panels are proposed to bring the doors down to a standard size.

Mr. Evans stated that he does not agree with basing the new doors on the design of the second-floor window. He stated that the doors should not be made to look like windows. He argued that they are poorly proportioned. He reminded the Committee that this building is a National Historic Landmark and a highly significant building. He explained that the new design does not need to be a restoration if the historic doors cannot be documented. However, he contended that the proposal deserves more consideration by a design professional. He suggested that the dimensions and framing should be larger to give the doors appropriate proportions. He stated that the doors should be wood, not metal. He opined that this design appears inexpensive and would be more appropriate for a retail environment, not the country's oldest, most important theater. He asserted that the design should respect the grand history of the building.

Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants why they did not consider solid wood doors. Mr. Sylvester responded that he did not want to entomb the audience members in the theater. It is a living building that should relate to the street. Mr. Evans asked when people occupy the lobby behind the doors. Mr. Sylvester responded that they are in the space during intermissions and before and after the shows. Ms. Sell explained that, because the building likely had solid wood paneled doors, the staff suggested a wood door with lower solid panels and glazing above. Mr. Evans suggested a heavier wood door with glazing in the center similar to the door on the 9th Street side in a 1957 photograph. Ms. Gutterman stated that she understands that the doors need to be replaced, but recommends the applicant hire an architect to design some options with compatible materials and appropriate relationships of solid to glass.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

New Additions Guideline: Recommended: Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that the character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

New Additions Guideline: Recommended: Placing a new addition on a non-character-defining elevation and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

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.