MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

TUESDAY, 16 DECEMBER 2014
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR

PRESENT
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP
Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Dave Schultz, DAS Architects
Jay Rockafellow, DAS Architects
John Connors, Brickstone
Greg Heflin, Brickstone
Ian Toner, Toner Architects
Rustin Olher, Harman Deutsch
Mark Wallace, Harman Deutsch
Michael Skolnick, PZS Architects
Herb Schultz, PZS Architects
Marcin Szkotak, L2Partridge
Andrew Ross
Peter Burwasser
Manja Lyssy
Chris Tantillo, Tantillo Architecture
Rachel Thurston, Tantillo Architecture
Devon Chesire, Rubenstein Partners
Lorna Katz Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Michael Harshany, The Sullivan Company
Stephen Maffei, Abitare
Logan Dry, Abitare
Jim Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co.

CALL TO ORDER
Mr. McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman and Pentz and Mr. Cluver joined him.

DRAFT

ADDRESS: 15-21 S 11TH ST
Project: Replace storefronts and windows; construct roofdeck; extend elevator and stair to roof
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Brickstone Realty
Applicant: Jay Rockafellow, DAS Architects Inc.
History: 1912; William Steele & Sons
Individual Designation: 6/14/2013
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate a building on S. 11th Street, between Market and Chestnut Streets. The rehabilitated building will house retail space on the first floor and office space on the upper four floors.

The ground floor on S. 11th Street was stripped of its historic ornament and storefronts, probably in the 1950s. The storefront area is currently a jumble of non-historic elements added over time. Non-historic storefronts and infill would be removed, historic storefront openings including transoms reopened, and aluminum storefronts installed. Lost cladding and capitals on the storefront piers would be replaced; the replacement cladding material is only specified as "stone," but should be more precisely defined. An existing egress doorway with transom would be retained in the southernmost bay. A new entrance for the upper-floor office space would be created adjacent to the existing egress doorway. It would include a glass and metal canopy. A detail of the canopy is provided, but it does not include information about the hanger rods, which are shown attaching to the terra cotta cornice in a rendering. In light of the fact that the building originally had two metal canopies tied back into the cornice, such a hanger rod design should be acceptable, but the details should be provided. Fabric awnings would be installed at the other storefront openings. At the north façade, along Ludlow Street, infilled openings would be reopened and aluminum storefront systems installed. At the rear, along a service alley, louvers and metal doors would be installed.

At the upper floors, all windows would be replaced with aluminum windows matching the pane configurations and other details of the historic windows. Details of the proposed windows have not been provided, but can be confirmed by the staff. The historic terra cotta, brick, and other features would be cleaned and restored. The staff can review specifications and samples for this work.

An elevator and stair would be extended to the roof to access a new rooftop terrace for the office tenants. The elevator penthouse would include a small glass and aluminum vestibule. The rooftop additions would be set back significantly from the primary facades so as to be inconspicuous from the street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details including storefront, window, canopy, awning, and replacement cladding details as well as brick and terra cotta cleaning, repair, and replacement specifications and samples, pursuant to Standards 6, 7, 9, and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Dave Schultz and Jay Rockafellow and developers John Connors and Greg Heflin represented the application.

Mr. Schultz presented the architectural plans as well as historic and current photographs to the Committee. He stated that he was also prepared to provide the additional details requested by the staff. He described the building and its history. He pointed out a photograph of the building dating to the 1930s and noted that the building had two metal canopies at that time. Ms. Gutterman asked if they were glass and metal canopies. Mr. Schultz stated that they were glass and metal. Mr. Schultz observed that the storefront area of the building was stripped in the 1950s and replaced with modern storefronts and streamlined cladding. He explained that the storefronts are currently covered in signage and metal panels and many of the underlying conditions are hidden. He reported that all of the historic storefront elements were removed long ago, except the transom over the doorway at the south end of the building. He displayed several photographs of the building in its current state. The terra cotta would be restored and cleaned.

Mr. Schultz explained that the first floor would be used as restaurant or retail space. A lobby for the upper-floor office space would occupy a small section of the first floor. The upper floors would be used as open office space for hi-tech companies. He stated that the developer is targeting creative, start-up, entrepreneurial companies. A terrace would be added at the rooftop. An existing stair and elevator would be extended to the roof. The terrace would be "significantly inboard" from the parapets. The terrace railing would be a planter.

Mr. Schultz displayed detailed architectural plans. He noted that they called for pointing, repairing, and cleaning of the terra cotta. He explained that new windows would be installed. He stated that the windows are currently metal and would be replaced with aluminum windows with the same shapes, profiles, dimensions, and pane configurations. The front façade has double-hung windows; the side and rear facades have industrial sash. The historic windows would be replicated as closely as possible.

Mr. Schultz presented the plans for the storefronts. He stated that they are currently a "jumbled mess." The new storefronts will be very simple, clean, and transparent and related to the historic elements of the building. The storefronts will have awnings mounted at the transom-bar level.

Mr. Schultz stated that the southernmost bay on the front façade retains its historic transoms, but the doors are lost. He explained that a set of the original metal doors that once stood in this location survive inside the building. He proposed to move those doors to the exterior opening and fix them in place. He stated that they would reinstall the historic doors in that location, but not use them because they are not durable enough and because they do not meet current egress requirements. He stated that they would locate the main entrance to the office space to the left of the southernmost opening. The doors in that entrance would match the new storefront details in the other openings. A simplified version of the historic canopies seen in the 1930s photographs would be installed at the doorway. He displayed a detailed drawing of the proposed bronze metal canopy with a glass top.

