

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

**Suzanne Pentz, Acting-Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
28 January 2003**

Present

Suzanne Pentz, Acting-Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Herbert Levy FAIA
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jeffrey Barr, Historic Research Technician
Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

Sarina Rose, Kramer Marks Architects
Joan McConnon, Project H.O.M.E.
Gordon Fluke, Cecil Baker and Associates
Nan Gutterman, Vitetta Group
Ruben David, Capital Programs Office
Jason Stevens, Capital Programs Office
Hyman Myers, Vitetta Group
Allan Domb, Allan Domb Real Estate
Jerry Roller, J.K. Roller Architects
David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinski Architects
Drew Hamilton, Dane Décor
Richard Thom, AIA
Stephen Fradley, Tischler und Sohn
Van Strother, New Covenant Church
Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Sprint Spectrum LP
John Cluver, Voith & Mactavish Architects
Fern Polaski, 2220 Brandywine Street
Thomas Kirk
David Nasatir, Esq., Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell and Hippel LLP
William G. Schwartz, Esq., Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell and Hippel LLP
Robert Shaffer, Shaffer Group Incorporated
William Alesker, AIA
Elizabeth Cecil
Michael Fuchs
Robert Ryan, 829 North 29th Street
Beth Ryan, 829 North 29th Street
Robert Rabinowitz, Paul Rabinowitz Glass Company, Incorporated
Robert Powers, Powers and Company
David Grasso, Metro Development
Victor Antes, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Sean Trainor, 1701 North Street
David Blumenfeld, Metro Development
Frank Kakos, Kakos Architects

Rick Tullio, 1717 Pine Street
Steven Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association

Suzanne Pentz, Acting-Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:34 a.m.

613-621 Catharine Street

United Communities Southeast Philadelphia, Owner

Shaffer Group Incorporated, Applicant

DATE: c. 1838

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition, rehabilitation and new construction in concept

The Committee recommended denial of the first submission, asking for a revised site plan that would allow the view of the historic building from Catharine Street. The Commission received a revised proposal that moved the driveway to the west, in front of the historic building. However, that plan only had a 37-foot opening for a view to the historic building. At the Commission meeting, members asked the developer to remove two houses in order to maintain the presence of the historic building from Catharine Street.

The revised submission eliminated one house, but still has one house on the 619 Catharine Street property (four total along Catharine Street). The view of the historic building is still partially obstructed.

Staff recommendation: Denial as submitted pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and two site guidelines.

Ms. Spina presented the revised proposal, which eliminates one townhouse, and informed the Committee of the receipt of letters, which were both in support of and against the elimination of two townhouses. Mr. Tyler reiterated that the Commission concluded at the previous meeting, that it would give favorable consideration of the proposal with the elimination of two townhouses.

William Alesker, the architect, and William G. Schwartz, counsel for the project attended the meeting. Mr. Schwartz presented renderings which show the elimination of only one townhouse. He said that the developer believes that project will fail with the elimination of two townhouses. He reported that in canvassing the neighbors, he received a favorable response for the proposal since the area near Fulton Street will be developed as a park. Also, as a gated community it would give relief for some of the security issues. Mr. Alesker noted that from a design standpoint, the proposed view corridor is more appropriate than the large void in the street façade, which he believes, is disruptive. Ms. Spina noted that the break in the streetscape is an historic feature of this property.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested reducing the widths of the properties, but it was noted that a decrease to 18 feet would not meet the zoning requirements. Ms. Pentz opined that the revised proposal addresses the issues of concern, which are the open space and the view of the historic structure.

Mr. Levy thought that with the elimination of two parking spaces a clearer view could be acquired. Mr. McCoubrey expressed concern with the setback of the gate at the entry. Mr. Baron commented about the importance of the new design on the rear of the historic building where the demolition will occur. Mr. Schwartz responded that the design of the Marshall Street façade would be continued from the upper floors downward. Mr. Baron also said that the face the development on Marshall Street was also important to be integrated into that streetscape.

Nicholas Chmanek, of Councilman Frank DiCicco's office, said that the councilman has met with neighbors, and they believe that the revised proposal addresses the visibility of the historic building and the open space issue. The Catharine Street residents support the proposal.

Tom Kirk, resident at 623 Catharine Street, said that he supports the project with more houses not less and believes that the proposed plan allows for a sufficient view corridor.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept of the proposal.

The applicant agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

2220 Brandywine Street

Fern Polaski, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof decks

This application proposes legalizing a series of decks on the row house at 2220 Brandywine Street. L&I issued a violation for the decks on 4 September 2002. The decks and railings are tan in color and are constructed of PVC manufactured by Brock Deck Systems. The railings are 37" tall and consist of sections of pickets separated by posts with arrowheads. The upper deck sits on the three-story front section of the row house. It is 16' wide and 20'-2" deep and is set back 9' from the front façade. The lower and middle decks sit on the two-story rear ell. The lower deck is 4'-8" wide; the middle deck is 7'-8" wide. Both are 8'-2" deep. The middle deck is positioned 2'-5" above the lower deck. The three decks are linked by two flights of metal spiral stairs. The decks are accessed through a third-story, rear door that opens onto the lower deck. The application does not specify whether the door was extant or was added with the decks. The decks are not visible from Brandywine Street but are highly visible from 22nd and Spring Garden Streets.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal and stated that the staff would recommend approval of a deck on the rear ell.

Fern Polaski, the owner, attended the meeting and said that the decks are not visible from Brandywine Street, only from 22nd and Spring Garden Streets. She stressed the need for more space and contended that changing the configuration of the decks would be burdensome. She noted that she had not realize that a permit was needed to erect the decks. In addition, she explained that the deck on the rear ell provides access to the deck on the main roof. It is her opinion that the materials used for the construction of the decks are sensitive to her neighbors, who support the decks. Ms. Polaski cited other decks in the neighborhood.

Ms. Spina pointed out the construction of a deck requires a permit regardless of historic status. Mr. Baron reiterated that consistency in the application of the deck policy is important and noted that neighboring decks have been denied.

