

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

**TUESDAY, 23 JUNE 2015  
ROOM 578, CITY HALL  
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

**PRESENT**

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair  
Rudy D'Alessandro  
Nan Gutterman, FAIA  
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C  
Suzanne Pentz  
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

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

**ALSO PRESENT**

Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Casey Sawron  
Dan Sawron  
Lawrence Weintraub  
Giacomo Apadula  
Julie Motl  
David Borgenicht  
Janet Kalter  
Joe Schiavo  
David Scheuermann  
Chad Jenofsky  
Patti Riley  
Rich Thom, Tucker Realty  
Diane Tucker, Tucker Realty  
Rob Kettell  
Jacob Adelman, Inquirer  
Tim Shaaban, Urban Space  
F. Al-Nakib, F.A.N. Gallery  
Gregory Diehl, Old City District  
John Edwards, Varenhorst  
Stephen Varenhorst, Varenhorst  
Hasina Choudary, Varenhorst  
Andrew Phillips, Christ Church  
Eric Robbins  
Tony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing  
Robert Powers, Powers & Co.  
Kevin McMahan, Powers & Co.  
Andrew Reiman, J&L Designs  
Patti Littley, J&L Designs  
Dimitri Bousolis

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 JUNE 2015  
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Philip Chen, Ann Beha Architects  
Mark Cartella, Aegis Property Group  
Tom Chapman, Esq, Blank Rome  
Daryl Carrington, JDavis Architects  
Brian Wentz, Keast & Hood  
Jim Campbell, South Street West Business Association  
Marcus Ferreira, South Street West Business Association  
Deborah Seitz, JDavis Architects  
Jeff Pastva, JDavis Architects  
Lauren Vidas, South of South Street Neighborhood Association  
Deena Kobell  
Cindy Park  
C.W. Lewis  
Michael Jones  
Shahied Dawan, Universal Companies  
Jeff Kurtz, Dranoff Properties

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

**ADDRESS: 219 CARPENTER ST**

Project: Construct third-floor rear addition and roof deck on rear ell  
Review Requested: Final Approval  
Owner: Dan & Casey Sawron  
Applicant: Lawrence Weintraub, Lawrence Weintraub AIA  
History: 1845  
Individual Designation: 5/31/1966  
District Designation: None  
Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to rehabilitate the three-story brick rowhouse at 219 Carpenter Street, which backs up to Hall Street. New windows and doors are proposed for all openings. The existing interior staircase and pilot house will be demolished, and a new code-compliant stair leading to a new third-story rear addition will be constructed. The addition will cover a large portion of the rear slope of the roof. A roof deck is proposed for the top of the existing rear ell.

This applicant came before the Architectural Committee in March 2015 to request demolition of nine feet of the rear ell, a rear gate for parking in the rear yard, a roof deck on the rear ell, and rehabilitation of the front façade. The Committee recommended denial, owing to incompleteness, and the application was withdrawn before review by the Historical Commission. Since that time, the applicant has hired an architect and the scope of work has been revised to the current application. The Committee responded favorably to a deck on top of the rear ell during the review in March.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the new construction is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Lawrence Weintraub and property owners Dan and Casey Sawron represented the application.

Mr. Weintraub emphasized that the proposed addition would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. He explained that the house has suffered from years of deferred maintenance, and the new owners are starting a rehabilitation that will include a new code-compliant stair.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there is a way to accomplish the roof access without the overbuild onto the rear roof. She stated that she is concerned about placing weight onto the original roof. Mr. Weintraub responded that the property next door at 221 Carpenter Street similarly reconstructed its rear ell, but rather than overbuild on the rear roof, there is a structure that pops up. Mr. Weintraub explained that he is concerned that the neighbor's design creates a gully between the wall of the pop-up and the rear slope of the main roof that could encourage leaks. Ms. Gutterman responded that a pop-up type design would work if flashed correctly. She asked why the pilot house cannot slope. Mr. Weintraub responded that the current pilot house has a reverse slope pop-up, with a six-foot high door that is not code-compliant. Ms. Gutterman commented that she does not like the proposed overbuild of the original roof. Mr. Weintraub stated that there is an existing pilot house accessing the rear ell roof, and he would like to replace it with a new code-compliant pilot house. He stated that there is no way to access the proposed deck without one. Ms. Hawkins responded that there are many reconfigurations from which Mr. Weintraub can choose that do not require the overbuild. She continued that Mr. Weintraub has chosen to do a single slope flat roof that extends from front to rear, but if it were to slope into the side yard, it would still offer the height needed, and would reduce weight on the roof, since Mr. Weintraub had mentioned structural problems associated with the existing stair. Mr. Weintraub responded that the pilot house is in poor condition, but the main roof is actually structurally sound and in very good condition. He emphasized that an overbuild of the rear slope of the main roof would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and is a low-maintenance solution. Ms. Gutterman responded that it may be inconspicuous, but it is also an impact on a historic property, and it concerns her.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the new interior space above the rear roof slope that would be created with the overbuild. Mr. Weintraub responded that he is not trying to gain head height in the attic, but intends to use the space for duct work or air conditioning equipment. The ceiling of the master bedroom will be reframed completely, so the additional weight will not present a problem. He asked for suggestions regarding a roof slope of the pilot house. Ms. Hawkins responded that he could use a cricket, or other devices to solve the problem. Mr. Weintraub asked for clarification, but was told that he was being argumentative. Mr. Weintraub responded that he was simply trying to explain the reasoning behind his design. Mr. McCoubrey opined that the addition should not be placed on the rear slope of the main house. Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the proposed design is not appropriate. Mr. Weintraub asked for clarification as to how roof deck access can be achieved with a redesign. Ms. Hawkins stated that it is not the role of the Committee to provide architectural design assistance; it is the role of the Committee to provide comments on the proposed design. Mr. Weintraub commented that a pilot house is necessary for roof access, and the new pilot house is proposed to be just two-and-a-half feet taller than the existing pilot house. Ms. Hawkins responded that no one has suggested that there should not be a pilot house, but there is concern about building onto the structure of the existing roof. She asked the Committee for other concerns. There were none.

