

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

**TUESDAY, 25 FEBRUARY 2014
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Suzanne Pentz
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

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

ALSO PRESENT

Caroline Boyce, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Mark Merlini, Brickstone
John Connors, Brickstone
David Capelli, Stantec
Eric Farrell, Stantec
Anthony Naccarato, O'Donnell and Naccarato
Chris Hepp, Inquirer
Taya Dixon, Epsilon Associates
Marcio Tavares, The Architectural Team
Leonard F. Reuter, Esq.
Gabriel Gottlieb
Jennifer Arnoldi, Martin Jay Rosenblum, Architects
Daniel Harkins, Brickhouse Developers
Murray Spencer, McIntyre and Capron Associates
Christian Busch, 20th Century Preservation
Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture
Tony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing
Hyon Kang, KCA Design
Dave Ragazzi

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 701-39 MARKET ST

Project: Construct residential tower
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Independence Center Realty LP
Applicant: Mark Merlini, Independence Center Realty LP
History: 1859; Lit Brothers Store; various buildings, 1859-1906
Individual Designation: 5/26/1970, 6/30/1970
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: The Mellon Independence Center, formerly the Lit Brothers Department Store, is an enormous structure occupying an entire city block. It consists of a series of interconnected buildings and additions bounded by Market Street, 8th Street, Filbert Street, and 7th Street.

This application proposes to construct a 35-story, 400-foot-tall residential tower within the footprint of the existing building. The tower would be located in the north central section of the building along Filbert Street, a service alley. The rear façade of the subject property bounds Filbert Street on the south. On the north side of the block, Filbert Street is bounded by the side of the federal detention center, the rear of a large warehouse building associated with the former department store, and a mid twentieth-century parking garage, which spans Filbert at the west end. The six-story Filbert Street façade would be retained and the tower built behind it. The ground floor of the Filbert Street façade, which has been altered many times, would be altered to accommodate entrances and loading dock for the tower. The bridge, which spans Filbert Street connecting the former department store to the warehouse, would be retained.

The project poses interesting questions regarding the application of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines.

At first glance, it appears that the project would clearly be at odds with the Standards. However, upon further consideration, the answer to the question of compliance with the Standards appears less obvious, owing primarily to the configuration of the historic building, its relationship to nearby structures and streets, and the location of the proposed tower.

Standard 2 stipulates that:

The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

A section of the flat roof, which has been substantially altered for mechanical equipment, would be removed, but it is not a distinctive material or feature. One could argue whether the construction of the tower would alter spaces and spatial relationships that characterize the property.

Standard 5 stipulates that:

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

Again, it is difficult to claim that a section of altered flat roof not visible from the public right-of-way constitutes a distinctive material or feature. The project complies with Standard 5.

Standard 9, which is on point, stipulates that:

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.

Again, the question of historic spatial relationships arises. The historic building is so large that the primary spatial relationship potentially impacted by the proposed construction is that of the building with the sky. When viewed from 7th, 8th, or Market, will the tower appear to rise from the historic building or will it appear like a tower on an adjacent lot? Will it destroy characteristic, historic, spatial relationships? The answers to the questions that spring from considerations of size, scale, proportion, and massing all depend on the resolution to the spatial relationship question. If the tower is visually divorced from the historic building when viewed from the primary public streets, not the service alley, can its size, scale, or massing impact the historic building?

Standard 10 stipulates that:

New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in a 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 tower could be removed and the flat roof reinstalled. This alteration is reversible and the proposal complies with Standard 10.

In addition to the Standards, several Guidelines are on point. The Guidelines recommend:

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

Designing a new addition in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.

Considering the design for an attached exterior addition in terms of its relationship to the historic building as well as the historic district or neighborhood. Design for the new work may be contemporary or may reference design motifs from the historic building. In either case, it should always be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color.

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

Designing a rooftop addition when required for the new use, that is set back from the wall plane and as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street.

The Guidelines recommend against:

Attaching a new addition so that the character-defining features of the historic building are obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

Duplicating the exact form, material, style, and detailing of the historic building in a new addition so that the new work appears to be part of the historic building. Imitating a historic style or period of architecture in a new addition.

Designing and constructing new additions that result in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the resource, including its design, materials, workmanship, location, or setting.

Designing a new addition that obscures, damages, or destroys character-defining features of the historic building.

Constructing a rooftop addition so that the historic appearance of the building is radically changed.

The proposed addition would not obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features. There would be no loss of significant historic fabric. The tower would not imitate or duplicate the style or features of the historic building. New and old would be clearly differentiated. The addition would be located on a non-character-defining elevation. As with the Standards, the Guidelines call on the Commission and Architectural Committee to determine whether the tower will be conspicuous or inconspicuous, whether it would disturb character-defining spatial relationships, and whether it would be compatible in size, scale, proportion, and massing. All of these determinations, which are interconnected, will be predicated on whether the tower appears divorced from or attached to the historic building when viewed from the primary public streets. When making this determination, one must consider carefully the location of the tower and the characteristics of the surrounding environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff offers no recommendation until it has undertaken a site visit.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developers Mark Merlini and John Connors, architect David Capelli, and engineer Anthony Naccarato represented the application.

Mr. Farnham reported that he visited the site yesterday and took several photographs of the conditions along Filbert Street. He displayed the photographs for the Committee, applicants, and audience.