Ms. Pentz stressed that typically the Committee and Commission do not approve decks on main buildings, only rear ells. Mr. McCoubrey noted the importance of deferring to the *Standards*.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial pursuant to 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.]; and the Rehabilitation Building Exterior Roofs guideline: [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as ... decks and terraces ... when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

1608 Mt. Vernon Street

Michael Fuchs, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Revised façade rehabilitation

The front façade of this building needed structural repairs in the upper stories. The Commission previously approved the rebuilding of the façade. Through the course of construction, the masonry subcontractor had a dispute with the contractor and destroyed over half of the historic bricks and all of the marble lintels and sills. The contractor tried to salvage older bricks from other buildings, but could not recover enough for the entire façade. The owners have since changed contractors and the new contractor wishes to finish rebuilding the façade with new bricks and to install marble lintels that are only 2 inches deep (with a 2-inch backing of limestone or steel) rather than the historic dimension of 4 inches.

Staff recommendation: Approval with staff to review brick and marble matches and pointing sample.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal.

Michael Fuchs, the owner, said that while rebuilding the front façade, the marble lintels and sills were damaged. The applicant proposes new brick, which are not an exact match and new marble lintels and sills. He noted that the entire massing of the building remains intact. The applicant said that the inner CMU wall has an enormous amount of ties, which will allow for the butter joints.

Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the two-inch difference behind the marble. Mr. Fuchs responded that four-inch marble requires a special order.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with butter joints and the staff to review details.

The applicant agreed with the recommendation.

829 North 29th Street

Robert Ryan, Equitable owner

William Alesker, Owner/Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1874

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation and addition in concept

This application in concept calls for a three-story addition along the rear of the building to convert this building to apartments on the upper floors. To make this narrow building feasible for apartments, the addition will house the stairwells. Entrances to the individual units will be through the new construction. The addition will differ from the historic building by having stucco walls and a standing-seam metal mansard roof. The historic rear wall will remain at the first two floors, with the current window openings cut down into doors, but the cornice, mansard and dormers along the entire rear façade would be demolished.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the addition at the first two floors, pursuant to Standard 9. Staff thought the two uses should be reversed (having the commercial space on the third floor). A single use at the third floor would require only a single stair tower and preserve much of the mansard details.

Robert and Beth Ryan, the equitable owners, and William Alesker, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Alesker said that the addition's dimension would be twenty-feet, without any disturbance to the front or side façades. Mr. Ryan pointed out that the first floor would not be changed.

Ms. Spina said that the rear is visible from a public right away and that the addition would require the removal of the mansard roof. It was suggested reversing the usage, and putting the commercial use on the third floor. However, this would be difficult in meeting ADA requirements. Mr. Tyler suggested adding several more dormers on the new roof to break up the continuous roofline.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept with the addition of more dormers on the addition pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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.].

The applicant concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

1701, 1703 and 1705 North Street

Sean Trainor, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1701 and 1705: 2002, 1703: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Rear decks

The owner wishes to install rear decks at the second floor of these houses. Double-leaf sliding glass doors will lead out to the decks. Once the planned construction along North 17th Street occurs, the rears of these houses will no longer remain visible.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and the Committee thought the proposal appropriate since 1701 and 1705 are new construction. In addition, 1703 would be hidden by pending new construction.

No one was present to represent the proposal.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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.] and 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.].

1901 Walnut Street

Firsttrust Bank, Owner
 Robert Rabinowitz, Contractor/Applicant
 DATE: 1926, McLanahan & Bencker, architects
 PROPOSAL: Alter storefront, install glass enclosure

The entrances to the storefronts on this building are in curved recesses with bronze frames and doors and marble panels. The application calls for removing a wrought-iron gate and installing a glass wall and door at the street line, making the recess an interior vestibule. The tenant in the commercial space, Firsttrust Bank, says the glass is necessary for the security and comfort of its patrons. The condo association has approved the work, on the condition that the wrought-iron gate is given to them to store on site.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

Ms. Spina explained the application. She emphasized that the entrances on this building are recessed in a solid versus void configuration, which should not be altered.

Robert Rabinowitz and Ed Bickerdyke attended the meeting to answer questions about the proposal. Mr. Rabinowitz said that the main reasons for the alterations are security and protection from inclement weather. He noted that the frame of the door would be concealed behind the columns and the only exposed metal would be the metal shoe at the bottom of the doors. Mr. Bickerdyke emphasized that the storefront would not protrude, only the view of the brass door would be seen. He asked the Committee if there were anyway to accomplish the alterations as proposed. Mr. Rabinowitz thought that a drive down Walnut Street to see how other businesses have addressed this situation could prove promising.

Mr. Levy inquired about the dimensions of the door, and noted that a 4 x 8-foot door would carry a lot of weight. Ms. Pentz said that the proposed alterations significantly change the entrance's feature.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.] and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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.]

1428-34 Chestnut Street aka 111-15 South 15th Street

111 South 15th Street Associates, LP, Owners
 Victor Antes, Architect/Applicant
 DATE: 1922, Ritter & Shay, architects
 PROPOSAL: Awnings, canopy, rooftop decks, new paving, new doors

This application has a number of parts. For the 15th Street elevation, the owner wishes to install awnings at each window and a wrought-iron canopy over the entrance doors. The awnings have open sides and start at the transom bars. The owner wants the awnings to provide signage for the building. The canopy will have a glass roof and its pattern mimics the iron details on the original gates on Chestnut Street. Also, the application includes new frame-less sliding glass doors.

On the Sansom Street elevation, the application calls for an awning over the doors leading to the

office space on the lower floors. The revised first floor plan requires an additional door. The plan includes a new double-leaf service door next to the existing double-leaf service door.

The upper floors have the typical setbacks found on high-rise buildings of this period. At the 24th floor some of the windows had been changed to doors in the past. The application calls for changing all of the windows to multi-paned, wood doors with transoms, leading out to the rooftop balcony. Frosted, tempered glass panels will separate the individual units along the balcony. The 26th floor will feature common space. Here, the application includes cutting down windows into doors and creating an outdoor deck. The railing of the parapet does not meet code, so the application includes a metal railing installed on the inside of the parapet wall.

The proposal also includes new sidewalk paving and planters along Chestnut, 15th and Sansom Streets and the legalization of the removal of the cooling tower structure.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the canopy at the 15th Street entrance, the streetscape improvements, the new doors on the 24th and 26th floors and the railing at the 26th floor, and legalizing the removal of the steel structure for the cooling tower, pursuant to Standard 9 [*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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.*].