Ms. Hawkins asked for public comment, of which there was none.

Mr. Weintraub asked if he can change the design to reflect what was built at 221 Carpenter Street. Ms. Gutterman responded that she does not have a concern with the proposed height or the pilot house itself, but she does have a concern with the proposed overbuild, and the structure over the rear roof. She did not offer a comment as to a sloped versus flat roof of the pilot house. Ms. Hawkins noted that crickets would be acceptable as part of the redesign. The Committee members agreed that the proposal would be acceptable if the pilot house was added without building onto the main roof.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided there is no overbuild onto the rear roof structure of the original house, and the new construction is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ADDRESS: 1827 PORTER ST**

Project: Install parking pad and vehicular entrance at rear yard

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Giacomo Apadula

Applicant: Lawrence Weintraub, Lawrence Weintraub AIA

History: 1907

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to create a two-car concrete parking pad in the rear yard of this property located within the Girard Estate Historic District. The rear yard of the property faces Roseberry Street. The houses on the north side of Roseberry Street are outside the district and are not designated as historic.

The application proposes to create a curb cut on Roseberry Street and to remove the non-historic cement block wall to create an entrance to the parking pad. Brick piers would be constructed on either side of the new opening. A decorative brick and cast stone wall would divide the parking pad from the rear yard. A black metal fence would replace the existing cyclone fencing on the east and west sides of the rear yard.

Most of the houses along the north side of the 1700 and 1800-blocks of Porter Street in the Girard Estate Historic District have rear-yard parking pads accessed from Roseberry Street. Since the establishment of the historic district, the Historical Commission has approved three applications for rear parking at these houses. It denied one application proposing parking at the rear, but the parking would have been accessed from 18th Street, not Roseberry Street.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Lawrence Weintraub and property owner Giacomo Apadula represented the application.

Mr. Weintraub stated that the proposed design is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood, and will preserve some of the existing rear grass area. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if consideration was given to permeable pavers in the parking area, so that grass could grow through. Mr. Weintraub asked if such pavers were acceptable to the Streets Department. Mr.

D'Alessandro said he did not know. Mr. Apadula commented that he would prefer to use the pavers as proposed.

Ms. Gutterman asked why prompted the proposal to add the arch at the wall in the back yard, other than the desire for a decorative feature. Mr. Apadula responded that the desire is strictly decorative. Mr. Weintraub commented that the gate and wall unify the path out of the parking area and into the rear yard. Ms. Gutterman responded that she understands the gate and wall, but was questioning the arch. She stated that it is not her taste, but conceded that it fits with the neighborhood. Others commented that it would have no effect on historic resources and therefore should be allowed because it is the owner's preference.

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

**ADDRESS: 2416 PINE ST**

Project: Construct rear addition with pilot house and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: David Borgenicht

Applicant: Julie Motl, Julie Motl, Architect

History: 1840; 1910

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a rear addition with roof deck and pilot house on this three-story rowhouse located mid-block in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The rear slope of the main block would be removed. The rear of this property is not visible from a public right-of-way. The staff suggests that the pilot house roof be sloped to minimize potential visibility, and that a mockup be prepared to determine visibility of the pilot house and deck from Pine Street. This application also proposes a new front door, which the staff suggests should be a six-panel door rather than the panel configuration that is shown in the elevation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial of the front door as proposed; approval of the application with an appropriate front door, provided a mockup shows them to be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Julie Motl and property owner David Borgenicht represented the application.

Ms. Motl provided a sightline drawing for the Committee. Ms. Hawkins asked about sloping the roof of the pilot house to follow the slope of the stair. Ms. Motl responded that she is amenable to that change. Ms. Stein suggested that the slope should be steep at the front face of the pilot house.

Ms. Hawkins asked if any part of the trellis is visible from the public right-of-way. Ms. Motl responded that it would not be visible. Ms. Hawkins commented that there is potential for visibility from other locations and angles on Pine Street. Ms. Broadbent confirmed that the staff has not yet viewed a mockup to determine visibility.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the front door. Ms. Broadbent commented that Ms. Motl was not made aware of the staff's recommendation of denial of the proposed door until now. Ms. Motl responded that she is amenable to changing the paneling of the new door. She stated that the front façade will remain untouched except for the new door within the existing frame and transom, and the addition of star bolts.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the proposed gutter for the rear addition. Ms. Motl responded that it is a through-wall scupper into the gutter.

Ms. Hawkins asked for public comment, of which there was none.