Ms. Hawkins asked if this block of Filbert Street is considered the public right-of-way. Mr. Connors responded that the western end of the block was stricken from the City Plan when the parking garage was constructed. The eastern end is an open street. Mr. Capelli showed a site plan with the public portion of the street indicated. The street is public from about the bridge eastward. Mr. Connors stated that the abutting property owners own their halves of the street at the west, but pedestrian and vehicular easements that allow passage.

Mr. Connors stated that the existing building sits on 140,000 sf of land area and the by-right Floor Area Ratio (FAR) allows for about 2.5 million sf of floor area. Currently, the building has about 700,000 sf of floor area above grade. Therefore, it is using only a small percentage of the space allowed on the site by the zoning. Mr. Connors observed that they have often thought about constructing a tower at the site to occupy more of the allowable space on the site. He

explained that the building is so large that it has separate cores arranged throughout the site. The locations of the cores indicate that a tower could be more easily erected at the north-center section of the building. Years ago, they considered an office tower, but the market has changed in the area and a residential tower would now be more appropriate. He stated that the footprint of the tower would be about 12,000 sf, or less than 10% of the total site. The tower would be setback at least 150 feet from the major streets and 180 feet from Market Street.

Mr. Capelli showed large versions of the architectural drawings to the Committee. He showed a plan and stated that the tower would sit within existing demising walls that were constructed when the various buildings that make up the Lit Brothers Building were interconnected. He explained that the lower floors of the tower would be used as office space as they are now. He stated that the Filbert Street façade would be retained and the tower built behind it. He showed an elevation drawing of the Filbert Street façade and pointed out where the entrance and loading dock would be located. He showed the bridge over Filbert Street and the copper bridge over the existing loading area and stated that both bridges would be supported and retained in place. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Capelli to confirm that, excepting the ground floor of the Filbert Street façade, the entirety of the existing building at Filbert including the bridges would be retained. Mr. Capelli stated that that was true. The ground floor would be reconfigured for new entrances, but otherwise the Filbert Street façade would be retained as is. Ms. Stein asked if they would retain the windows in the Filbert Street façade. Mr. Capelli stated that the windows are in good condition and would be retained. He noted that the floors would be reconstructed in the same locations, allowing the windows to be used. The tower would stand 29 stories above the roof and have 12 units per floor. The tower would have 342 units.

Mr. Cluver asked how the residents would enter the tower. Mr. Capelli stated that residents would enter the tower through the building, from Market, 7th, and 8th Streets as well as the concourse. They could also enter from Filbert. Mr. Connors stated that the primary entrances would be through the historic building. Mr. Capelli stated that the bicycle storage and other facilities would be accessed from Filbert.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants to discuss the exterior materials of the tower. Mr. Capelli stated that it would be clad in cementitious panels and glass. The tower would be off-white and light grey to recede and not detract from the historic façade. Mr. Connors added that the owners directed the architect to create a tower that would not compete with the historic building. Ms. Hawkins observed that a 35-story tower will inherently compete. Mr. Cluver asked about the top floors of the tower. Mr. Capelli stated that the upper area would have screening or louvers for mechanical equipment.

Ms. Hawkins asked how the Architectural Committee can recommend approval of a 35-story tower on an historic building when it requires rowhouse owners to ensure that decks are inconspicuous. Mr. Connors responded that the historic building is very large, an entire city block. Ms. Hawkins asked if the tower was by right from a zoning perspective. Mr. Connors stated that the zoning for it is by right. Ms. Hawkins stated that she finds the tower "too big for the site." Mr. Cluver stated that he did not object to the proposal because the tower would not feel as though it were part of the Lits Building. He opined that the tower would appear disconnected from the historic building and would not change one's perception of it. Mr. Capelli stated that they studied the location of the tower in considerable depth and located it as they have to minimize its visual impact on the historic building. Mr. Cluver asserted that the connection between the historic building and tower would only ever be seen for a short distance

along 7th Street at Filbert. Mr. Connors noted that the federal detention center on 7th Street is very tall and would block most views of the tower from the northeast. Mr. Connors noted that the federal court house tower is much closer to 7th Street than is this proposed tower. Ms. Hawkins and Mr. Cluver agreed that, if one accepts the premise of a tower at this site, the proposed location for the tower is the best one.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the Lits Building is actually many building that were constructed and joined over time. Mr. Connors agreed and stated that they believe that it is made up of 13 structures. Some say 17 buildings. He explained that, when they rehabilitated the building in the 1980, they divided north-south into three separate sections with fire-rated walls between them. They also divided it in half east-west, creating six sections total, each of which can function independently. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the fact that this structure is composed of several buildings constructed at different times is supportive of this application. The history of this structure is one of dynamic growth and change. He concluded that the argument for the tower is strengthened if you place it within this historic context. Mr. McCoubrey added that, given the scales and sizes of the buildings on Market, 7th, and 8th Streets, a tower in the proposed location does not compete with the historic facades. He suggested, however, that they may want to reconsider the skin of the tower and not defer too much to the historic building. The tower should be of its time.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the bridge over Filbert Street. Mr. Naccarato, the engineer, stated that the bridge is supported independently of the building and can be held in place while the tower is constructed. He stated that he is confident that they can build the tower without disturbing the bridge.