Denial of the proposed doors at the 15th Street entrance, pursuant to Standard 2 [*The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*] and Standard 5 [*Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*] The present doors can become automatic doors or the replacement doors should have bronze frames to match the current ones.

Denial of the awnings, pursuant to Standard 9 [*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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.*]. The awnings should have more of a slope and aprons, like traditional awnings.

Staff split on the new doors on Sansom Street. One member recommends approval and the other staff members wanted more information to justify the removal of historic fabric.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal.

Victor Antes, the architect, David Grasso, the owner, David Blumenfeld and Robert Powers attended the meeting. Mr. Grasso noted that other developers have tried to develop a viable building; however, he remarked that the proposed two separate uses seem to achieve its viability. He explained that the additional service entrance on Sansom Street would be acquired by expanding the existing entrance, with another set of double doors to the left, which would be used as a loading area. Mr. Powers said that the new door would be centered on the existing window. Ms. Spina pointed out that service door was never centered. Mr. Grasso said that all the doors would be uniform with small glass openings and painted to match the store. In addition, the new doors on the 15th Street façade would match the profile of the existing doors with a bronze frame. He also pointed out that the sliding doors would be at a different plane than the sidelights. Mr. McCoubrey thought that the bronze frame should be darker in color.

Mr. Baron believed that the canopy should have a three-dimensional quality. Mr. Grasso said that the concept for the canopy is based on the wrought iron on the Chestnut Street façade. He has located a company that can duplicate the profile and combine elements that have depth and a certain transparency to mimic the original lace work. He also noted that the attachment would be in the side arch so as not to penetrate the metal spandrel with minimal disturbance to the historic fabric. The canopy would be lit from within to light the sign on the canopy as well as the street itself.

The proposed awnings, which are shallow in depth, are intended to enhance the building and will have minimal impact on the ornamentation on the side of the windows. Committee members thought that the awnings should have an apron for the signature and more of a slope. Mr. Grasso believes that the awnings will bring attention to the building and they would be attached through the stone. Mr. Levy expressed concern about the possibility of a varying amount of signatures on the awnings. Mr. Grasso said that it is his intention to control the amount of signatures, and that only one signature is required for the tenant on the main door on Chestnut Street. It was pointed out that the Bellevue has similar awnings with different names in the same font. Committee members thought that the awnings should have an apron with a drop and the angle should be changed. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the awnings be installed below the transom bar to reveal the transoms.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

1. *Approval of the service door on the Sansom Street façade;*
 2. *Approval of new doors with bronze frames on the 15th Street façade;*
 3. *Approval at the 24th floor changing windows to multi-paned wood doors with transoms;*
 4. *Approval of cutting down windows into doors and roof deck with a metal railing at the 26th floor;*
 5. *Approval of new sidewalk paving and planters;*
 6. *Approval of the legalization of the removal of the cooling tower;*
 7. *Approval of the canopy, and*
 8. *Approval of the awning with a skirt and positioned below the transom bars.*
- With the staff to review all details.*

The applicant agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

1717 Pine Street

Rick Tullio, Owner

Frank Kakos, Architect/Owner

DATE: 1914, new façade, Henon & Boyle, architects

PROPOSAL: New steps, railing, alterations to doorway

This application proposes installing new front steps with a landing and railing at the Georgian Revival row house at 1717 Pine Street. The installation would require a change in sill height, which would, in turn, require alterations to the doorway. The extant single step would be removed and limestone steps with two treads as well as a landing would be installed. The steps would be oriented perpendicular to the front façade, changing the path to and from the doorway. The landing and steps would be 7' by 3'-8" and would rise 1'-7" above the sidewalk. A painted, steel railing with simple balusters and balls on the newel posts would run along the landing and down the steps. The connection of the railing to the front façade is not detailed. The railing should not mount to the limestone watertable. The original door would be repositioned higher in the doorway. The transom would be reduced in size to accommodate the relocated door. The original transom frame would be reused, but its height would be reduced. The original transom

bar would be reused if possible. If not, a new transom bar to match the existing would be fabricated. The existing metal security grille would be removed from the door. The application does not specify whether an existing oil fill pipe in the front façade would be repositioned. If it is, it should be moved in a way that protects the limestone watertable.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 5: *[Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]*; 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.]*; and 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.]*.

Mr. Farnham presented the application.

Frank Kakos, the architect, and Rick Tullio, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Kakos explained that the owner believes that the alterations to the steps and landing will give a presence and a sense of privacy to the entrance. He pointed out that if the proposed design was altered, directing the steps outward toward the street, as some Committee members suggested, the landing would encroach on the sidewalk.

Mr. Baron suggested erecting railings at the existing step. He also noted that the extant façade is historically significant. The applicant rejected the idea of railings alone and asserted that trash would collect along the railings. Mr. Levy rejected the notion of reducing the size of the transom. Mr. McCoubrey remarked that the extant stoop is rather small; however, he believes that it is nonetheless significant. He said that he could support a plan that raised the platform but maintained the existing door. Ms. Pentz contended that the present condition is awkward; she asserted that removing the transom entirely would enhance the facade. Mr. D'Alessandro disagreed, he thought that the current conditions should be preserved. Ms. Pentz opined that raising the sill and modifying the transom would be acceptable. Mr. McCoubrey thought that the existing stoop could be extended outward but that the other features of the façade should be retained.

Mr. Tullio asked that the minutes reflect his dismay over the Committee's contention that the existing conditions are acceptable.

The Architectural Committee was split in its recommendation. Two members agreed with the staff recommendation. Two members recommended approval of a modification to the steps provided that the remainder of the façade is retained.

1929 Sansom Street

Project H.O.M.E., Owner

Sarina Rose, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1925, Arthur L. Harson, architect

PROPOSAL: Awning on 20th Street

This proposal calls for an awning at the handicap entrance on 20th Street. The proposal offers three different versions. The first, the one the owner prefers, is a semi-circular canvas awning. The other two versions copy the canopy at the police station on the same façade; one spans the entire storefront and the other sits over the door only.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the arched awning, but approval of the canopy that mimics the one at the police station, pursuant to Standard 9 [*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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.*] and the storefront guideline [*Not recommended: Introducing a new design that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.*] Staff split on the size of the canopy.