Mr. Schultz displayed drawings of the existing and proposed north façade along Ludlow Street. He explained that the first bay at the west is detailed like the front façade and would be rehabilitated like the front façade. To the east of the first bay, the building transitions to a much more industrial look. At the upper floors, new aluminum industrial sash to match the existing would be installed. Graffiti would be removed and the masonry would be repaired and pointed. At the ground floor, infill would be removed and new storefront systems installed in the large openings. At the rear, along Clifton Street, which is a service alley, windows would be replaced

to match, masonry repaired and pointed, and some louvers installed. The Philadelphia stair would be maintained.

Mr. Schultz displayed a rendering of the renovated building. He then displayed detail drawings of the canopy. Mr. Schultz presented a materials sample board to the Committee including a limestone-like material for the missing cladding. Mr. Cluver asked if they would replicate the coursing of the cladding. Mr. Schultz stated that they would. He added that they do not yet know the precise state of the storefront cladding below the metal that now wraps the piers. Ms. Gutterman asked about the material at the bases of the storefront piers. Mr. Schultz replied that they will use a gray material for the bases. The metal would be dark bronze. Mr. Cluver asked about the material that would be used to remake the missing capitals. Mr. Schultz stated that it would be a pre-cast material. Ms. Gutterman asked if they could use terra cotta to remake the missing capitals. Mr. Schultz responded that they would not propose real terra cotta. He added that they hope that the capitals survive behind the metal infill. Mr. Cluver asked about the plan to remake them if they have not survived. Mr. Schultz stated that they would replicate them in a substitute material if they have been lost. Mr. Cluver stated that any replacement cladding and capitals should visually match the historic terra cotta. He suggested that the bases of the piers should be granite, even if the material above is a substitute for terra cotta. Mr. Schultz agreed to use granite at the bases.

Ms. Gutterman asked how the awnings would attach to the storefronts. She asked if they would attach to the steel structure. Mr. Rockafellow explained that the building has a pre-cast concrete structure, not a steel structure. He stated that the awnings would attach to the structure at the insides of the piers and at the transom bars. Ms. Gutterman asked why the canopies on Ludlow looked different than those on 11th Street. Mr. Schultz observed that she was confusing the window mullions for canopy divisions. The canopies on Ludlow and 11th will be the same. Mr. McCoubrey opined that the transom bars were too wide. He suggested relocating the awnings up slightly to hide the transom bars. Mr. Schultz agreed to adjust the design in that regard. Mr. Cluver asked about the transoms. Mr. McCoubrey suggested aligning the transom muntins with the window divisions above. Mr. Schultz stated that the new transoms were based on the one surviving historic transom, but he offered to consider Mr. McCoubrey's request.

Mr. Cluver asked about the panels above the storefronts on Ludlow Street. Mr. Rockafellow replied that the panels exist and will be left in place. Mr. Cluver asked about the historic doors that will be installed on the exterior in the southernmost bay. Mr. Rockafellow reported that they are metal. Mr. Cluver suggesting using the proposed storefront system in the southernmost bay rather than installing the historic doors because there is no proof that these historic doors are the appropriate doors for that opening. Mr. Schultz replied that the historic photographs show doors like the ones they are proposing to move. Mr. Cluver responded that they should not guess about the doors, but should install the new storefront system in that opening. Mr. Schultz agreed to do so.

Ms. Gutterman contended that the Committee should have been provided with sightline studies showing that the terrace cannot be seen from the public rights-of-way. Mr. Schultz replied that sightline studies are unnecessary because the terrace is set back significantly behind the parapets. He claimed that it would not be visible to the public. Mr. McCoubrey agreed. Ms. Gutterman asked why most of the railing was formed with planters, but on small section was a plain railing. Mr. Schultz explained that that section is a gate used for accessing the roof.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that his organization nominated this building. He stated that his organization is “really excited” because “this is probably the best-case scenario for the reuse of this building.” He acknowledged that there are still many details for the staff to consider, for example, the windows. He stated that the industrial character of the windows at the side and rear should be retained. He said that the material used to reclad the storefront piers, if necessary, should harmonize with the terra cotta above. It should have a sheen to look more like terra cotta. He asked if the developers were seeking federal preservation tax credits. Mr. Connors stated that they were likely not seeking such credits.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the new storefront system is installed in the southernmost bay instead of the historic interior doors, a dark granite is installed at the bases of the storefront piers, and the transom divisions follow those of the windows above, with the staff to review details including storefront, window, canopy, awning, and replacement cladding details such as color, sheen, finish, profile, and attachment as well as brick and terra cotta cleaning, repair, and replacement specifications and samples, pursuant to Standards 6, 7, 9, and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 1627 WALLACE ST
Project: Construct roof decks; alter window and door openings at side
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Yuval Ben-Zeev, Cedar Apartments LLC
Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects
History: 1859
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000
Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct two roof decks at the rear of the property, and modify several window and door openings on the north and west (rear and side) façades to accommodate interior alterations and to allow for access to the proposed roof decks. The roof decks will be visible from N. 17th Street across several rear yards, as will a few of the window and door opening modifications.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Ian Toner represented the application.

Mr. Toner stated that 1627 Wallace Street is the third property in from the corner of N. 17th Street. Ms. Gutterman noted that the cover letter mentions patching of stucco. Mr. Toner responded that the interior is being reconfigured so that bathrooms and kitchens are along the exterior wall. The windows are quite low on that west side, resulting in the need to raise several of those window sills to accommodate the bathrooms and kitchens. They will infill where needed with stucco, repainting all of the stucco so that the wall is one color. The windows on the rear of the ell that will be cut down to doors will retain their current widths. The proposed decks will not

create an overhang or be supported from below like those at 1625 Wallace Street, and the roofs will act as the deck floors.