Ms. Stein stated that she approves of the scale and massing of the tower. It does not detract from the historic building. She stated that the one concern is the “design character” of the tower. She stated that the proposed tower does not fit in with the character of the historic building, but competes with it. It brings too much attention to itself. The vertical stripes of concrete create a very strong vertical line on the tower. She suggested more glass. Mr. Connors noted that glass is very expensive and asked if it was the only solution. Ms. Stein conceded that there may be other design solutions. She suggested that they should make it “look new.”

Ms. Pentz stated that the proposed tower appears like a “remote” building and not part of the historic structure. She asked if the copper bridge would be impacted by the construction. Mr. Capelli responded that the copper bridge would be retained in place and supported during the construction. The erection of the tower would not harm or alter the copper bridge in any way. The applicants once again assured the Committee that their architectural drawings propose no changes to the bridges and they have no intention of altering or removing the bridges. The bridges will be retained and preserved.

Mr. Cluver asked if the applicants are proposing any signage to differentiate the tower from the historic structure. Mr. Merlini replied that they are not currently proposing any new signage for the building. He noted that they have discussed changing the text on some existing awnings and canopies to indicate the presence of the tower, but are not anticipating any new signage.

Caroline Boyce of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia noted that her organization provided a letter supporting the project. She stated that the bridge over Filbert Street should be designated as historic if it is not already designated. She reported that the Preservation

Alliance's advocacy committee has reviewed Independence Center Realty's proposal for the tower. The committee considered the project in the context of three major issues before the Commission. First, does the proposal constitute an alteration or a demolition? Second, does an addition at the proposed location meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the rehabilitation of an historic resource? And third, does the design as proposed merit final approval by the Historical Commission?

Ms. Boyce explained that the committee first agreed that the proposal should be reviewed as an alteration, since the extent of proposed demolition is limited to a comparatively small area of interior fabric not visible from the public right of way and since all exterior facades are being retained in place. In this case, the portions of the building proposed for demolition do not constitute a "significant part" of the historic resource. However, she cautioned that major demolition is proposed in areas immediately adjacent to the pedestrian bridge spanning Filbert Street. The proposal calls for the preservation of the bridge, but it is unclear whether this feature is currently under Historical Commission's jurisdiction, given that it is not included within the boundaries of the Lit Brothers tax parcel. If the Commission finds that the bridge is not currently included in the Lit Brothers designation, she urged the Commission to amend the nomination to include the bridge, ensuring that its preservation remain within the Commission's purview.

Ms. Boyce reported that, on the second question, the committee agreed that an addition to the Lit Brothers building could satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards if it did not destroy or obscure character-defining features of the building, did not detract from the visual impact the building currently commands, and was compatible in design with the historic structure. Because of the significant setbacks from Market, 7th, and 8th Streets and the comparatively small footprint of the addition compared to the overall building footprint, the committee concluded that a tower in the proposed location was an acceptable alteration that does not detract from the integrity of the resource. This was also considered in light of the building's complex history as an ad-hoc assemblage of multiple parcels whose unifying element, the Market Street façade, is visually and physically removed from the site of the tower.

Ms. Boyce stated that, on the third question, however, the committee felt strongly that the design as proposed does not merit final approval. While the proposal has merit in concept, the tower as submitted is not compatible with the historic Lit Brothers building in terms of the quality of its design, the compatibility of its cladding materials, or the proportions of its fenestration. The committee found the proposed design to be inappropriately bland and lacking a level of architectural distinctiveness more befitting a landmark of Lits stature. While the Preservation Alliance does not, in this case, oppose an addition to the building, we urge the Commission to hold its design to a higher standard than that which is currently proposed.

Dave Ragazzi, a real estate agent, stated that he finds the tower appropriate for the site and neighborhood. He posited that the original builders of the Lits Building likely would have constructed a tower if they had had the technology. He agreed with the Preservation Alliance that the tower should have a more distinctive design.

Mr. Cluver stated that he would move to recommend approval, provided the bridge over Filbert Street is retained and preserved regardless of its designation status. He stated that, although not part of his formal recommendation, he would suggest that the architect "revisit" the design of the tower to do "something that has a little bit more of a character to it, whether it be glass or something more panelized that has more of a sense of base, middle, top." He stated

that the changes to the tower are something to “explore,” but he does not offer any formal recommendation in that regard. Ms. Pentz seconded the motion. Ms. Hawkins offered amendments. She suggested that the motion also require the retention of the copper bridge. She stated that the recommendation should be predicated on the proposed tower’s footprint, the large setbacks of the tower from the primary facades, and the large size of the historic building. Mr. McCoubrey added that the motion should note the nature of the development of the block over time. Ms. Pentz agreed. Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicants should be required to present the redesigned tower to the Architectural Committee. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Cluver stated that the redesign should be reviewed again by the Architectural Committee. Mr. Connors informed the Committee that the design would also be subject to the review of the Civic Design Review Committee of the City Planning Commission. The Committee adopted the motion.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the bridge over Filbert Street and the copper bridge are preserved, owing to the proposed tower’s footprint, its large setbacks from the primary facades of the very large historic structure, and to the development of the historic structure, which grew and changed over time; with the staff and Architectural Committee to review details; pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 4624-42 WALNUT ST

Project: Rehabilitate building, install ADA entrances, aluminum-clad windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Breslyn Limited Partnership

Applicant: Brett Meringoff, Breslyn Limited Partnership

History: 1913; Breslyn Apartments; Frederick C. Michaelsen, architect

Individual Designation: 11/4/1982

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the exterior and interior rehabilitation of five existing apartment buildings, to be undertaken as a historic rehabilitation tax credit project subject to review and approval by the National Park Service. Proposed exterior work includes exterior masonry cleaning, repair and repointing; replacement of existing windows and doors; and the installation of new ADA accessible entrances.