Ms. Spina presented the revised proposal for the design of the awning.

Sarina Rose, the architect, and Joan McConnon, Associate Director of Project H.O.M.E., attended the meeting. Ms. Rose presented a revised design for a shed-type awning to span the entire storefront. She inquired if the proposed logo is appropriate. The Committee responded that its appropriateness is governed by the logo remaining on the skirt of the awning.

Ms. Spina said that the proposed awning's height would hide the brickwork and spandrels. Mr. Tyler inquired about the height above the sidewalk. The applicant responded that the height is 10 feet. Mr. Tyler suggested the lowering the awning to the top of the door within the guidelines of the Zoning and Streets Departments.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised shed-type design lowered to a height above the top of the door.

The applicant agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

226 South 16th Street

Allan Domb Real Estate, Owner

Gordon Fluke, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1929-30, Grant Simon, architect

PROPOSAL: Alter parapet at 18th floor

This application returns to Committee and Commission as requested. At the 18th floor, the architect proposes to lower the parapet wall and coping to 30 inches. To bring the railing to the 42 inches required by code, the proposal includes glass panels set into channels in the coping, topped by metal rails.

Staff recommendation: Approval of design. Though staff notes that it recommends against the removal of any fabric at the parapet.

Ms. Spina presented the application. Mr. Levy suggested a continuous piece of glass instead of the metal railing. Mr. D'Alessandro stressed the importance of reinstalling the coping.

Gordon Fluke, the architect, attended the meeting. He agreed with the Committee's recommendations; however, he believed that a more substantial material should be installed at that height.

Mr. McCoubrey expressed concern about the step, which is created, and that the glass panels should marry into the back of the parapet.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as submitted or an

alternate design with continuous glass.

City Hall, Broad and Market Streets

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Nan Gutterman, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1871-1901, John McArthur, architect

PROPOSAL: Bird netting

The Committee and Commission approved bird netting on the columns and pediments of the pavilions and central portals in the past. However, birds are congregating on the windowsills and meeting rails as well. This application calls for bird netting on the windows of the pavilions and the central portals.

An example of the netting is already installed on the northeast pavilion. Please try to look at it before the meeting.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standards 7 and 10

Hy Myers and Nan Gutterman attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina presented the project. Mr. Myers stated that 20 tons of pigeon droppings were removed from the building eight years ago. The pigeons have not been eliminated however, and recently, nearly 10 more tons of pigeon droppings have been removed. Ms. Spina observed that the older bird netting has not been maintained. Ms. Gutterman reported that the City would contract for the annual maintenance of the new netting.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the project as proposed pursuant to Standard 7 [Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.] and 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.].

The applicant agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

200 South Broad Street, Palm Restaurant

Bellevue Associates, Owner

A. Robert Torres, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1902-1913, G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, architects

PROPOSAL: Signage

This application proposes installing a 41" diameter back-lit circular logo sign for the Palm Restaurant in the Bellevue Hotel building at 200 S. Broad Street. The aluminum sign would mount on an extant transom on the Broad Street façade of the building. This transom, the furthest north in the restaurant, is the only one without leaded glass. It would stand 8" in front of the window and would attach with 4 bolts to the transom's wood frame. It would be dark bronze in color with ivory push-through acrylic graphics.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The staff would recommend approval of a similar sign mounted inside the glass.

Robert Torres, architect, attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Farnham presented

the project. Mr. Torres commented that there are many restaurants on S. Broad Street and The Palm desires increased visibility. The sign will be mounted to the wood frame of the transom, will be easily removable in the future. He added that the sign will not extend out beyond the face of the stone and the lettering is modest in dimension.

Mr. Levy observed that there were already multiple Palm restaurant signs and logos on the exterior. Mr. Torres responded that new awnings are proposed and the logos would be eliminated. The Palm would still be identified on the lip of each awning.

Mr. McCoubrey observed that the proposed sign does not fit the rhythm of the awnings and windows and commented that locating the sign behind the glass would be far less intrusive. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz agreed that locating the sign behind the glass would be preferable.

Mr. Torres asked about revising the proposal for an interior sign to fit the dimension of the transom. The Committee thought that they could recommend approval for a redesigned rectangular sign behind the glass.

The Committee voted to recommend denial of the exterior sign as proposed pursuant to 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.] and suggested an interior sign, behind the transom, at the same location.

1617 John F. Kennedy Boulevard, Suburban Station

Suburban Station Associates, Owner

Nayan Shah, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1930, Graham Anderson Probst & White, architects

PROPOSAL: New doors, signage

This application proposes new doors and signage for a pharmacy at the corner of 17th Street and JFK Boulevard in the Suburban Station building. At its August 2002 meeting, the Commission reviewed a similar application for this site. Included in that application were a revolving door on JFK Boulevard and an automatic sliding door, ramp, and transom box sign on 17th Street. The Commission approved the application with the condition that the proposed plastic face of the box sign be replaced with a metal face with plastic lettering. The current application includes a ramp (previously approved), an automatic swinging door, and a transom box sign (previously approved) at the 17th Street entrance and an automatic sliding door (alternate 1) or a revolving door (alternate 2, previously approved) at the JFK Boulevard entrance. It also includes signage at all 17th Street and JFK Boulevard windows, none of which has been approved. On the 17th Street façade, 3M Panaflex film with the Walgreens logo would be applied to several windows, an unspecified "Hallmark" sign would be mounted behind a storefront window near the door, and the previously mentioned box sign would be mounted in the transom above the door. On the JFK Boulevard façade, 3M Panaflex film with the Walgreens logo would be applied to several windows, a second unspecified "Hallmark" sign as well as a large neon mortar and pestle would be mounted behind storefront windows, and several red neon signs would be mounted in the transoms behind the glass.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the ramp, swinging door and box sign on 17th Street, and the revolving door (alternate 2) on JFK Boulevard. Denial of the window film and sliding door (alternate 1) on JFK Boulevard, pursuant to Standard 9: The staff was split on the neon signs on JFK Boulevard. No staff member recommends approval as submitted. Some suggest coordination

of the box sign on 17th Street with the transom signage on JFK Boulevard. Others suggest limiting the JFK Boulevard signage to the Walgreen's logo with the deletions of the "1-HR PHOTO," "FOOD MART," and two "PHARMACY" signs, which would overwhelm the façade.