Mr. Cluver noted that there is visibility of the decks and a few of the window modifications from N. 17th Street, but opined that the changes will have minor visual impacts, and will be an improvement over the rear at 1625 Wallace Street. He elaborated that the west façade has a nice rhythm to the fenestration, but it is a narrow area, resulting in minimal visual impact. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he is not bothered by the visibility because it is set back from N. 17th Street.

Mr. Cluver asked about the material of the new windows. Mr. Toner responded that the existing windows on the side and rear are vinyl, and he is looking for guidance as to what the new windows should be, noting that only a few of the windows are being replaced. He commented that the previous owner had installed the vinyl windows and went through a legalization process through the Board of License & Inspection Review. Ms. Broadbent confirmed that the previous owner did apply to legalize the vinyl windows on the side and rear façades, but the current legal status of the vinyl windows is unknown. Mr. Toner asked if they should use similar style vinyl replacement windows, or if they should upgrade to wood windows, despite that the majority of the windows are not being replaced and will remain vinyl. Mr. McCoubrey responded that side and rear non-visible windows can be vinyl, but highly visible windows should be wood.

Mr. Cluver opened the floor to public comment. There was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, including the vinyl replacement windows on the secondary façades, provided the existing vinyl windows were legalized through the Board of License & Inspection Review, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 4258-64 MAIN ST
Project: Alter storefront; install awnings and banner sign
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: SJ Barbeque LLC
Applicant: Herb Schultz, Polatnick Zacharjasz Architects
History: 1850; Blantyre Mills
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Manayunk Historic District, Contributing, 12/14/1983
Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter a storefront and add signage to a building located within the Main Street Manayunk Historic District. The existing storefront has previously been altered. The proposed storefront alterations include the application of painted wood paneling over the existing stucco at the first floor, new doors and a NanaWall system within existing openings, installation of a banner sign at the second and third floors, and installation of four awnings that extend six feet at the first floor to shelter a sidewalk seating area.

Please note that, since the time of the Architectural Committee meeting, the applicant has revised the drawings to reflect comments from the Committee members. These revisions include a change in width and location of the awnings to better relate to the window openings

above, and the change from applied wood paneling over stucco to only painting of stucco at the first floor.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the awnings, banner sign and NanaWall system; denial of the wood paneling, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Herb Schultz and Michael Skolnick represented the application.

Ms. Pentz asked about the material under the stucco. Mr. Schultz responded that it is brick. Ms. Pentz directed him to a photograph from 1982 that shows rubble stone under stucco.

Mr. Schultz explained that there are two sets of existing double doors on the first floor, and that they are proposing to remove the center post at one door opening. The overall masonry opening would remain the same in height and width.

Mr. Schultz stated that the buildings on either side of the subject property have a version of a wood paneled system at the first floor, and it is the desire of the property owner to continue that horizontal line visually and to separate the restaurant on the first floor from the residential use of the upper floors. Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicants have an alternative proposal to the wood paneling. Mr. Skolnick responded that they may propose to retain the stucco and use wood trim to create panels, giving a similar appearance to that of the adjacent restaurant. He explained that the goal is to unify the ground floor and make it clearer as to where the entrance is located. Mr. Baron commented that the staff is not in favor of wood paneling because this is a mill building, and the paneling gives the appearance that there was a commercial storefront, which changes the character of the building. Mr. Schultz asked if the Committee would be amenable to any other treatment at the ground floor that would assist with keeping a consistent appearance across the two buildings. Mr. Cluver responded that the Historical Commission does not have jurisdiction over paint color, so that is an option to explore. Mr. Baron clarified that the Historical Commission does exercise jurisdiction of paint on masonry, including stucco, but not on trim. Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Baron if the Historical Commission would approve painting the stucco black. Mr. Baron responded that he cannot predict how the Commission would vote. Mr. Cluver summarized that the project will be stronger historically if the stucco is not painted to differentiate the ground floor from the upper floors. Ms. Gutterman added that no applied element should be used on the stucco.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned whether the proposed awnings can be used more effectively to unify the ground floor, instead of having multiple smaller awnings. Ms. Broadbent explained that the staff had encouraged the applicants to use multiple smaller awnings over the multiple door openings in order to keep the awnings within the masonry openings. Mr. Schultz confirmed that their original idea was to have two long awnings that spanned the ground floor. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the awnings should align with the pairs of windows above, so that the awnings will act as the visual separation between the ground floor restaurant and the residential units above. Mr. Cluver voiced his approval for this alternative. He explained that the awnings would not have to stay within the masonry openings, and can extend wider onto the piers. Mr. McCoubrey opined that the proposed wood paneling gave the appearance of a boarded-up storefront, and the building is large enough to warrant the installation of awnings that relate to the upper stories instead of just the storefront. Mr. Cluver suggested that the applicants revise the drawings for review by the Historical Commission to reflect the comments regarding the

awning placement, and to also provide an existing elevation placed above the proposed elevation.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested the use of a more minimal support system for the proposed banner sign. Ms. Pentz opined that the banner sign support system is acceptable.