The application proposes to replace existing aluminum replacement windows with new historically-appropriate aluminum clad wood windows with historically-appropriate brickmolds and trim to match historic material. It also proposes to replace existing double doors on all front elevations with new metal doors with glazed panels to match existing, and to replace existing front elevation balcony doors and single-leaf doors on 47th Street with new solid core wood doors with panels and glazing to match existing, as well as to replace existing exterior aluminum storm doors with new aluminum storm doors.

The application further proposes new accessible entrances at 4628-30, 4636-38, and 4640-42 Walnut Street to be created by modifying existing window openings, and a new accessible enclosed vestibule to be installed below the east elevation metal fire balcony at 4640-42 Walnut Street. ADA accessibility would also require modifications to site grading and the installation of

at-grade concrete ramps and stairs with railings. All work for ADA entrances would occur at side and rear elevations inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

The application also proposes the relocation of the existing metal gate between 4636-38 and 4640-42 Walnut Street, and the removal of the existing gate and replacement with a new gate on the Farragut Street elevation at 4624-26 Walnut Street, as well as the removal and replacement of the existing aluminum and PVC downspouts with new dark bronze aluminum downspouts and scuppers. Additional work includes the removal of the existing roof and repair of deteriorated decking followed by the installation of new insulation and a rubber membrane roofing system, and the location of mechanical equipment on the roof.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Taya Dixon, historic preservation consultant, and Marcio Tavares, architect, represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked for clarification of the building numbers as they related to the street addresses. Ms. Dixon clarified that Building 1 is 4640-42 Walnut Street, Building 2 is 4636-38, and so forth, in reverse numerical order. Mr. Cluver noted that the new ADA enclosure was on Building 1, at the end of the row.

Ms. Hawkins expressed appreciation for the thoroughness of the application, and Ms. Dixon stated that they were applying for historic tax credits, and would be presenting the design to the State Historic Preservation Office as well as the National Park Service.

One of the primary issues, Ms. Dixon noted, was the replacement of the windows with aluminum clad wood windows, but she reinforced that the current windows are terrible aluminum windows. She noted they were able to pull off much of the panning to identify the brickmolds underneath; they were able to identify two different types.

Ms. Hawkins noted that there were no dimensions on the window details showing the existing versus the new, but that that was an issue that could be resolved at the staff level.

Mr. Cluver questioned the fact that the low arched windows were shown in the proposed plans with a flat-topped window with infill in between, and asked if that was the historic configuration. Ms. Dixon replied that it was; when they pulled off the panning, the infill was solid. Mr. Cluver asked what the proposed material for the infill would be, and Ms. Dixon replied that the window manufacturer can field cut aluminum with wood backing to fit the opening.

Mr. Cluver asked for clarification about the floorplan for the ADA accessible entrance at Building 1. Mr. Tavares noted that the sheet number was A-201, and that the fire escape was used as egress to the stair. The proposal is to modify the fire escape so there is head room above it, with a storefront system below, creating a vestibule with a floating floor. The existing door opening into the community space would need to be widened, because the current opening is not wide enough to accommodate a 36" door, and that they are proposing to put in an automated door opener. Ms. Hawkins clarified that the applicant was proposing to ramp up using the concrete sidewalk between buildings 1 and 2. Mr. Tavares agreed that there would be a main ramp that would stop half way, because the elevation of Building 1 is higher than the

elevation of Building 2. Mr. McCoubrey noted that this ramp would be minimally visible from the public right-of-way, and Mr. Tavares agreed, stating that the space between the buildings is approximately eight feet wide, and that an existing gate would be relocated to the front edge of the buildings to accommodate the ramp.

Mr. Tavares described other proposed changes to the building, including re-grading and the replacement of a second gate.

Ms. Pentz asked whether the existing structural system is wood framing. Mr. Tavares replied that the exterior of the buildings are masonry and the interior are wood framed, and that the rear balconies are steel channeled with open metal grates, and the front balconies are poured concrete.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the stucco infill of the storefronts, which Mr. Tavares noted exists. He continued that the only proposed work to those areas is to open up the hopper windows.

Mr. Cluver asked Ms. DiPasquale whether the existing windows were replaced legally, and Ms. DiPasquale replied that the record is unclear. Mr. Cluver noted that he believed the aluminum clad, one-over-one windows were unlikely to have been the original configuration, and that usually in instances such as that, the Commission requires that the windows be painted wood with the historical configurations, unless it was approved previously. Ms. Dixon noted that in the property's 1982 designation description, the windows were described as one-over-one sliding sash bay windows on the front facades. Ms. DiPasquale stated that she spoke with Scott Doyle at the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission, who noted that, since the windows are currently aluminum replacement windows, there is generally more leniency in the federal review in terms of the materials for the new replacement windows, especially given the fact that the applicant is able to recreate the brickmold. Mr. Cluver agreed that the ability to recreate the brickmold was key, along with the fact that the porches are the most prominent feature of the buildings, and that the windows are not as strong of a contributing element as they are in most other buildings in the city. Ms. Dixon noted that there is a nearly identical group of buildings a few blocks away that has some original wood windows on the side elevation that are one-over-one.