Ms. Motl noted that she would adjust the proposal with regard to the pilot house and front door.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the front door as proposed; approval of the application with an appropriate front door, provided the pilot house roof is sloped and a mockup shows the reduced height of the pilot house is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and the trellis is not visible from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

**ADDRESS: 2106 LOCUST ST**

Project: Construct rear addition with pilot house and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: David & Mary Scheuermann

Applicant: Stephen Mileto, Qb3, LLC

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a rear addition with pilot house and roof deck on this three-story rowhouse located within the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District. The existing rear of this property is not original and is not visible from the public right-of-way. The pilot house and roof deck are proposed for the main block of the house, and a deck is also proposed for the second-story rear of the property. This rowhouse is taller than the building to its west, resulting in a potential increase of visibility from Locust Street. The applicant has proposed a deck railing built on an angle to minimize visibility.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial of the deck as proposed but approval of the application if the railing of the roof deck is pulled back to a point at or behind the chimney, with the staff to review details and a mockup to confirm that the new construction is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Stephen Mileto and owner David Scheuermann represented the application.

Mr. Mileto explained that they incorporated the staff's suggestions into the design, including sloping of the pilothouse, which he opined will not be visible. In response to a question, Mr. Mileto noted that the chimney next to the deck is not in use and the neighbor's chimney was already extended in the past with a tall b-vent.

The Committee members suggested that, perhaps, the front railing does not need to be 42 inches tall because there is not a long drop off beyond the railing. It may only need to be 36 inches tall to satisfy the building code, given the fact that there is no drop off. They also suggested that the railing should have vertical metal pickets rather than glass panels.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested adopting the staff recommendation with the addition that the railing should have vertical metal pickets instead of glass. Mr. Mileto indicated that he was amenable to the suggested revisions.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the deck as proposed, but approval of the application with a deck railing with vertical metal pickets set back to a point at or behind the chimney, with the staff to review details and a mockup to confirm that the new construction is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

**ADDRESS: 130 S FRONT ST**

Project: Construct 15 townhomes on site of parking lot

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Front Street Development

Applicant: Nichole Howell, JKR Partners, LLC

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct 15 townhouses on the site of a parking lot on S. Front Street in the Old City Historic District. The Commission's jurisdiction is limited to Review and Comment because the site is considered undeveloped. Several of the parcels making up this site were individually designated, but the Historical Commission rescinded those designations, most recently in 2005. The property is classified as non-contributing in the Old City Historic District.

While contemporary in style, the proposed townhouses are compatible with the historic district. Parking is accessed from a shared drive, alleviating the need for front-loaded garages. The context surrounding this site is varied. The site is located at the southeast corner of the historic district. All but one of the historic buildings on this block was demolished many years ago. The historic building at 149 S. Hancock Street still stands. The building to the south of this site, at Front and Walnut, is a non-historic mid-rise that is contemporary in style. To its south, across Walnut Street, stands a non-historic hotel, which is outside the historic district. To the north of this site, across Sansom Walk, is a large, non-historic parking garage. To its north, across Ionic Street, is another non-historic mid-rise that is contemporary in style. Across Front Street, to the east, is I-95.

**STAFF COMMENT:** The staff comments that the proposed new construction is compatible with the historic district, satisfying Standard 9.

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

Ms. Hawkins commented that she appreciated the fact that the application did not propose front-loaded garages and included a real limestone base. All of the parking is internal and accessed from a single drive off of Front Street. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the masonry bases were rather tall and could be reduced in height. Ms. Gutterman expressed concern that Sansom Street, which is a pedestrian walkway on this block, looked in the rendering like it was being reopened to traffic, although the architectural drawings with the application do not mention work to the street and there is no parking access to the complex from Sansom Street. She also had concerns about whether the development included the lots along Hancock Street because they are included within the apparent property line on the plot plan. Mr. Baron noted that the building permit and plans indicate no work to lots along Hancock Street.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment. Patricia Reilly, who lives in the historic district, asserted that the townhouses should have a more traditional design to fit better into the district. Richard Thom commented that he was gratified to see that this development was much more in scale with the district than a previous proposal for the site.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee commented that the proposed new construction is compatible with the historic district, satisfying Standard 9.

**ADDRESS: 218-26 ARCH ST**

Project: Construct ten-story mixed-use building

Review Requested: Review and Comment or Final

Owner: 218 Arch Street Associates, LP

Applicant: John Edwards, Varenhorst, PC

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a large mixed-use building on a parking lot on the south side of the 200-block of Arch Street. The property is classified as non-contributing in the Old City Historic District. The properties at 218 and 220 Arch Street were individually designated as historic, but those designations were rescinded in 2006. The property includes a section of Little Boy's Way or Court, a small, private street that runs between Arch and Cuthbert Streets. Little Boy's Way may be the only original, surviving cobblestone street in the city and is listed as significant in the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. Owing to Little Boy's Way, the status of this site, developed or undeveloped, and therefore the level of the Historical Commission's jurisdiction, plenary or review and comment, is uncertain and can only be determined by the Historical Commission itself. The Commission discussed the matter in 2006, while reviewing an application for this site, but tabled the application without concluded the matter. The application was later withdrawn and the question remains open. The Architectural Committee should formulate a recommendation that can be used for either scenario.

The application proposes a ten-story structure with a six-story brick color façade on Arch Street. The building steps up from six to 10 stories as it steps back from Arch Street. The building will include ground floor retail and a large entryway on Arch Street to interior parking. The building has industrial-style punched windows throughout the upper floors. Materials have not been noted on the drawings, but appear to be brick of various colors with limestone trim, as is suggested in the cover letter.

No information has been provided regarding any work to Little Boy's Way.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION OR COMMENT:** The staff recommends or comments that the proposed building is incompatible with the historic district in height, massing, and scale, pursuant to Standard 9, and the application is incomplete owing to a lack of information about materials and work to Little Boy's Way.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Steven Varenhorst, attorney Anthony Forte, and developer Jonathan Staven represented the application.

Mr. Varenhorst explained that they intend to work with the staff on a plan to restore Little Boy's Way, although they only control a portion of it. Mr. Forte contended that the Commission's jurisdiction is review-and-comment, not plenary. He explained that the design is based closely on a zoning envelope that was developed during litigation of an earlier proposal and that is the subject of a court order. That court order, Mr. Forte noted, stipulated a 65 foot tall section of the building on Arch Street and a nine-story section to the south. Mr. Forte said that the design includes setbacks at various heights as the building steps up from Arch Street. He conceded that the court order does not bind the Historical Commission.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked about materials and was told that the Arch Street façade would be clad in red brick, and the setback portions would be clad in grey and off-white-colored brick. Ms. Gutterman said that the setback from Arch Street was appreciated but that the building should also be set back from Little Boy's Way, which is a small street. Mr. Varenhorst pointed out that Little Boy's Way is surrounded by very large buildings with no setback. Mr. Forte noted that they are proposing a courtyard facing Little Boy's Way, which would open up the street on the west side. Ms. Hawkins stated that she finds the scale of the windows too large on the upper portions of the building, particularly facing Little Boy's Way. She recommended smaller, individual punched openings on the off-white and grey portions of the building. She also suggested cornices or other devices to terminate the facades.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor for public comment. Neighborhood resident and appellant in the court case Joe Schiavo opined that the building does not conform to the court order. He urged the applicants to redesign the building to conform to that approved envelope with a five-story section on Arch Street and a nine-story building to the south. He stated that the proposed building is generally one story taller than that stipulated in the court order. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance asserted that the building should comply with the massing envelope stipulated in the court order. He stated that he agreed with the staff recommendation that the proposed building is incompatible with the historic district in height, massing, and scale. Andrew Phillips, the rector of Christ Church, spoke in opposition to the proposed heights of the building, which he contended would obstruct the viewshed of the steeple. Fred Al-Nakib of 221 Arch Street asked why the depth of the setback was 14 feet rather than 24 feet. He thought that greater setback would reduce the massing visible from Arch Street. He also suggested that the building should have setbacks on Little Boy's Way. Janet Kalter, Old City resident and appellant in the court case, spoke in opposition to the proposed height, massing, and scale. Old City architect Richard Thom explained that he had been hired to represent the owners of 232-6 Arch Street. He said the building was overbearing in scale. He also noted that the fenestration pattern was out of scale for the streetscape. Resident of Old City Robert Kettel stated that the project was incompatible in scale and massing with the historic district. He also contended that the three colors of brick are incompatible. Brad Eagleman of Brandywine Management also spoke against the proposed design.

Ms. Hawkins concurred with several of the comments and suggested that the architect reconsider the massing and scale of the building, especially the sizes and locations of the setbacks as the building steps up. Mr. Staven, the developer, responded to the many comments, stating that his company is committed to working with the interested parties involved with the court order to adjust and refine the design. He stated that they would revise their application and resubmit it to the Historical Commission for another round of reviews at a later date. Mr. Baron acknowledged the withdrawal and suggested that the applicants submit a formal letter of withdrawal prior to the Historical Commission meeting.

**ADDRESS: 105 N VAN PELT ST**

Project: Construct rear addition with roof decks, renovate front façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Michael J. Rochford

Applicant: Patricia Littley, J&L Designs, Unlimited

History: 1875

Individual Designation: 4/28/1970

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a three-story rear addition and roof deck. The existing rear wall and rear ell, both of which are not visible from a public right-of-way, would be demolished. A rear addition would be constructed in place of the ell. A deck would be located on the addition and would be accessed by a spiral stair. The deck would be set back from the front façade of the building so that it would likely not be visible from Van Pelt Street or any other public right-of-way.

Much of the work proposed to the front façade is inappropriate, but the details can be corrected at the staff level. Historic two-over-two windows would be replaced with six-over-six windows. The proposed roofing and front door are also historically inappropriate.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial of the front façade renovation, but approval of the addition and roof deck, provided a mockup confirms that the work is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Designers Patricia Littley and Andrew Reiman represented the application.

The applicants distributed a revised façade drawing to the Committee members. The Committee members claimed that they had struggled to understand the application because the architectural and engineering drawings seemed to show different treatments. The Committee members asked numerous questions while striving for clarity. They asked if the mansard would be demolished with the rest of the roof. Ms. Littley replied that it would not. They asked about the skylights, which Ms. Littley said would be of a flat type. They then questioned the placement and sizes of mechanical equipment. Ms. Hawkins asked for a single set of consistent drawings. Ms. Littley responded that she would have the engineer produce a consistent set of drawings.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness.

**ADDRESS: 1200-02 CHESTNUT ST**

Project: Cut down window and install ADA entrance, clean and repair masonry and bronze, install mechanical units on roof

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Drexel University, Attn: Kimberly Miller

Applicant: Galen Plona, Bittenbender Construction, LP

History: 1916; Beneficial Savings Fund Society Building; Horace Trumbauer, architect

Individual Designation: 9/9/2006

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to renovate an existing bank building into an educational facility. Beyond exterior cleaning and repair, which can be reviewed at the staff level, the application proposes to cut a new ADA accessible entrance and to construct new mechanical units and an elevator overrun on the roof.

The proposed ADA entrance would be located in the southernmost window opening along the 12<sup>th</sup> Street façade. The new entrance would require cutting down the existing granite base and removing the existing window. The existing granite window surround and pediment would be retained. The new entrance would feature a glazed metal door and multi-lite bronze-finished transom.

In addition to the ADA accessible entrance, the application proposes to install two new mechanical units and an elevator overrun on the roof. The proposed mechanical units would be less than 12 feet in height and located at the center of the roof, approximately 11 feet from the east elevation, and 46 feet from the north elevation. The new elevator overrun would be located at the south end of the roof, adjacent to, but behind, an existing chimney. The elevator overrun would be visible from S. 12<sup>th</sup> Street.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the proportions of the multi-lite transom over the new entrance are consistent with the existing window, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Gutterman recused. Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Historic preservation consultant Bob Powers, architect Philip Chen, and property manager Mark Cartella represented the application.

Mr. Chen introduced the project, noting the applicants' understanding of the importance of the building and its original architect. He noted that one of the focuses of his firm, Ann Beha Architects, is adapting historic buildings to fit new uses. He noted the building has been vacant since 2001, and that this project will revitalize the building and stop ongoing decay. He observed that the building is listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and that they will be pursuing historic preservation tax credits through the National Park Service and Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission, which will be reviewing the exterior and interior rehabilitation.

Ms. Stein expressed grave concern over the rooftop mechanical equipment. She noted that, whether or not the mechanical units are visible from the street, they are certainly visible from taller neighboring buildings. She asked whether there was any investigation into putting the mechanical units into the existing mechanical penthouse. She also asked about the cladding material of the elevator overrun. Mr. Chen responded that they did explore putting the mechanical units in the existing penthouse, but found that its ceiling was too low to

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 JUNE 2015**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

accommodate the units. Ms. Stein asked whether they were planning to use the penthouse for anything, and Mr. Chen responded that they were not, and that it would remain empty. Ms. Hawkins asked whether there was a way to modify the penthouse to accommodate at least some, if not all, of the equipment, or to screen the equipment so that there was less of an impact to neighbors. Mr. Chen responded that they could, but at the cost of the project. He noted that they did look at the possibility of reframing and restructuring the penthouse, but it was not within the project budget. Ms. Stein commented that she personally had issues with placing mechanical units on the roof of a significant building, which is a developer's solution. She stated that, given that this is a Drexel University project, she was extremely opposed to it. She noted that the equipment would be visible from many neighboring properties and would do a disservice to the neighborhood.

Mr. Cartella noted that the footprint of the mechanical unit would extend beyond the footprint of the existing penthouse itself, so the existing penthouse would need to be significantly modified to accommodate it. Ms. Stein asked whether the system could be split into two smaller units. Mr. Cartella noted that that option had been explored early on in the project, but dismissed. He stated that he would need to discuss it again with the design engineer to know whether it would be a feasible solution. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the engineer could specify equipment that of the sizes that they wanted. Mr. Chen noted that the existing penthouse is not large, having been constructed in a time with no central air conditioning. It was intended to house considerably smaller equipment, such as fans.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the unit, as presented, sits 12 feet above the top of the cornice. She noted that she appreciated that they had attempted to push the units back from the edge of the roof, but questioned whether they could be pushed even closer to the penthouse. Mr. Chen responded that he appreciated the concerns, and did explore options for reducing the size of the units. He explained that Drexel University does not have unlimited funds to spend on the project. Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the applicant was pleading financial hardship. Mr. Chen responded that he was not saying that it would be a hardship, but that they are working within a budget to do as much as they can, and that the building does require all new systems to bring it to code. He noted that, with additional study, they may be able to reduce the size of the units.

Ms. Stein asked whether some of the equipment could be moved inside, for instance to the third floor. Mr. Chen responded that the interior of the building is fully programmed, and that the third floor has offices, instructional space, and other administrative spaces. He noted that there is a basement, which will be filled with additional mechanical and electrical equipment. He noted that the building has a large main hall, and one additional floor that can be occupied, the third floor. Ms. Stein responded that the programming of the building is not really the concern of the Architectural Committee, and that her concerns are with the visibility of the rooftop units from other tall buildings.

Mr. Powers commented that the units would not be highly visible from the street. He stated that the standard is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, not invisible from neighboring buildings. Ms. Stein responded that that may be the case, but that they would be visible from other neighboring buildings, and, as a corner property, the units may be visible from the street at a great distance. Mr. Powers asked whether it was common for the Committee and Commission to regulate views from the upper floors of neighboring buildings. He reminded the Committee that the Commission is charged with protecting the public views of historic buildings, not private views. Ms. Hawkins asserted that the Commission has jurisdiction over the entire exterior

envelope of the building. Mr. Powers responded that it is not a question of jurisdiction, but of the application of the appropriate standard.

Ms. Pentz asked what “ETR” means on the drawings, and Mr. Chen responded that it means “Existing To Remain.”

Ms. Hawkins asked about the exterior material of the elevator overrun. Mr. Chen responded that it is shown as block, but that it has not been fully determined, and they would be willing to consider buff brick to match the existing rear wall and penthouse.

Mr. D’Alessandro noted that the proposed door does not seem to fit the elements of the existing window. He asked whether the proposed door would be bronze, and Mr. Chen responded that it would be. Mr. McCoubrey noted that there appeared to be an odd proportion to the window. Ms. DiPasquale responded that there were three vertical divisions to the proposed transom, as opposed to the two vertical divisions of the existing window. Mr. McCoubrey noted that, if the door came up to the height of the existing bottom pane, it would potentially allow for them to replicate the existing window above the new door. Ms. Hawkins noted that having the three vertical muntins created overly vertical panes of glass. Mr. Chen responded that the height of the door would truncate the existing proportions. He stated that, through the use of the three vertical muntins, they were trying to achieve a proportion of the panes that matches the proportions of the other windows on the building. Ms. Hawkins noted that the proportion of the existing window is more square. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the width of the frame is larger than the existing frame, and that there is an opportunity to retain the appearance of the existing window and its frame with the new door.

Mr. D’Alessandro asked whether the granite detailing could be recreated below the window. Ms. Hawkins disagreed, noting that doing so would create a false sense of history. She noted that she was more concerned about the proportions of the sash versus the door.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, with the following suggestions: that the proposed door is reevaluated relative to the proportions of the existing window, that mechanical systems are incorporated into the existing penthouse and sized to have less impact on the roof, and that the elevator overrun is clad in buff brick.

**ADDRESS: 2108 AND 2110 WALNUT ST**

Project: Demolish most of building, construct seven-story building, rehabilitate front façade and carriage house

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: 2110 Walnut Street Development, LLC

Applicant: Tim Shaaban, Urban Space Development

History: 1868; Furness & Hewitt, attributed; 1920

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes, in-concept, to demolish much of the building at 2108 Walnut Street and construct a new structure at that site and the vacant lot at 2110 Walnut Street.

While application proposes to retain the front façade of 2108 Walnut and the associated carriage house on Chancellor Street, it proposes to demolish a significant portion of the historic building, including the majority of the western party wall, roof, and intact southern façade, which features a mansard roof with dormer windows and a bay window. Unlike other properties on the block, 2108 Walnut did not historically have a rear-ell, but currently features a one-story, non-historic addition that spans from the main block to the carriage house, filling the lot.

The proposed new building would feature a four-story front façade generally aligning with the flanking four-story Second Empire rowhouses, but with an additional two stories set back from Walnut Street. The façade would be constructed of a dark blue metal structure with large vertical glazing and a stone or concrete base. The rear of the proposed new construction, located on Chancellor Street, would feature a garage entry, and tiered balconies.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to §14-1005(6)(d). The application proposes the razing or destruction of a significant part of the historic building, which must be considered a demolition in the legal sense. No justification for the demolition, a claim of financial hardship or necessity in the public interest, is proffered. Moreover, the proposed new construction is incompatible with the historic building and thereby fails to satisfy Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Tim Shaaban represented the application.

Mr. Shaaban presented revised floor plans of the existing and proposed buildings, showing the retention of considerably more of the existing building walls, which was highlighted. He noted that, as opposed to the previously proposed clearspan penetration of the wall, the new proposal would feature three smaller penetrations of the western wall, and encapsulation of the rear wall. Ms. Hawkins asked whether the existing footprint of the main block of the building would be retained for the full height of the building, and Mr. Shaaban confirmed that it would.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether the exterior of the proposed new construction had been revised, and Mr. Shaaban responded that it had not. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the only portion of the existing building to be removed, beyond the western wall penetrations, would be the non-historic, one-story connector. Ms. DiPasquale clarified that the rear elevation bay would also be removed, in addition to the non-historic, one-story connector. Ms. Hawkins asked what would be retained. Mr. Shaaban noted that, on the 2108 building, they would work on restoring façade, penetrate the western wall in three places per floor but retain the masonry wall, demolish the

rear fire stair and bay window, encapsulate the rear mansard, convert a fourth-floor window into a door, and remove or modify the one-story connector. The carriage house, including exterior walls, roof and cupola, he noted, would be preserved, except for an eight-foot wide opening at the second floor.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether, given the changes, the staff still considered the project a demolition. Mr. Farnham responded that he did not believe that the revised proposal would be considered a demolition in the legal sense in that the applicant would be required to demonstrate hardship or public interest for an approval, and that the Commission could approve the removal of the rear features and encasing of the mansard as an alteration. He noted, however, that , although the proposed work may not be considered a demolition in the legal sense, it still may not satisfy the Standards.

Mr. Shaaban noted that the Walnut Street façade of the proposed new building is more of a placeholder, and that they are willing to work with the staff and the Committee to develop a more acceptable design at a later date. He stated that he is primarily concerned with the massing for the purposes of this review.

Ms. Gutterman noted that the materials proposed are inappropriate for the historic district, and that the amount of addition on top of the roof is too much. One story, she noted, might be acceptable, but the two stories and one-story setback is too massive. Mr. Shaaban opined that the structure would not be visible from the north side of Walnut Street. Ms. Hawkins noted that visibility must be considered from many different angles, not just head-on. Mr. Shaaban agreed, and clarified that he did not think this addition would be visible from most vantage points on Walnut Street. Ms. Hawkins noted that having the glass railing so close to the front of the building would increase the visibility of the addition. Glass, in particular, she noted, would be even more conspicuous. Mr. Shabaan noted that the railing would be setback approximately six or eight feet from the corner. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the mansard slopes back as well. Mr. Shaaban noted that they would be willing to create a mock-up and pull the railing back to a point where it was not visible.

Ms. Gutterman opined that the massing is too much building for the site and the building materials are inappropriate for the district. Ms. Pentz questioned the proposed materials. Ms. Gutterman noted that they appeared to be metal and glass as opposed to masonry and wood and glass.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the application package should include streetscape photographs of Walnut Street so the Committee and Commission can better understand the context of the building. Ms. Hawkins noted that she believes this area has more of a masonry, punched-opening vocabulary. She noted that the new building does not need to match the historic buildings exactly, but the context should be taken into account, and perhaps the base of the building should be differentiated from the overbuild. She commended the four-story height of the front of the new building, which maintains the cornice height of the adjacent structures, but encouraged stepping back the addition additionally.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that there should be additional study on Chancellor Street as well, as the current proposal seems to overwhelm the narrow, carriage house-lined street. Mr. McCoubrey noted that, if the overbuild was set back and not visible from any public right-of-way, then he would not object to it. Mr. Shaaban noted that this portion of Chancellor Street is not a through-street. He noted that a neighboring carriage house already has a one-story addition on top of it, making it about a story taller than the carriage house at 2108 Walnut. Mr. Shaaban noted that

there will likely always be some places where the structure will be visible. He noted that the addition can only be set back so far. Ms. Hawkins responded that no one was suggesting that the structure be invisible. She noted that the proposed building is extremely large, both from Walnut Street, and maybe even more from Chancellor Street, since it is a much smaller street. She applauded Mr. Shaaban for retaining the carriage house, but suggested that he look at reconfiguring the site in a way that allows him to keep the structure lower or step it back even farther. Mr. Shaaban asked if there was a magic number of feet that it would need to be set back, noting that the more square footage they lose, the less viable the project becomes. He noted that, pending the Historical Commission process, the lots will be consolidated and the structures combined. He noted that they could build a seven-story tower on 2110 Walnut with Historical Commission review and comment only, but that is not the preference, since they would like to use the width of both properties. Ms. Hawkins reiterated that the proposed structure did not need to be invisible. Ms. Gutterman agreed, noting that it should not look like it is swallowing the historic buildings. Ms. Hawkins suggested that material and color selections may also help minimize the impact of the design.

Because the application requested review-and-comment only, the Architectural Committee did not offer a formal motion, but instead let its comments during the review stand.

**ADDRESS: 265 S 20TH ST**

Project: Legalize HVAC equipment at rear of property

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Johanna & Gregory Hanson

Applicant: Johanna Hanson, Style Limited Partnership

History: 1880

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application requests the legalization of mechanical equipment that was installed at the rear of this corner property without permits or review by the Historical Commission. A new condenser unit was mounted at the second-floor level of the rear wall. The staff suggests that the new unit be relocated. Options for relocation include the roof, mounting above the projecting bay at the rear on a bracket, or below grade with a grate to cover the opening.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the applicants were not able to attend the meeting, as they had been unaware of the meeting date and time because the staff mailed the notification letter to an incorrect address. Mr. Farnham suggested that the Committee proceed and review the project. He stated that the staff would work with the applicant to overcome the mistake. If the applicant objected to missing the Architectural Committee meeting during the Commission's review, the Commission could table the application and remand it back to the Committee.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant had objected to relocating the unit, and Ms. DiPasquale responded that the applicant had objected to all of the staff's suggestions for possible relocation. She noted that the applicants asserted that the staff's suggested options would be feasible.

Ms. Stein clarified that the equipment in violation included the bracket, condenser, electrical boxes and wires. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the staff of the Historical Commission had not requested the violation, but that it had been initiated by the Department of Licenses & Inspections.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the purpose of some of the photographs presented in the application. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she assumed that they were to represent other wall-mounted mechanical equipment located on rear walls in the neighborhood. Ms. Gutterman noted that the other units were not as visible as the unit at 265 S. 20<sup>th</sup> Street, the subject of this review.

Most of the Committee members agreed that the proposal does not satisfy the Standards. Mr. D'Alessandro dissented.

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

**ADDRESS: 1524-34 SOUTH ST**

Project: Demolish historic building except façade, restore façade, construct four-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Universal Community Homes

Applicant: Thomas Chapman, Blank Rome LLP

History: 1920; Royal Theater; Frank E. Hahn, architect

Individual Designation: 9/7/1978

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes the demolition of all but the front façade of the Royal Theater and the construction of a mixed-use, retail and residential building behind the façade. The application claims that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In other words, the application claims that the forced retention of the building would induce a financial hardship on the owner. The application has been referred to the Historical Commission's financial hardship consultant and the Committee on Financial Hardship, which will meet on 30 June 2015. The Architectural Committee may, of course, opine on the financial hardship aspects of the application, but the architectural aspects of the application should be its primary focus.

The designated site is 1524-34 South Street, a rectangular lot that runs south to Kater Street. The construction site includes 1524-34 South Street as well as several adjacent lots that are not designated as historic.

The Historical Commission individually designated the Royal Theater in 1978. The theater is not located in a historic district and no interior spaces in the building have been designated as historic. The Historical Commission has jurisdiction over the exterior envelope of the building, i.e. the four exterior walls and the roof, and the site.

The Royal Theater consists of a lobby on South Street and an auditorium at the rear. The front façade is brick with stone and metal accents. The side and rear facades are unornamented brick. The building is in poor condition. All interior finishes, fixtures, and features have been lost.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 JUNE 2015**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

This application proposes to demolish all but the front façade of the Royal Theater. The front façade would be restored. Infilled openings would be reopened and new doors and windows matching the historic would be installed. Masonry and metalwork would be restored.

The new building would be two stories on South Street to the east and west of the historic façade and four stories behind the historic façade. The returns of the historic façade would be brick, giving the façade a sense of volume. The new facades along South Street would be primarily glass with brick and stone veneer. The upper, setback facades facing South Street would be clad in cementitious panels. The new building would be four stories along Kater and clad in brick and cementitious panels. The windows in the new construction would be metal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** No recommendation on the claim of financial hardship and the proposed demolition. Approval of the restoration and construction aspects of the application, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9, provided the Historical Commission finds that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, pursuant to §14-1005(6)(d).

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Gutterman recused, owing to her firm's involvement with this property several years ago. Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Tom Chapman, property owner's representative Shahied Dawan, developers Jeff Kurtz and Amanda Mazie, engineer Brian Wentz, architect Darryl Carrington, and preservation consultant Robert Powers represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins polled her fellow Committee members as to whether they wanted to discuss the financial hardship portion of the application, or defer to the Committee on Financial Hardship's assessment of it. She noted that the Committee on Financial Hardship will review the application at a public meeting next week. The Committee members unanimously decided to limit their review to the architectural aspects of the application.

Mr. Carrington, the applicant's architect, reported on the condition of the Royal Theater, which he asserted is very poor. Mr. Carrington shifted to a discussion of the proposed building and restoration of the historic front façade. Ms. Hawkins stated that the restoration details for the front façade can be reviewed by the staff. The Committee members agreed that the proposed restoration was appropriate and could be finalized with the staff's assistance.

Mr. Carrington introduced the Committee to the site, which runs from South to Kater Street. He stated that they have worked extensively with interested parties in the community. He explained that the first floor will be used for retail. The South Street facades adjacent to the historic façade will be steel and glass, to differentiate them from the historic façade. He stated that all of the floors will align with the openings in the historic façade. The building above the retail is T-shaped in plan, with the base of the T at the historic façade. The returns at the edges of the historic façade will be brick to give the façade a sense of volume, presence, and stability. The upper floors of the residential space will be set back from the front façade. Ms. Stein asked if the proposed canopies replicate historic canopies. Mr. Carrington replied that they are reminiscent of the historic marquees, which changed over time, but they are lighter and in a contemporary vernacular. The historic marquees, which were not original, obscured the arched openings. The proposed canopies will allow the arches to be seen. They will be metal and glass. Mr. Carrington turned his attention to the Kater Street façade. He stated that the rear of the building will be clad in masonry and cementitious panels. He clarified that the masonry would be a real brick.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she was concerned that the top floor of the new building would be constructed only five feet back from the historic façade and loom above the façade. She asked if it would be possible to push the new construction back from the historic façade. She acknowledged that doing so would likely lead to the loss of two residential units. She questioned whether the bedrooms in that section of the new building met code because they appear not to have windows. Mr. Carrington explained that they do have the requisite windows. Ms. Hawkins stated that the upper floor of the new construction should be set back more from the historic front façade. Mr. Carrington asserted that the proposed setback was typical and appropriate. Ms. Hawkins suggested that it might need to be 10 feet instead of five. Mr. Kurtz stated that the five-foot setback seemed appropriate to the design team, given the height of the parapet at the top of the historic façade. He stated that he was willing to have his architects evaluate the impact of increasing that setback, but contended that the new construction would not have an adverse impact on the historic façade with the setback as proposed. Mr. Carrington suggested that the light color of the new construction would cause it to fade into the sky. He also explained that they have set the entire new building back six feet from the sidewalk line at the rear along Kater Street at the request of the neighbors. He contended that the floorplate of the building is already shrunken to its minimum, owing to the concession to the neighbors at the rear. Ms. Pentz asked about the height of the front parapet. Mr. Kurtz stated that it is 3'-6" tall. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the historic marquees. Mr. Kurtz directed him to a photograph in the submission.

Jim Campbell of the South Street West Business Association and an architect with his office on the 1500-block of South Street stated that this proposal is the best his organization has seen in terms of preservation and reuse in 40 years. He stated that the South Street West Business Association supports the application.

Lauren Vidas, the chair of South of South Street Neighborhood Association, the registered community organization, stated that her organization strongly supports the plan and looks forward to the redeveloped site. This proposal is the best the organization has considered for the site. It respects the historic building and the economic realities.

Marcus Ferreira of the South Street West Business Association voiced his support for the project. He stated that it offers the right density and an appropriate mix of uses. He stated that proposed architecture respects the historic façade and the street. He advocated for the five-foot setback behind the front façade, stating that, owing to the height of the building and width of the street, the new construction will be inconspicuous. He stated that the proposed signage is appropriate as well.

Steve Cobb of the Office of Councilman Kenyatta Johnson informed the Committee that the Councilman supports the application. He stated that the property has been vacant and blighted for several decades and needs to be redeveloped. The proposal respects the historic façade.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Alliance holds an easement on the front façade and that this project appears to honor that easement. He stated that he is looking forward to reviewing the final plans for the stabilization of the façade.

Mr. Chapman reminded the Committee that the zoning for the project has been granted by ordinance. He also noted that the project has been approved by the Planning Commission as part of the zoning review and is subject to Civic Design Review.

Mr. Powers, the applicant's historic preservation consultant, stated that he reviewed the architectural design and found it to be compatible with the historic façade and environment in size, massing, materials, and scale. He stated that the restoration details for the historic façade are correct as well. He stated that, in light of the condition of the building, he finds the proposal to be appropriate.

Ms. Pentz stated that she was in the building 15 years ago and it was in very poor condition at that time. She stated that the building is a shell and the only valuable part of the building is the front façade. She stated that the application offers a legitimate approach to protecting the historic resource, which she supports.

Mr. Carrington addressed the canopy again, stating that it provides a pedestrian scale to the building, which is taller than most in the area. The canopy mediates between the pedestrians and the taller facade. It recreates the spatial relationships established by the older marquees, but does it in a lighter manner that allows the details of the building to be appreciated.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the restoration and construction aspects of the application, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9, provided the Historical Commission finds that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, pursuant to §14-1005(6)(d).

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:05 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 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.

§14-1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition.

No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.

DRAFT