Jerry Roller and Nayan Shah, from JK Roller Architects and Ann Green, from Walgreen's attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Mr. Roller explained that the Streets Department preferred "blending", or raising the sidewalk, for accessibility rather than the ramp as previously proposed. Mr. Roller also noted that he and his client had decided to withdraw the proposed sliding door design (alternate #1) in favor of the revolving door design (alternate #2). Ms. Green presented a sample of the window "film". Mr. Roller explained that the ground floor retail spaces at this property have numerous large storefront windows. Walgreen's has no use for deep "show" windows and propose to obscure the glass with opaque film. The staff and Committee agreed that the frosted glass sample was preferable to the green film proposed in the drawing. Mr. Levy asked about the Hallmark signs. Ms. Green responded that company policy prohibits any other individual product signage. The Committee and applicant discussed the setback of the interior signs that will range from 6 inches for the Hallmark signs to approximately 2 ft. for the pharmacy signs.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the project with the 3M Scotchcal ElectroCut Crystal window film, blended sidewalk, revolving door (alternate#2) and signage as proposed.

The applicant agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

1225 Pine Street

Robert Epstein, Owner

Arlene Matzkin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Enlarge rear dormer

This application proposes enlarging the rear dormer and adding a rear balcony on the row house at 1225 Pine Street. The new dormer would extend almost the entire width of the house and would include two sets of double-leaf doors opening onto a shallow balcony. The new dormer and balcony would be minimally visible from S. Camac Street between Pine and Panama Streets.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The staff was unanimous in its vote for a recommendation of denial, but not in its rationale. Some staff members objected to any enlargement or alteration of this historic dormer. Others objected not to enlargement per se, but to a dormer of this size, especially with the overlap onto the chimneys.

Arlene Matzkin, architect, attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Ms. Matzkin contended that the photographs indicate that the enlarged dormer would be minimally visible from any public right of way. Ms. Pentz commented that it is unfortunate to lose the original dormer. The Committee agreed that the proposed work has limited visibility.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the project as proposed.

911-13 Clinton Street

Michael Carosella, Owner

David Amburn, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1835-1843

PROPOSAL: Front façade rehabilitation, elevator tower, decks, new windows and doors at rear

This application proposes the conversion of four Clinton Street row houses into a residential complex with 15 condominiums. The front façades, which retain their original fabric, would be cleaned and repaired. The details of this work can be reviewed at the staff level. A great number of changes are proposed for the rear facades, which face onto Cypress Street and are minimally visible from 9th and 10th Streets. The 900 block of Cypress Street is a service alley populated by fences, garages, and secondary facades. No buildings front onto Cypress Street. The alterations would include the demolition of a 1-story garage addition at 911 and a wall at 917 as well as the construction of a large elevator tower, rooftop additions, a garage addition. Changes would also include a door enlargement and the lowering of a section of roof. Nine decks, seven doors, four windows, two garage doors, and three gates would be added. Seven windows would be converted into doors. Two doors would be converted into windows. Ten windows and two other openings would be partially or fully infilled or blocked. Scant details have been provided. Details including materials, colors, and configurations of new doors, garage doors, windows, railings, and gates must be provided for review.

Proposed alterations to 911 Clinton Street:

- demolish a 1-story garage building at the rear for 2-car parking pad
- partially infill three window openings on east façade of rear ell
- convert door into window on east facade of rear ell
- add deck on rear addition at 2nd-story level and convert window into door
- add deck on rear ell at 4th-story level and convert dormer window into door
- add deck at rear of rear ell at 2nd-story level and add new double-leaf door on east façade of 913
- add deck at rear of rear ell at 3rd-story level and convert window into door
- add single-leaf steel gate at rear

Proposed alterations to 913 Clinton Street:

- add deck on rear ell at 4th-story level and convert window into door
- raise part of roof at rear ell
- build addition on roof at rear ell
- partially infill two windows at 3rd-story level
- infill one window on west façade of rear ell
- add door on west façade of rear ell
- block two windows from the inside on the west façade of the rear ell
- install new sliding doors in existing openings on west façade of rear ell
- infill opening at north façade of rear ell
- add garage door in north façade of rear ell

Proposed alterations to 915 Clinton Street:

- partially infill two windows at 3rd-story level
- lower sill height and enlarge door on east façade of rear ell
- cut new window on east façade of rear ell
- convert door into window on east façade of rear ell
- add new single-leaf door on east façade of rear ell
- add deck railing in eight openings at 2nd and 3rd-story levels of rear ell
- add deck railing at 4th-story level of rear ell
- add 1-story extension and garage door to rear ell for garage

Proposed alterations to 917 Clinton Street:

- demolish a brick wall along Cypress Street and create a 2-car parking pad
- add deck on rear ell at 4th-story level and convert window into door

- add deck at 3rd-story level of north façade of rear ell and convert window into door
- add deck at 2nd-story level of north façade of rear ell and add double-leaf doors on west façade of rear ell at 915
- infill large porch at north façade of rear ell
- partially infill opening at west façade of rear ell and add triple window
- convert window into door on west façade of rear ell
- lower roof for deck at 4th-story level on rear ell and add pair of double-leaf doors on west façade of rear ell at 915
- add single-leaf steel gate at rear

Other proposed alterations:

- add 4-story elevator tower in shared side yard between 913 and 915
- add double-leaf steel gate in shared side yard between 913 and 915

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided that the following changes are implemented, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Changes to be made for a staff recommendation of approval:

1. The widths of the decks on the rear ell of 911 should be reduced to the width of the rear ell itself. The decks should not extend out over the side yard.
2. The windows at the 3rd story, rear of the main buildings at 913-917 should not be infilled.
3. New doors and windows installed in historical openings should retain historical light configurations as well as muntin dimensions and profiles.
4. Salvaged, matching brick should be used for all infill. Infill in significant, historic openings should be indicated with reveals. Infill in insignificant, non-historic openings should be toothed in to reduce mismatch. All masonry work should be reviewed by staff in the field.