Mr. Cluver opened the floor to public comment. There was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the banner sign and NanaWall system; approval of the awnings, provided they relate to the windows above, with the staff to review details; and denial of the wood paneling, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

ADDRESS: 150, 152, AND 154 VINE ST
Project: Construct three five-story townhouses on vacant lots
Review Requested: Review and Comment
Owner: Essie Ancrum
Applicant: Rotciver Lebron, Harman Deutsch
History: vacant lots
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct three five-story, single-family residences on a currently vacant lot. The buildings would be composed of grey brick with dark grey metal, green metal, and translucent panels, green metal bay windows, and aluminum casement windows. The Vine Street elevation of the two eastern properties would include slightly recessed entries with contemporary doors and cast stone steps, and would feature contemporary roll-up garage doors. The fifth floor of the three townhomes would be set back five feet from the Vine Street façade, and balconies would be located on the 4th floor roofs. The corner townhouse would have a punched opening with a tripartite casement window facing Vine Street, and would be accessed through a contemporary entrance with cast stone steps and a garage door on 2nd Street. The rear of the properties would be composed green metal panels for the first several feet, with light grey stucco for the remainder of the façade. It would feature roll-up garage doors for the two eastern properties, a continuous wood screened deck along the second floor, and aluminum-clad sliding patio doors with dark grey powder coated metal Juliet balconies on the 3rd and 5th floors, and small horizontal fixed aluminum-clad windows on the 4th floor.

STAFF COMMENT: The staff comments that the proposed construction does not relate to the Old City Historic District in scale, massing, rhythm, proportions, color, or materials.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Rustin Ohler and Mark Wallace represented the application.

Mr. Ohler described the context of the proposed new construction, noting that it would be another typology along a variegated block. Mr. Ohler noted that they were attempting to relate to the adjacent buildings through the window heights, and Mr. Cluver responded that none of the levels seem to relate to the adjacent buildings.

Mr. Cluver commented that the proposed new construction is not a good addition to the historic district.

Ms. Gutterman questioned why the garage doors could not open to the rear, and Mr. Ohler responded that the rear is a narrow yard that would not permit vehicular access. Ms. DiPasquale questioned the purpose of the garage door openings at the rear of the properties, and Mr. Ohler responded that the purpose was to create lower level flex space.

Mr. Ohler acknowledged that these would be contemporary buildings, but asserted that that is the point.

Mr. Cluver opened the floor to public comment. A neighbor, Peter Burwasser, commented that the garage access on N. 2nd Street would be problematic because N. 2nd Street is very busy. Mr. Cluver asked if the project had received zoning approval, and Mr. Ohler responded that it had. Mr. Burwasser commented that the decks on the second floor seem odd.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that the large translucent windows on the Vine Street façade should have a mullion/muntin pattern rather than being large, unbroken planes. Mr. Ohler responded that they could look into that option.

Mr. McCoubrey opined that the green metal seemed inappropriate. He continued to note that the 2nd Street elevation could benefit from larger, punched openings rather than the narrow strips of windows currently presented.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee concurred with the staff comment that the proposed construction does not relate to the Old City Historic District in scale, massing, rhythm, proportions, color, or materials, adding that the garage fronts on Vine and N. 2nd Streets are inconsistent with the historic district, that the translucent windows on the Vine Street elevation should include a mullion/muntin system, and that the N. 2nd Street windows should be expanded.

ADDRESS: 508-32 WALNUT ST
Project: Install ADA entrance
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: FRUB Penn LLC c/o Rubenstein Partners
Applicant: Marcin Szkotak, L2 Partridge, LLC
History: Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company Building; 530, Edgar Seeler 1914; 520, Ernest J. Matthewson, 1930; 508, Mitchell/Giurgola Associates, 1971
Individual Designation: 9/25/1962
District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Significant, 3/10/1999
Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a portion of the existing stone base below a window opening and install double entrance doors in the front façade to allow for ADA access to the original Penn Mutual Building at 6th and Walnut Streets. A section of the base of the building would be removed for a new door opening and dark bronze doors would be installed under an existing window to the east of the main entrance to the building. The window above the new

door would remain. The Historical Commission recently approved a similar ADA entranceway for the PSFS Building at 200 W. Washington Square, a.k.a. 700 Walnut Street, but only after the applicant demonstrated that the proposed location was the only feasible location for ADA access.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, unless the applicant demonstrates that the proposed location is the only feasible location for ADA access, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Accessibility Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Devon Cheshire and architect Marcin Szkotak represented the application.

Mr. Szkotak provided a ground floor plan. He explained that the property is made up of three buildings, known as 510, 520, and 530 Walnut Street. He stated that this proposal is for the 530 building. He explained that the floor level for 530 is above the street level and can only be accessed by stairs. He stated that 510 is at grade level, but is three quarters of the way down the block and one has to go up and down an elevator to get to the main floor of 530. He stated that there is an existing accessible entrance that is two buildings away and one has to transverse back and forth through the buildings to get to it.

Mr. Szkotak stated that the building owner is looking to lease a unit that contains space on the basement level, main level, and mezzanine level to a museum tenant. He explained that one of the potential tenant's main priorities is to have a direct accessible entrance. He stated that they looked into a few options to see what would make a feasible accessible entrance. He distributed photographs showing that this location is the best location for the new accessible entrance. Mr. McCoubrey asked when the entrance would be open. Mr. Szkotak stated that it would be open when the tenant's operation is open. Mr. McCoubrey asked if this entrance was the main entrance for the one tenant. Mr. Szkotak affirmed. Mr. Cheshire stated that the there would also be access to the common space of the building from this space.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Committee would like to see the access to the building planned holistically, making the building as accessible as possible. The Committee would like to avoid future applications for individual accessible entrances for each tenant. Mr. Cheshire stated that, as a landlord, he struggles with these issues all the time. He claimed that this solution could serve the whole building, although they still have not worked all the details with the tenant.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the top of the stone base remain between the new doors and the existing window, that the existing profile continue across the opening, to give more of an indication of what the base looked like before the door cut. Mr. Szkotak stated that there is enough height to do that. He stated that the top of the base might have to be removed to put in some support structure, but it could be reinstalled. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that it be a straight cut in the stone and not attempt to create a return or architectural detail around the door. He stated that it should be a straight simple cut and it should be aligned with the window opening above. Mr. Szkotak confirmed that those changes to the design could be incorporated.