Mr. Cluver moved to recommend approval of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, noting that the clad windows are recommended for approval owing to the condition of the property at the time of designation. Mr. McCoubrey added that the storefront infills should be painted a darker color, and Mr. Cluver accepted.

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

ADDRESS: 1515-17 N 16TH ST

Project: Construct apartment building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 17 Street Development LP

Applicant: Hyon Kang, KCA Design

History: vacant lot, ID building demolished in 1999

Individual Designation: 7/1/1982

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a nineteen (19) unit apartment building on a currently vacant lot. The proposed structure will be four (4) stories in height, with the first three stories to be composed of burgundy/red/brown brick façade with brick quoins and the fourth story of stucco. The proposed windows on the 16th Street façade will be aluminum clad or composite, with trim to be of brick or cast stone.

The former structure at this location was individually designated in July 1982, but was demolished in May 1999 after it was deemed imminently dangerous. The Historical Commission approved the demolition without conditions. There are no remaining historic resources on the lot, and the property does not fall within a historic district.

Given that there are no historic resources on the site, the demolition was approved without condition, and the property was individually designated and not within a district, there is no basis for judging this proposal against Standard 9, which reads:

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.

There are no historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property that could be destroyed. Likewise, there is no way to judge compatibility or differentiation because there is no defined historic resource against which this proposed building can be judged. Moreover, because this property is not within a locally-designated historic district, there is no defined "environment" within which to judge this application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Hyon Kang represented the application.

Mr. Cluver noted that he had several design-related comments. One, the main door was shown as swinging in, but it would need to swing out for code reasons. Mr. Cluver noted that, if the door swings out, there might be a desire for some covering over it like an awning. Mr. Kang noted that they would be including a pediment or some sort of structure over the entrance on the first story only.

Secondly, Mr. Cluver noted it would be nice to have some articulation on the front façade.

Third, Mr. Cluver noted that the stuccoed fourth story appeared to be inconsistent with a historic district, and that it appeared to be three stories with a stucco addition. It was noted that the property is not in a historic district and there are no historic resources surviving at the site. Mr. Kang responded that they could make the façade entirely brick, if that was preferable. Mr. Cluver continued that if the applicant desired to create historical architecture, traditionally building facades were divided into a base, middle, and top, with a first floor articulated in some way, generally with a water table, two stories, and then a third above a cornice line, or some other distinguishing feature. Mr. Kang described the surrounding buildings as primarily having three continuous stories, without a water table on the lower level. Mr. Cluver noted that the immediately adjacent neighbors have mansard roofs, which is a completely different character than a stucco wall. Mr. Kang responded that they could replace the stucco with another material. Mr. Kang noted that, although the property does not fall within a district, they are trying to be sensitive to the neighborhood. Ms. Hawkins noted that replacement of the stuccoed fourth floor with brick would be preferred, as would changing the material below the first floor windows to cast stone panels to create the appearance of a water table.

Ms. Stein questioned the positioning of the proposed building in relationship to the lot lines and neighboring buildings. Mr. Kang noted that the proposed building would project beyond the adjacent building, which is set back approximately 20 feet. The committee recommended that the applicant return brick along the south side façade to the inside corner to create dimensionality. Ms. Stein asked whether there was also a setback of the building to the north, and Mr. Kang responded that the building was flush.

Ms. Pentz asked about the wall in the rear photograph, and Mr. Kang responded that the wall no longer exists, as the photograph used in the packet was from a 2011 Google Streetview. Mr. Kang continued that it is now a completely vacant lot from 16th Street through to Sydenham Street.

Mr. Kang noted that the building will not extend the full length of the lot, but will be set back 52 feet from Sydenham to accommodate parking requirements and rear yard setbacks.

Mr. Cluver asked Ms. DiPasquale if the Commission has full jurisdiction over this property or whether it only has Review-and-Comment authority. Ms. DiPasquale responded that this is a unique situation, as a building was present at the time of designation, but was demolished with the Commission's approval owing to imminent danger. Ms. Hawkins interjected that the parcel is still listed, but the exact basis for the review is unclear. Mr. Cluver noted that there is very little information aside from the floorplan and elevation. Ms. Hawkins recommended that the applicant revise and annotate the drawings for the Commission meeting. Mr. Kang noted that typically their plans would be much more thorough, but, given the lack of existing historic resources on the site, the lack of precedent for this type of review, and the fact that the project is not in a historic district, their understanding was that the Commission's jurisdiction was limited in this case; there are no historic resources to protect or be compatible with at the site. He further noted that it was their desire to create a design that was sensitive to the neighboring properties, but that was also reasonably priced. If implemented, the Committee's suggestions would increase costs significantly.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the plans are revised to include articulation of the base,

middle, and top of the building, a treatment over the main entrance, and the continuation of brick through the fourth floor façade and around the first bay of the side facades, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 118 KENILWORTH ST

Project: Construct third-floor addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: R. G. Woodstock Associates