Mr. Farnham presented the application.

David Amburn, the architect, attended the meeting and explained the proposal at length. He stated that the front façade is in good condition with the exception of rotting sills. The applicant, Committee, and staff agreed that all work proposed for the front façade, for example a new door, is restoration work and can be review and approved by the staff. For the masonry work, Mr. Amburn concurred with the staff and agreed to infill with salvaged brick. He also explained that the proposed sliding door at the rear of 913 would be used for trash pick-up. Currently a door and two windows exist at that location. He further explained that all rear windows needing replacement would be replaced in kind and that the rear bay at 915 would not be altered. The Committee and applicant discussed the decks at the rear of 911 at great length. Mr. Amburn noted that the deck extends out to the property line. Committee members objected to the decks over the side yard. The applicant explained that the structure for the decks needed to be on the property line to allow for parking for two cars. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the deck be bracketed or cantilevered out. The applicant also explained that the raising of the roof at 913 Clinton Street is necessary to meet ADA requirements for the elevator lobby. Mr. Baron asked about air conditioning equipment. The applicant described the proposed placement of the air conditioning units and stated that he would add documentation of their proposed placement to his proposal. The units would be located on the rear of the roof of the proposed elevator tower and on the rear ells of 913 and 915 Clinton Street. The units would be minimally visible, the applicant claimed. The Committee asked the applicant to submit a site plan for the air conditioning units.

Mr. Levy inquired about the raising of the sills at the 3rd-story rear of the main buildings at 913, 915, and 917. Mr. Amburn responded that kitchens would be installed at those location; the countertops, which are 36 inches in height, mandate the change in sill height. The Committee concurred that the sills should not be altered. The countertop situation should be addressed on

the interior, not the exterior. Mr. Levy thought that all brick infill should be indicated with reveals. Mr. Baron thought that the deck railings should have simple vertical designs. Committee members asked the applicant to work with staff on the light configurations for new and altered windows and doors. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the parking areas at 911 and 917 were open and if the applicant had considered gates for security. The applicant responded that open-air parking allowed for two cars, not one. Mr. Baron thought that the new gates should be more modern than those proposed. Mr. Amburn said that the gates mimic existing railings but would not be confused for historical gates.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal, with the inclusion of site plans for the air conditioning units, pursuant to 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.], with the staff to review details.

315-19 Arch Street

Philadelphia Management Company, Owner

Andrew Hamilton, Applicant

DATE: 1916,, Sauer & Hahn, architects

PROPOSAL: Projecting sign

This application proposes signage for the *dane decor* store on the first floor of the Schmidt Building at 315-319 Arch Street. This application is limited to the signage labeled sign D in the elevation drawing titled “exterior signage.” Signs A, B, and C have been approved at the staff level. The type D sign, with the store’s name, would consist of a fabric banner with applied red and white vinyl lettering and an aluminum mounting system. The sign would be mounted at the top to the brick façade and at the bottom to a joint in the terra cotta storefront. The third, top arm of the bottom mounting brackets can be deleted from the design if necessary without compromising the structural stability.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 10.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal and noted that Mr. Tyler and Ms. Spina had confirmed during a recent site visit that the exterior of the storefront is, in fact, terra cotta.

Andrew Hamilton attended the meeting to explain the proposal first present at the previous Commission meeting. The proposal stipulates that the sign attaches at the top to the brick above the storefront and at the bottom to a reveal in the terra cotta storefront. The center arm of the bottom support was not needed and would be removed from the design. Ms. Pentz asked the applicant for details on the mounting bar. Mr. Hamilton said that bolts would go all the way through the storefront to provide stability under wind loads. The through-bolts would be installed in the joint between the terra cotta pieces. Mr. Levy asked about the positioning of the through-bolts. The applicant explained that the bolts would be placed above and below the reveal.

The Committee thought that the bolts should be placed horizontally within the reveal so as to minimize damage to the terra cotta. Mr. Levy suggested that the applicant back the mounting hardware with felt to further limit damage.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval provided that the applicant redesign the

lower mounting bracket, realigning the bolts horizontally, with the staff to review details.

121-35 Walnut Street, NE corner of 2nd Street

Renaissance Properties, Incorporated, Owner

Richard Thom, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 121-25: 1830s; 127: between 1796-1835, new façade – c. 1875; 129-35: 1961

PROPOSAL: Final approval of addition and rehabilitation

This development returns to the Committee and Commission for final approval for the rehabilitation of the buildings along Walnut Street and the new construction at the rear. Overall, the historic buildings will be cleaned, the bricks spot-pointed, and the cast iron repainted.

On 121 Walnut Street the storefront with the stained-glass transoms will be kept and all of the windows on the upper floors will have six-over-six, true-divided light windows. The drawings show louvered shutters on the second floor, but paneled on the third & fourth. On the east façade, the fire-escape will be removed and the doors changed to windows with infill below.

123 Walnut Street will have new six-over-six windows and paneled shutters on the second floor. The storefront will remain, but the door will be replaced with a glazed and paneled door.

The first floor of 125 Walnut Street will be altered. The vestibule that exists does not meet ADA requirements. The proposal calls for rebuilding the vestibule slightly larger to accommodate a wheelchair. The now missing historic wrought iron canopy will be reconstructed in fiberglass with internally illuminated stained glass panels. The new design is based on historic photographs. A roof deck will be installed on the rear.

The cast-iron building at 127 will have the most changes. The proposal calls for repairing the cast iron; however, the abacus details at the 2nd floor are beyond repair. These elements will be reconstructed in fiberglass to match the originals. Floors 3, 4, and 5 may have had wood casement windows originally, but non-historic aluminum double-hung windows and infill were installed a number of years ago. The proposal includes new, wood double-hung windows at these floors. Also, the top of the window opening at the 5th floor had a cast iron band with a central rosette. The proposed design is to install a two-light transom in its place. The proposal also calls for new double-hung windows installed in the side elevations. The rear will also receive a roof deck.

Only two changes will occur on 129-35: the paneled door will become glazed to match the sidelights and a dormer will be installed on the west elevation in the rear addition.