Mr. McCoubrey opined that this is a great place for an accessible entrance, but it should serve the broader building and not one tenant only.

Lorna Katz-Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that the applicant has not presented this proposal to the Association and invited the applicant to attend the Association's next meeting. She stated that she appreciated the Committee's point of view on the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the dado cap remains between the window and the door, the width of the entrance aligns with the window opening above, and the return opening on the dado base is not articulated but is a simple cut, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Accessibility Guideline.

ADDRESS: 508-32 WALNUT ST
Project: Install glass canopy
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: FRUB Penn LLC
Applicant: Joseph Winchester, The Sullivan Company
History: Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company Building; 530, Edgar Seeler 1914; 520, Ernest J. Matthewson, 1930; 508, Mitchell/Giurgola Associates, 1971
Individual Designation: 9/25/1962
District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Significant, 3/10/1999
Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a non-historic glass and metal canopy at the main entrance to the Mitchell/Giurgola designed Penn Mutual tower at 510 Walnut and install a metal canopy in its place. The main entrance has been significantly altered from the original Mitchell/Giurgola design. The new canopy will be comprised of two steel beams, supported by the two lower existing support brackets and an existing metal wrapped beam, with t-shaped steel purlins, and aluminum panels supported by steel spider connections. The proposed steel framing of the canopy reflects the architecture of the Independence Visitor Center and the Liberty Bell Museum to the north of Independence Hall.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Devon Cheshire and architect Chris Tantillo represented the application.

Mr. Tantillo stated that they are hoping to open up the views from the lobby and that the new canopy would be light and unobtrusive.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there had been an original canopy designed by Mitchell/Giurgola. Ms. Coté stated that the building originally had an open vestibule at this doorway, but it was later infilled. Mr. Tantillo stated that the original configuration can be seen in the photographs in the packet that they provided.

Mr. Cluver stated that the current canopy was installed in 1996 and historic designation came afterward, in 1999. Mr. Cluver asked for an explanation on the detailing of the design that is based on something that is a block and a half away. Mr. Tantillo stated that they attempted to keep the design clean and work with the existing structure. He explained that the existing structure has three support brackets and the new canopy would use the lower two brackets; a

new beam would be installed. He stated that the detailing was chosen because many pedestrians are familiar with the architecture of the area and this is an allusion to that architecture. He opined that something with more detailing and rhythm is better than something more monolithic.

Mr. Cluver stated that he had difficulty understanding the existing conditions. Mr. Tantillo described the existing conditions to the Committee, occasionally pointing to photographs.

Mr. Cluver stated the he understood the allusion to the Independence Visitor Center, but felt that the design was out of character with the Mitchell/Giurgola building. He stated that there should be some distinction between the original building and the new canopy; this design feels somewhat out of place. He suggested that it be simplified somewhat. He stated that he is not sure of the necessity of the projecting elements. Mr. Tantillo stated that it helps create lightness at the edge. He stated that some of the projections could be eliminated, but the elimination might leave the canopy out of proportion.

Ms. Gutterman asked why this canopy is proposed to extend further out than the existing canopy. Mr. Tantillo stated that it creates a lighter edge and draws attention away from the heavier beam.

Mr. Cluver asked about lighting. Mr. Tantillo stated they propose LED lights concealed behind the support beams.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the canopy should not wrap around the Egyptian Revival façade. Mr. Tantillo stated that setting the canopy panels back will make the support beam more visible. He stated that the location of the beam is determined by the use of the existing support bracket. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the panel stop short of the Egyptian Revival façade. Mr. Tantillo stated that that could be done. Mr. Cluver stated that the dimension of that panel should be replicated on the other end to be symmetrical.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the width of the two outer panels is reduced, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 528 AND 530 SPRUCE ST
Project: Construct addition with roof deck on garage; remove connector
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Theodore Schiffman and Manja Lyssy
Applicant: James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co.
History: 1795; Aaron Clarke, house carpenter
Individual Designation: 4/30/1957
District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to subdivide two existing three-story rowhouses and to construct an additional floor and roof deck on top of an existing one-story, non-historic garage. The existing one-story garage associated with 528 Spruce Street would be subdivided to become the garage and new in-law suite for 530 Spruce Street. The new addition would be clad

in brick, and would include a pent-eave over the existing garage door, six-over-six windows and a pair of French doors and Juliet balcony at the second floor, and false windows with Juliet balconies at the third floor to camouflage the roof deck behind. The roof deck on the new addition would include a small pilothouse, a covered area with skylights, and a trellis. The application also proposes to demolish a portion of an existing one-story connecting hallway at the rear of the garage.

The Commission approved a very similar faux façade with deck on a non-historic garage in the Rittenhouse area a few years ago. John Cluver of the Architectural Committee was the architect of that approved proposal.

Please note that, since the time of the Architectural Committee meeting, the applicant has revised the drawings to eliminate the pent roof over the garage and increase the height of the third floor punched opening sills, as well as shown the proposed façade in relation to the adjacent non-historic building at 537 Cypress Street, as requested by the Committee. The applicant has also removed the muntins from the proposed windows, making them one over one rather than six over six to give the façade a more modern appearance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect James Campbell and property owner Manja Lyssy represented the application.

Mr. Campbell described the context of the property and the work to be conducted.

Mr. Cluver noted that the proposed project would have the appearance of a three-story building, but in reality would be a two-story building with a roof deck and thin faux front. Mr. Campbell stated that their desire was to bring the brick parapet on the side of the building as high as possible without shading the deck of the adjacent property.

Mr. Cluver opined that typically the Committee does not like Juliet balconies, and that he thought the interaction between the front and side facades is odd when viewed obliquely. Mr. Campbell noted that this block of Cypress Street is a mix of one to four-story structures, some of which front the street, others of which are garages and decks for Delancey and Spruce Street properties. Their attempt with the proposed construction, he continued, was to step from the adjacent four-story building to the proposed three-story and the lower properties to the east.

Ms. Pentz asked whether any demolition was proposed other than for the connector, and Mr. Campbell responded that there would be no other demolition, but that the garage would have to be re-structured somewhat, and the garage door widened.

Ms. Gutterman asked how tall the proposed construction would be, and it was determined that the rendering depicted the proposed structure slightly lower in relation to the adjacent property than it would be in reality. Ms. Gutterman asked if the windows of the proposed construction would be lower than the windows of the neighboring property, and Mr. Campbell responded that they would not be much lower, if at all. Ms. Gutterman opined that it would look awkward if the proposed windows did not align with those of the adjacent building. Mr. McCoubrey interjected that the windows could be within range of those of the adjacent property, but need not align precisely. Windows on adjacent buildings often do not align exactly.

Mr. Campbell noted that they are currently going through the zoning process to subdivide the properties, which Department of Licenses & Inspections is calling a re-drawing of lot lines. They have not yet received zoning approval for the project. Mr. Campbell further noted that the presented drawings are slightly more conceptual, and that they would love to receive final approval and to work with staff on the details once the zoning process has been finalized.

Mr. Cluver noted that the application also proposed a pent roof over the garage. Mr. Campbell responded that they would like to be able to protect the garage doors. Ms. Gutterman asked why they needed to protect their garage door when other garage doors in the city are not protected. Mr. Campbell noted that they would like to reduce the appearance of a modern door and to have additional protection. Ms. Gutterman asked if they would be widening the door, and Mr. Campbell responded that they would be widening it by a few feet. Ms. Lyssy noted that the current garage door is difficult to pull in and out of.

Mr. Cluver commented that the window proportion of the faux third-floor windows seems lower than that of the second floor. The sill, he noted, appears to be at foot level compared to the second floor. The whole facade, he noted, would feel pushed down. He reiterated that he is not a fan of Juliet balconies, and suggested that the applicant eliminate the balconies at the third floor and bring the masonry to sill height and use railings to fill in to the required height. Mr. Campbell responded that he did not view the third-floor railings as balconies, but rather punched openings with railings. Mr. Cluver opined that the punched openings are not where typical punched window openings would be. Mr. Campbell noted that the sill of the proposed opening is raised slightly, with the railing extending to the required 42” height.

Mr. McCoubrey asked why the applicant wanted to extend the wall to the top of the third floor, rather than making it a two-story building with a deck on top. Mr. Campbell responded that they wanted to make the deck as inconspicuous as possible, and that per zoning code, if they did not extend the faux/parapet wall, they would be required to pull the deck back five feet from the façade, since Cypress Street is considered a primary street. Mr. McCoubrey commented that he was concerned that the proposed construction would look like someone took a nice old house and punched the windows out and did other things that would not be approved on a historic building. Mr. McCoubrey opined that he would rather see the proposed construction as a carriage house with a roof deck. Others disagreed.

Mr. Cluver opined that perhaps the applicant could consider creating a two-story house with a gable roof that would slope back and disguise the deck. Mr. Campbell responded that that would be problematic as well as it would greatly decrease the usable space on the deck. Mr. McCoubrey disagreed with Mr. Cluver, noting that he would not personally worry about creating a roof, but that there are numerous forms of parapet systems that could be employed. Mr. Cluver responded that parapet systems often feel top-heavy in the context of an area with many sloped roofs. Mr. McCoubrey again disagreed and replied that this is not an old building; that it is all new.

Mr. Baron noted that the garage is not historic or significant, and that the street has a variety of heights; the block is not a consistent row of similar houses, but is an alley block with various and sundry building types. He noted that the staff recommended approval because it deemed the design to be compatible with the block and the district. Ms. Gutterman commented that it is

important to understand how this building relates to the adjacent building and the buildings across the street, and how the punched openings would work.

Ms. Gutterman commented that she did not understand the pent roof over the garage, and that the façade appears busy and complicated. Others disagreed.

Mr. Cluver commented that his fundamental struggle is with the faux façade, which he opined is not consistent with the historic buildings in the district. He suggested that the applicant "call a spade a spade," and create a two-story building with a deck on top, because he believed the frontispiece would look odd. Ms. Lyssy noted that as, the owner, she is looking for sun protection and a sense of security with a full-height wall.

Mr. Cluver opened the floor to public comment. Lorna Katz Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association noted that the applicants presented to the Association and that they looked favorably on the added height of the faux third floor. The Association was primarily concerned with was the subdivision of the combined rowhouses back into two properties, rather than the aesthetics of the proposed construction.

Ms. Gutterman made of motion of denial as presented, owing to a lack of clarity and understanding of how the addition relates to the adjacent and neighboring buildings. She recommended that the applicant explore raising the sills of the third floor punched openings to a traditional window sill height, consider a one-story addition with roof deck, and remove the pent roof. Mr. Cluver seconded the motion, adding that he did not like the Juliet balcony on the second floor.

Ms. Pentz disagreed with the motion, commenting that she approved of the application as presented. She added that she did not disagree with the Committee's suggestions, but believed that the Committee should defer to the applicant's preferences when they did not raise preservation concerns.

Mr. Cluver asked for Ms. Pentz's thoughts on the structural stability of the faux wall at the third floor. Ms. Pentz responded that it appeared completely viable from a structural standpoint.

Mr. Baron objected to the motion, noting that the Committee could achieve the same goals by recommended approval with modifications, rather than denial. He stated that such a recommendation would allow the applicant to move forward in a timely manner and would eliminate unnecessary administrative tasks for the staff, which would have to restart the process for this project. Mr. Baron noted that, given the lack of significance of the garage and the variety of buildings on the street, sending this project back to the starting line seemed excessive.

Ms. Gutterman responded that she thought that, even if the Committee recommended denial, the applicant could still make these changes and present them to the Commission in January and that the process would not be held up. Ms. DiPasquale replied that, in that situation, a motion of "approval, provided that…" would be beneficial. Mr. Baron noted that, if the recommendation is for denial, it implies that the project should be completely redesigned and the review process restarted.

Mr. Cluver responded that his concern with a recommendation of approval with modifications is that it requires the Committee to understand what modifications they feel would be appropriate.

Mr. Cluver noted that the Committee does not really know what will make sense in this situation. He opined that the current proposal did not "feel" right to him, and that he did not know if the modifications the Committee suggested would feel right either. He further noted that there is not much precedent for this type of design on which to fall back. He noted that he understood that it is a secondary elevation. Ms. Gutterman disagreed, stating that Cypress is a primary elevation, and should not be treated as an alley. Mr. Campbell noted that they are not treating the Cypress elevation as an alley, and that the owners would like a more distinguished design.

Ms. Gutterman and Messrs. Cluver and McCoubrey voted in favor of the motion of denial. Ms. Pentz dissented.

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

ADDRESS: 626 S FRONT ST
Project: Rehabilitate building
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Vicki Angelos
Applicant: Stephen Maffei, Abitare Design Studio, LLC
History: 1760; Old Philadelphia Tavern
Individual Designation: 6/24/1958
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the partial restoration of this house. The house, constructed about 1760, is one of the finest early Georgian mansions of the city. Unfortunately, over the years, the house has been altered several times. A four-inch thick brick veneer, a corner entrance, and window bays were added at the first floor when it was converted to a restaurant. The rear ell was enlarged, bringing the first floor out toward the street. A garage was added and then altered several times. The Commission has reviewed several proposals for the property over the years, but none have been undertaken and the property has sat vacant.

The current application proposes returning the building to residential use. A circa 1910 photograph will be used as evidence for the partial restoration. The application proposes removing the added bays and restoring the window openings, side doorway, and frontispiece.

When the mason began an exploratory removal of some of the brick veneer, he found that it had been tied into the original wall. He feared that removing more veneer would result in structural instability. The evidence of potential instability is somewhat inconclusive because he exposed a rebuilt area of wall around an air conditioner, which may or may not represent the conditions of the walls as a whole. For this reason, the architect is proposing two alternatives. If feasible, the veneer would be removed and the historic wall restored. However, if the removal is found to be infeasible, the veneer would be left in place and the correct windows and frontispiece would be installed in a plane four inches proud of the original wall.

The application proposes replacing the windows and reconstructing the side cornice. The details in the current drawings are incorrect, but can be corrected with the staff's assistance. On the front façade, a casement window is proposed in place of a double-hung sash for a code

compliant exit. Two dormers are proposed in the gambrel roof for light and views. The gambrel roof of this early, important building is a character-defining feature; the proposed dormer on the front of the gambrel does not satisfy preservation standards. The applicant claims that window alterations are necessary to achieve code-compliant egress windows, but a variance would likely be granted from those requirements for this very significant, very old building, especially in light of the fact that a sprinkler system is being installed.

The application proposes reconstructing the walls at the rear ell, rear addition, and garage. It also proposes adding a sliding door in the west wall of the rear ell and a deck with an elaborate railing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of all elements except the front dormer, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Steven Maffei and Logan Dry represented the application.

Mr. Baron read the staff recommendation but explained that the applicant had revised the drawings to show more accurate details for the windows, shutters and pilasters at the door on Bainbridge Street. The architect has shown two options for working with the first-floor brick façade. Option One proposes to retain the existing brick veneer and insert matching brick at the corner and along the jambs of the windows. Option Two proposes to remove the mid twentieth-century veneer and restore the eighteenth-century brick façade in its original plane, supplemented by salvaged matching brick to rebuild damaged areas.

Regarding the four-inch brick veneer at the first floor wall of the main house, the Committee members agreed that the ideal situation would be Option Two. The walls of the garage and first-floor addition to the rear ell will be rebuilt using a second modern brick that attempts to match the original brick. It was understood that this new brick will be an imperfect match, which may help to distinguish it from the eighteenth-century walls. Mr. Maffei noted his concern regarding the condition of the brick behind the veneer. He stated that the veneer appears to key into the original wall, and asked if they may install a new brick veneer which better matches the historic brick but sits proud of the original wall. Ms. Gutterman responded that this may be acceptable. She opined that Option One as proposed may be impractical because by the time the window openings were moved and the corner doorway infilled, more than 50% of the existing mid-century brick would have to be replaced.

All of the Committee members dismissed the idea of patching the existing veneer brick. Instead, Ms. Gutterman favored the idea of constructing a new veneer in place of the existing one which would try to better match the historic brick, but sit four inches proud of the historic wall. Ms. Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey were not in favor of that idea. They thought that it was highly unlikely that the removal of the modern brick would destabilize the wall. Mr. Maffei said that the existing first floor wall is 16 inches wide. Ms. Pentz opined that the removal of the four-inch veneer would not make the original wall unsound since it would still leave a twelve-inch-thick original wall. She did not favor adding a four-inch brick veneer in any circumstance. She doubted that the veneer would have a foundation to give it stability.

All the Committee members agreed that the building should be made more stable by repairing the interior structure first and then repairing the exterior walls section by section, rather than removing the veneer wholesale.

The Committee next focused on an egress window for the third floor. Mr. Maffei proposed a casement window to look like a double hung window in the central opening of the Front Street façade. He said that this window could have a wider horizontal mullion to look like a meeting rail. Mr. Baron expressed a concern about the different planes of a double-hung window versus the single plane of a casement. Committee members discussed using a hopper or awning window on the bottom with a fixed window above to better replicate the appearance of a double-hung window. Mr. Maffei said that this might not supply the required square footage for egress. The Committee members also debated whether the casement window would not be better on the side. Ultimately it was agreed that the central front window was the best location.

The Committee members next addressed the proposed front dormer. Ms. Gutterman noted that the dormer appeared too large. Mr. Cluver said that there were two questions to be addressed: the first would ask whether a dormer should be added at all, and the second would address the design of the proposed dormer.

Mr. Maffei stated that the front dormer is extremely important to his client. He noted that it would provide additional headroom in a small space, a view to the river, and an access route in case of fire. He said he understood that corner buildings did not traditionally have dormers because they have side windows. Mr. Baron noted that the gambrel roof is a character defining feature of this important building. Although the proposed rear dormer would also be visible, he continued, the staff thought that it would be a compromise that would allow the most important parts of the facade to remain intact while allowing for a design to provide egress and light.

The Committee members asked about using the side windows for egress, and Mr. Maffei responded that they are not large enough. Asked about the rear dormer, Mr. Maffei noted that it is not in the bedroom. The Committee asked whether it would be possible to adjust the configuration of the top floor to make it into a bedroom suite that would extend to the rear dormer. Mr. Maffei responded that the floor plan was not negotiable. He noted that the owner's daughter would be living in the bedroom and that she needed privacy that he believed could not be achieved with a suite. He noted that the stair fixed the division of rooms because of the placement of structural elements surrounding the stair. Mr. Cluver said that he understood the potential need for the dormer to accommodate the new use but noted that the Standards do not allow for that option. This is a very significant, very old building. He noted that the Commission may wish to grant relief in this area. Other Committee members asked if a glazed roof hatch could be used instead to create light and access without creating a false historical appearance. Mr. Maffei said that he would research this option. He noted that he would be willing to give up the rear dormer in favor of the front dormer.

Mr. Maffei asked if he would need to restore the front door or add back the missing cornice if the dormer was not approved. The Committee members said that he is not obligated to restore the cornice and that he only has to restore the door on Front Street if he is rebuilding that corner. He noted that he would need to rebuild the corner to gain that interior space. The Committee members agreed that the door is part of that wall restoration because it is part of the circa 1910 picture that shows the corner intact. It was noted that the building will be sprinklered.

Mr. Cluver suggested venting for the cornice. It was agreed that the architect had several options and could work with the staff on a solution.

Mr. Baron asked the Committee members to address other elements of the design such as the rebuilding of the garage, the addition to the rear ell, the deck, the rebuilt west wall of the ell, and the sliding door in that wall. The Committee members unanimously supported those alterations except for the spheres located atop the deck railing. They asked that the spheres be removed, noting that the caps on top of the deck piers could be flat or pyramidal.

Mr. Cluver asked for public comment, of which there was none.

The Committee discussed at length ways to provide an option to the applicant if the Option Two restoration of the wall proved infeasible for reasons including structure and cost. There was no agreement on whether or how to do this. Mr. Baron noted that the staff typically reviews design details, but that the Commission should make decisions when financial considerations are involved.

The Committee decided to break the vote into pieces, addressing all the elements except the first floor veneer wall first, and then the wall.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On the first matter, the Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of Option Two to restore the façade in its original plane, except denial of the spheres on the deck railing, the light fixtures at the side door, and the additional dormers, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

On a second matter, the Committee split 2 to 2 to recommend recladding the first floor of the main house with a modern but matching brick in a plane four inches proud of the historic eighteenth century brickwork, if the restoration/reconstruction of the historic wall proved structurally infeasible.

The Committee members, and in particular Ms. Pentz, agreed to aid the staff in addressing this issue with a site visit.

Mr. Maffei asked that it be recorded that the recommendation does not provide him with an option for egress from the top floor.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

DRAFT

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

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

Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.

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

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

Accessibility Guideline, Not Recommended: Altering, damaging, or destroying character-defining features in attempting to comply with accessibility requirements.

Accessibility Guideline, Not Recommended: Making access modifications that do not provide a reasonable balance between independent, safe access and preservation of historic features.

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.

DRAFT