Applicant: Dan Harkins, Brickhouse Developers, LLC

History: 1767

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition on the rear ell of this eighteenth-century three-story structure. The rear ell is not visible from the public right of way. However, the building is very old and significant. The addition would demolish the roof of the ell and part of the rear slope of the main block. The staff contends that the design of the rear addition should be modified to avoid demolishing or connecting to the rear slope of the roof of the main building. The rear addition could gain additional space by replacing the hipped roof with a roof that extends to the rear of the rear ell. The application provides no details for the proposed restoration of the front façade, but the staff could work with the applicant to develop the appropriate details.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the rear addition is not attached to the rear slope of the main roof, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and the Roofs Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Dan Harkins and architect Murray Spencer represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that he had just been made aware that the applicant had provided new drawings to the Committee members at the start of the meeting, and that the staff comments related to an earlier version of the design. Mr. Baron opined that the new design addressed many of the issues raised by the staff recommendation. The addition, he noted, has less of an effect on the rear roof slope of the main block than the front. The roof on the new third-floor rear addition is now a gable rather than a hip. The restoration of the front façade is now shown in preliminary form.

Mr. Harkins and his architect explained the design. Mr. Cluver requested that the applicants look at the possibility of modifying the stair so that more of the rear wall could be saved. The architect said he would look at this option; however, headroom on the stair may be a problem. Mr. Cluver inquired about the appropriateness of paneled versus louvered shutters on the front façade. Mr. Baron explained that for this very early period building, solid shutters were normal for upper level windows; on later buildings, louvered shutters on the upper floors were common. Mr. Cluver also asked about the restoration of the dormer from a gable to a shed type. Mr. Baron showed a photograph to explain that the older dormer is embedded inside the current dormer. Mr. Cluver expressed concern about the note specifying Jeldwyn windows, but it was

pointed out that this was only for the rear and side facades, not the front façade. The applicant said he would work with the staff to find appropriately detailed windows for the front facade.

Mr. Baron explained that the façade currently has illegal vinyl windows and mid twentieth-century Permastone on the façade, all of which the current owner plans to remove. The brick façade that has been exposed beneath the Permastone has Flemish bond, but also areas of more damaged running bond where pent eaves used to exist. The applicant plans to reconstruct the pent eaves. Ms. Stein asked about the material of the bottom of the pent eaves. The applicant said that this would be detailed and worked out with the staff, but that he thought beaded board. Committee members thought it was important for the pents to be reconstructed with wood shakes since they will be so visible from the ground. Mr. Harkins said he would do so.

Mr. Baron stated that he thought the restoration should also include putting a shallow rectangular transom above the door in place of the fanlight. He noted that the current fanlight is a later change and actually cuts above the height of the floor joists for the second floor.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the stair house to the deck is as low as possible, more of the rear wall is retained if possible, an appropriate transom is installed over the front door, the pent eave is roofed with wood shakes, and appropriate windows are installed on the front façade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, and 9.

ADDRESS: 417 S CARLISLE ST

Project: Construct roof deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mark & Cindy Feinstein

Applicant: Martin Rosenblum, Martin J. Rosenblum & Associates

History: 1855

Individual Designation: 9/28/1965

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a roof deck and pergola on the main block of this house and a stair house on the rear ell. The Architectural Committee reviewed a similar application one month ago, in February 2014, and recommended denial. The earlier application proposed a deck on the front and rear slopes of the main roof of the rowhouse; the current application shifts the deck and stair house toward the rear, but the deck still stands on the rear slope of the main roof. The Commission typically approves roof decks on rear ells, but does not typically approve decks on main, gable roofs. This house is part of an exceptional row of houses, which have a consistent height. A staff member is scheduled to view a mock-up before the Architectural Committee meeting.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jennifer Arnoldi and attorney Leonard Reuter represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the applicant revised the proposal, but that the deck is still proposed to sit on a character-defining portion of roof and that a mock-up shows that the deck will still be visible from the public right-of-way. He said that the Commission has a long practice of disallowing decks on the main block of gable roof houses, both front and rear slope. He read from the Roof Guidelines, which call for identifying and protecting character-defining roofs such as mansards and gables, which he distinguished from flat roofs, which are less character defining.

Mr. Baron showed photographs from his site visit to evaluate a mock-up of the deck. The photographs demonstrated that the railing and pergola would be visible.

Ms. Arnoldi showed her photographs of the mock-up and said that the deck and pergola would be visible from Lombard Street at the south end of Carlisle. She noted, however, that they would not be visible from the north side, the direction from which vehicular traffic approaches.

Mr. Reuter disagreed with Mr. Baron's assessment that the Commission has consistently denied decks on the main roofs of gable roofs. He stated that the standard is that the deck should be inconspicuous, not invisible. He noted that the deck railing could be a thin cable rail.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the deck could be lowered by setting the structure back further on the rear slope and cantilevering the deck over the ridge. Ms. Arnoldi thought that this might be possible. Mr. Cluver expressed a concern about whether the building code would require the raising of the chimney with the deck so close underneath. Ms. Arnoldi said that she would research this question, but that they do not intend to raise the chimney.

Mr. Baron added that the neighbor next door has expressed concern about the deck and that the deck could also result in the neighbor having to raise the height of his chimney as well.

Mr. Reuter asked if this new proposal could be considered at the next Commission meeting on 28 February 2014. Ms. Hawkins said that she would consider that if all of these questions have been resolved.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 3 to 2 to recommend approval, provided the deck railing is a cable wire railing and is reduced in height to 36 inches, the entire structure is lowered by cantilevering, the structure is invisible from the public right-of-way, and chimneys are not raised. Mr. McCoubrey and Ms. Pentz voted in opposition.

ADDRESS: 1219 LOCUST ST

Project: Legalize aluminum window

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rose Andrea Kozlow

Applicant: Rose Andrea Kozlow

History: 1890; Furness, Evans & Co.

Individual Designation: 7/5/1984

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of aluminum windows installed without a permit. The illegal windows do not match the historic multi-pane windows, which are known from historic photographs. The applicant contends that the illegal windows match later non-historic replacement windows. The Commission has always required restoration to the original design unless the later alteration has acquired its own significance. The one-over-one windows used as the basis for this replacement have no historical significance and should not have been used as models. A letter from the applicant asserts that damage from Hurricane Sandy resulting in one broken window necessitated the replacement. The owner is familiar with the Historical Commission's processes, having applied for permits in the past for the first-floor window and a rear garage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

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

Mr. Baron stated that the contractor included a letter from Department of Licenses & Inspections with the application that indicates that work done at the property has passed a final inspection. However, the letter does not refer to the replacement of the windows, which was not permitted and would not have been inspected. The letter refers to repairs to the cornice and lintels at this property, which was undertaken at about the same time with permits and approvals. The Committee members reviewed the window proposal and concluded that the illegal windows were inappropriate in materials and design and therefore do not satisfy Standard 6.

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

ADDRESS: 200 W WASHINGTON SQ

Project: Install ADA entrance

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: St. James Associates Joint Venture

Applicant: Eric Farrell

History: 1869; PSFS Building, York Row, St. James; Addison Hutton, architect; Add. and alts. by Hutton and Furness Evans & Co.

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an ADA compliant entrance for a new urgent care facility that will occupy the northeast corner of the former PSFS building. The application offers two options for location of the ADA entrance. The first of these options modifies the existing window immediately to the west of the main entrance. The second of these options modifies the first existing window around the corner from the main entrance, on West Washington Square. The modifications to the windows in both options involves cutting down the masonry opening to the level of the sidewalk, removing an existing basement window and a section of spandrel cladding, and modifying the lower half of the existing double hung window above, along with portions of the original wrought iron window grille. The proposed ADA entrance door for both options is a single, glass and raised-panel door with decorative jambs, head and transom, matching the original extant design of the historic main entrance. Also included in the proposal is a modest sloped awning over the new entrance.

There is an existing ADA compliant entrance at the rear of the building along Saint James Street that should be considered for this purpose, in order to alleviate the need to modify an existing window opening on the highly significant historic building.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Eric Farrell and Christian Busch and attorney Tony Forte represented the application.

Mr. Busch stated that the future tenant will have a 15 year lease on the space and that the tenant has a history of good stewardship of historic buildings. The tenant is also willing to provide an interpretative installation of the building's history, and to leave the Frank Furness-designed interior columns exposed, which were recently uncovered during interior renovations.

Mr. Forte clarified that Jefferson Hospital's lease for the facility prohibits use of the Saint James Street (rear) entrance. Mr. Forte also added that an ADA entrance should be close to the main entrance, providing a similar entrance experience for the user, and that the existing Saint James Street entrance as the ADA entrance would not be appropriate or legal. Ms. Hawkins told the applicants that the lease agreement as it pertains to the rear ADA entrance is not of concern to this application.

Mr. Busch and Mr. Forte explained that they offered two options for ADA entrances in their application because the staff encouraged them to explore an opening on the Washington Square West side of the property, so as to not alter the Walnut Street façade. Mr. Busch noted that their preferred option is cutting the opening on Walnut Street, which could be less

noticeable because of its location past the main entrance steps. Mr. Forte stated that it would be best for the user to not have to travel around the corner of the building to a side entrance, and he noted that the existing Washington Square West side of the building has never had an entrance.

Mr. Cluver suggested that there are three issues to address. The first is the issue of using an existing ADA entrance on Saint James Street versus creating a new ADA entrance. The second is the issue of location of the ADA entrance, if a new entrance is created. The third is the issue of how the entrance will be installed, if one is created. He noted that his preferred option for a new entrance is the Walnut Street location.

Mr. Forte responded that there is a proposed valet parking drop-off location in front of the main entrance on Walnut Street that is not shown on the application materials, being two or three parking spaces in length. The tenant has not yet received approval for the valet parking. Mr. Cluver questioned what the use of the existing ADA entrance on Saint James Street will be if a new ADA entrance is constructed. Mr. Forte responded that the existing ADA entrance on Saint James Street will be used for emergency egress, or if an ambulance needs to pull up. Mr. Forte explained that the residents of the large tower next door have to use the Saint James Street entrance area to access their building, and that the combination of the residential use with the commercial use, both on Saint James Street, did not work well when this space was previously used as a restaurant.

Ms. Stein suggested that a new ADA entrance should be accessible both by other tenants of the building, and also future tenants of the space, so that there will not be a need in the future to construction additional ADA entrances in the historic building fabric. Her preference is the Walnut Street entrance, as long as it serves the building holistically and that the building will not be carved up in the future to add additional ADA entrances. Ms. Pentz stated that her preference for the ADA entrance is the existing Saint James Street entrance, and that its use could be justified in the name of historic preservation. Mr. McCoubrey stated that his general preference for ADA entrances is that they be in close proximity to the main entrance. He suggested that the existing Saint James Street ADA entrance is too far of a walk from the main entrance on Walnut Street. He also suggested that this tenant not having access to the Saint James Street entrance supported the case for the creation of an ADA entrance near the main entrance, with his preference being the location on Walnut Street. All Committee members agreed that the Walnut Street option for the ADA entrance was preferred over the West Washington Square option.

Mr. Baron then offered some historical perspective on the renovations to the building over time. He stated that the entire orientation of the building shifted to the rear (Saint James Street) when the building was converted, and that the building has its own drop-off there because the idea at that time was to get cars off of busy Walnut Street. This application will signal a re-orientation back to the Walnut Street side, despite the Saint James Street entrance created as a means of convenience for entering the building. He echoed Ms. Hawkins comment that the issue of this tenant not having permission to use the Saint James Street entrance is only a contractual issue. He explained that he had encouraged the applicant to consider the West Washington Square side for the ADA entrance because he is trying to preserve the symmetry of the Walnut Street façade.

Caroline Boyce, the executive director of the Preservation Alliance, stated that the Preservation Alliance supports the Walnut Street façade option for the ADA entrance. This is because the location of the proposed entrance on Walnut Street is slightly recessed and an entrance on West Washington Square would be more noticeable, and the direction of the traffic on Walnut Street makes it such that the Walnut Street entrance would be less visible. The Preservation Alliance also noted that the ADA entrance should be in close proximity to the main entrance.

Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Baron about the intended entrance when the restaurant use was approved for the building. Mr. Baron responded that he believed the intention for the restaurant was to have patrons enter through the St. James Street entrance. Ms. Pentz added that she also remembered that to be the case. Several Committee members suggested that the Saint James Street entrance should continue to be the “main” entrance, given this information. Other Committee members disagreed and suggested that Walnut Street is considered to be the building’s main entrance, and that adding an ADA entrance on Walnut Street would bring longevity to the building’s productive life.

Ms. Stein voiced concern that the current interior layout for the new tenant might not be appropriate for a future non medical-use tenant. She suggested that the dropped lobby and interior lift be pulled tighter to the exterior wall so that the layout could work for a future tenant. Mr. Cluver suggested that the push plate for the ADA entrance be more narrow in design and recessed into the entrance. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the kick plate on the bottom of the door be oil rubbed bronze. Ms. Hawkins added that the panels under the glass should be one panel instead of two panels, but that historic photographs should be used to confirm this. Mr. Busch responded that he will have these details reviewed by the staff.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of a new ADA entrance on Walnut Street, provided the interior layout is reconsidered to allow for use by other building tenants and future tenants, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9.

ADDRESS: 230-40 RACE ST

Project: Construct eight townhouses

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: 220 Race Street Associates, LP

Applicant: Andrew Kaplin, 220 Race Street Associates, LP

History: vacant lots

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct eight four-story, single-family townhouses on a vacant lot in Old City. The lot is considered an “undeveloped site” and the Commission’s jurisdiction is Review-and-Comment only. The proposed townhouses would be constructed in two rows running south from Race Street with a center driveway. The facades facing the driveway would be clad in brick and metal panels and have windows. The north or Race Street elevations would be mostly solid, with walls clad in brick and cast stone panels. The Race Street elevations would have few windows, mostly at the upper floors.

On this block and throughout the Old City Historic District, the buildings were historically used for light manufacturing, storage, and commerce and often had storefronts at the first floor. Many buildings have been converted to residential use, but retain vestiges of their former commercial uses. Residential townhouses are not typical of the main streets of Old City. The proposed buildings, especially with the first floor garages and mostly solid walls facing Race Street, are incompatible with the surrounding streetscape and district. Also, the size, scale, and proportions of the proposed buildings and their components such as windows overwhelm the two historic buildings that would flank the complex. Finally, the palette of materials is incompatible with the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The proposed buildings are incompatible with the surrounding streetscape and historic district. They may be contemporary in style, but should be completely redesigned to comply with Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Richard Villa represented the application.

Mr. Cluver stated that he was concerned with the lack of street-level windows and activity. He noted that the inward focus of the development seems very counter to the historic district. Ms. Stein stated the massing is a result of, and suffers from, the curb cut placement at the center of the lot, which kills the pedestrian life on the street. She suggested that it could be done in a different way by routing the traffic to the rear. Ms. Pentz stated that she found the façade, with its very few windows, incompatible with the historic district. Mr. McCoubrey concurred, stating that the Race Street façade could use more fenestration. He observed that more fenestration is used facing the proposed center driveway from the street. He suggested that having more openness on the front façade would help the design. He also suggested that acknowledging the entrance with a gate or narrowing the curb cut would also help the design.

Mr. Villa stated that the mostly solid wall on Race Street is a result of trying to minimize the noise from the traffic on the Benjamin Franklin Bridge. He noted that the Race Street façade steps down to the east and west, and that there are more windows on the driveway to provide views of the bridge and Center City.

Mr. Cluver stated that the new buildings should have more engagement with the street and reiterated that the current design is very contrary to the historic district. Mr. McCoubrey concurred. Mr. Cluver suggested connecting the two buildings on Race Street with an arch over the drive and pushing the garages deeper onto the lot.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee voted to comment that the proposed buildings are incompatible with the surrounding streetscape and historic district. They may be contemporary in style, but should be completely redesigned to comply with Standard 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

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

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

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.