The new construction consists of a seven-story addition at the rear of the property. The facades will have brick panels interspersed with terra cotta colored stucco panels. Grey concrete spandrels will divide the floors. The windows will be aluminum and many will have aluminum balconettes. The main entrance on 2nd Street will have multi-light aluminum doors.

Staff recommendation: Approval with the following changes, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9, all with staff to review details.

121 Walnut Street: louvered shutters should be installed on all floors; on the east side: doors should be installed in the bay under the hoist beam, not windows. These doors may have glazing.

123 Walnut Street: louvered shutters should be used rather than paneled, and if shutter hardware exists on upper floors, shutters should be installed on all floors.

125 Walnut Street: the vestibule should be made larger or smaller, since it visually cuts the next section of the storefront.

127 Walnut Street: the cast iron band at the top of the 5th floor window should be repaired / reconstructed instead of the proposed two-light transom.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and explained about the State's request for the complete demolition of the east façade of 123 Walnut Street.

Mr. Baron inquired if the historic street was being preserved as a driveway. Richard Thom, the architect, and Stanley Tarella attended the meeting. Mr. Thom explained that the historic paving will be kept from the curb to the new construction.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the design of the vestibule of 125 Walnut Street, and thought that the architrave on the vestibule should be removed.

The Architectural Committee recommended final approval of the project as revised, with the staff to review details pursuant to 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.] and 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 work 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.

7500 Germantown Avenue, Wingohocking Hall

New Covenant Church, Owner

Van B. Strother, Applicant

DATE:1890-92, Wilson Brothers, architects

PROPOSAL: Addition, elevator tower and skylights in concept

This application is for the conversion of Wingohocking Hall of the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf to senior housing for the New Covenant Church. This building sits near the rear of the property along West Gowen Street and has three parallel 4½ -story sections connected at the middle with hyphens, which are three stories high.

The western, 3-story hyphen will receive an addition to bring it to the full height of the rest of the building. The original proposal called for windows that match the rest of the section and clapboarding. PHMC reviewed the project for tax credits and asked for the addition to be glazed instead.

The property requires an elevator to all floors, so the application calls for installing an elevator tower on the rear of the eastern hyphen. This addition will have brick facing, but no windows or articulation. The treatment on the northern façade will match the work on the western hyphen.

The proposal also calls for removing the slate roof and installing asphalt shingles, but lacks details about the shingle type. Also, the plans include the installation of 25 skylights throughout the building, but no details are included. The floor plans show units at this fifth floor level, but the only source of light and air will be the skylights. The roof is steeply pitched so the skylights

will be highly visible.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the concept of infill at the hyphens, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. All other members believe that the façade of the additions should have stucco that matches the color of the schist.

Approval of the elevator shaft, as long as the facing is grey to match the schist, pursuant to Standard 9.

Denial of the asphalt-shingle roof and skylights, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6. The proposal does not offer justification for the complete removal of the slate roof. Skylights may be introduced in the design, but more details are needed before staff could give a recommendation.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal and inquired if the proposed skylights will meet the air and light code requirements. She noted that the skylights are highly visible and opined that too many new elements have been introduced to the roof. She also questioned replacing the roof, which is in good condition.

Van Strother attended the meeting to represent the proposal and responded that the skylights do meet the code requirements. He said that the State requested the glazing in the additions. He opined that he believes glazing will lessen the impact for these three massive buildings with a smaller building connecting at the third floor level. Mr. McCoubrey objected to the glazing, he believes that the proposal is more appropriate with clapboard and large windows with possibly a three-mullion section. Mr. Strother pointed out that the Office of Housing and Community Development, The City of Philadelphia and other governmental agencies are funding this project, and that the funding is based on 56 units. The applicant said that removal of the skylights would take away the 5th floor, which would eliminate seven to eight units. He believes that the proposed skylights have a low profile, which will blend with the new roof. Mr. Strother said that the State's preference for the new roof is asphalt shingles. He also remarked that an adaptive re-use of a property sometimes requires an interruption to the character of a building. In addition, he said that the skylights are not the driving factor for the removal of the slate, but that it is in poor condition. Mr. Strother said that owing to the time constraints, if the project does not move forward, it could prove to be a hardship.

Committee members discussed at length the removal of the slate roof. Ms. Pentz expressed concern about the addition of the skylights and the removal of the slate roof. She pointed out that typically if slate exists, then replacement should be in kind absent a showing of financial hardship. She thought that the location of the skylights should be re-studied. Mr. McCoubrey suggested possibly tucking the skylights behind the existing chimneys.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the additions on the hypens with a modified design and the elevator tower pursuant to 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 work 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.] and 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.]. It recommended denial of the roof replacement and the skylights as submitted pursuant to Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.], Standard 6 [Deteriorated 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.].

108-10 Levering Street

Levering Street Associates, Owner

Melissa Cooke, Applicant

DATE: c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Rooftop telecommunication equipment

The application proposes the installation of telecommunications equipment on the rooftop of the Archview Apartment building at 108-110 Levering Street in Manayunk. The installation would consist of two primary units, a 14'-8" tall antenna pole and a set of equipment cabinets hidden behind a wooden stockade fence. The fenced cabinets would be located on the roof of the 3-story section along the Gay Street façade. The fence would be 8' tall and enclose a 17'-11" by 31'-2" area. Two safety lights and a GPS antenna would rise from within the fenced area above the level of the fence. The large, 4'-square antenna pole enclosing six antennas would be located on the roof of the 4-story section of the building near the Levering Street façade. The pole would be disguised as a chimney. Cable trays painted to match their surroundings would run up from the ground on the façade, to the equipment cabinets, across the roof, up the secondary façade, and to the antenna. The Bureau of Historic Preservation has conducted a Section 106 review of the project and concluded that it would have no effect on historic and archaeological resources.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9: The staff would recommend approval with the following changes:

1. The equipment cabinets and antenna pole are moved inward away from the facades
2. The tall stockade fence is replaced with a shorter, less visible fence
3. The antenna pole is not disguised as a chimney
4. The cable trays are hidden inside the building or outside away from all street facades

Mr. Farnham presented the application.

Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Scott Heyer, the structural engineer, Melissa Cooke and Yvette Arceneaux, of Sprint, and Kathy Farrell attended the meeting. Mr. Sklaroff presented a sample of the material that is proposed to simulate the stealth antenna, which would be painted to match the brick of the building. He stated that the proposed stockade fence is intended to hide the equipment; however, he is amenable to whatever the Committee believes to be appropriate. Mr. Sklaroff said that the placement of the antennas was given great consideration. The applicant conferred with a structural engineer to explore structural elements, such as the condition of the walls. The Zoning Board, concerned about the weight on the roof, thought that the equipment should not span from wall to wall and should be tied into the roofing with the installation of plates.

Committee members inquired about the cable tray, which runs up the Gay Street façade and asked if it could be housed on the interior. Ms. Cooke responded that the tray is only three inches thick and that this is the most direct route to get power into the basement. She also pointed out that the Telecommunication Company does not own the interior. Mr. Heyer said that the proposed location for the equipment cabinets has an uninterrupted bearing wall all the way down. He also said that penetrations in doorways and openings could stress the existing structure. Mr. McCoubrey said that the proposed location for the equipment is highly visible and that an alternate location should be explored. He pointed out that there are other locations with bearing walls and that the proposed stockade fence is inappropriate. Mr. Baron cited other such applications and noted that in some cases, the applicant erected a mock-up to help find a location that minimizes any visibility. He also offered a staff visit to help determine visibility. He also

apprised the applicant of the Commission's Telecommunications Committee.

Mr. Sklaroff agreed to have a structural engineer explore other locations and submit a letter of his findings. He remarked that the fence would be painted a "City Lights" color, which seems to fade into its environment. Mr. Sklaroff commented that co-location is not an option because it would require more platforms.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired if the antennas could be moved away from the Levering Street facade and the applicant answered in the negative because of the detrimental impact on reception. The Committee concurred that visibility is an issue. The applicant should consider a simpler wood or metal housing for the cabinets. It also thought the faux chimney inappropriate, the mast should be moved, and that the cable tray on the Gay Street façade should be relocated into the interior. In addition, the Committee thought that the applicant should provide a site line study.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal as submitted, but offered the applicant suggestions for an alternate location, pursuant to 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.].

724-26 Pine Street

Lisa Roberts, Owner

John H. Cluver, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1830; 724 Pine altered c. 1930; 726 Pine altered c. 1940

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation, new windows and doors

At its June 2001 meeting, the Commission approved in concept an application for properties at 724 and 726 Pine Street as well as 721 and 723 Addison Street. The application proposed the removal of stucco on the front façade of 724 Pine, the removal of the twentieth-century brick façade on 726 Pine, and the reconstruction of both facades to their 1830 appearances but with an added portico that never existed. It also proposed demolition and new construction at the rears of the Pine Street properties and alterations to 723 Addison Street as well as new construction at 721 Addison. At its September 2002 meeting, the Commission gave final approval to all aspects of the project except the Pine façade restoration. This application proposes the rehabilitation of the front facades at 724 and 726 Pine Street. Also note that the façade at 721 Addison, which is new construction, has been changed from what was approved at the September 2002 meeting. The applicant has not specifically applied to the Commission for a review of this change to the design, but it should be reviewed as part of the current application.

At the 721 Addison Street façade, the previously approved design has been amended. The approved, pitched standing-seam roof has been replaced with a flat roof and parapet wall. Also the casement windows at the 2nd-story level have been reconfigured as a triple window and a metal railing has been added below the window. The remainder of the design is unchanged.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the front façade rehabilitation except the simulated divided light windows, colonnaded portico, metal handrails, and metal basement grilles, pursuant to Standard 6. Approval of the changes to the approved design for the 721 Addison Street façade,

pursuant to Standard 9. The proposed simulated divided light windows should be replaced with historically appropriate true divided light windows. The portico, handrails, and grilles are not simply replacements of missing historical features, but are conjectural. The portico should be deleted completely from the proposal. The design for the metal work should be replaced with either an historically appropriate design or a simplified contemporary design.

Mr. Farnham presented the project and Mr. Baron inquired about the number of lights in the dormer window. John Cluver, the architect, explained that the proposal included arched head windows in the dormers like those in neighboring dormers. Mr. Baron emphasized that the insurance survey specifies that the dormers originally had six-light arches. In addition, he contended that the Commission's conceptual approval of the demolition of the 1940 façade at 726 and its reconstruction to mirror that at 724 was based on the Restoration Standards; the introduction of the portico, which is not an historical feature, counters the conceptual approval of the restoration. Mr. Levy asked about the evidence for the arched doorway windows, which will be reconstructed. He also pointed out that the window and door locations at 724 and 726 do not match one another. Mr. Cluver responded that there is evidence in the interior that the two houses at 724 and 726 were erected as mirror images of one another. Mr. Tyler stated that the proposed portico was inappropriate on these 1811 buildings.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the restoration of the front facades as submitted without the proposed portico pursuant to Restoration Standard 7 [Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.].

Mr. Cluver presented a sample of the proposed window. He stated that the proposed windows would be simulated divided light windows. The original brick mold can be matched with the proposed windows, but the sills will be deeper. Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the simulated divided light system. Mr. Baron recommended that if the windows are approved that they be painted.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the windows as submitted with the stipulation that they be painted on the exterior.

Mr. Cluver acknowledged that he had redesigned the new addition at 721 Addison Street. He explained that the pitched roof had been eliminated, a parapet wall added, and the 2nd-story window redesigned.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the redesigned addition at 721 Addison Street.

The Committee discussed the design for the metalwork on the front façade including the railings along the steps and the basement grills. Some Committee members as well as staff objected to the conjectural design, which they claimed was not appropriate from an historical standpoint. Mr. Tyler suggested that the proposed railing is not of the period and that the applicant seek guidance from Henry Magaziner's book on ironwork for railing details. Mr. Tyler emphasized that to comply with the *Standards* the new ironwork must be either historically appropriate or contemporary in design. Mr. Levy suggested that the applicant work with the staff to develop an acceptable railing detail; however, Ms. Pentz thought the railing as submitted is appropriate.

The Architectural Committee recommended that the applicant work with staff to develop the railing details. It recommended that the staff review all details of the proposal.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary