

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

**TUESDAY, 23 JANUARY 2018  
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029  
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

**PRESENT**

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

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director  
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III  
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner I  
Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I

**ALSO PRESENT**

Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Darin Jellison, Blackney Hayes Architects  
Dani Leiman, Blackney Hayes Architects  
Jacob Cooper  
Joshua Otto, Otto Architects  
Paul Drzal, Paul Drzal, LLC  
Al Holm, Alvin Holm, AIA Architect  
Barbara Eberlein  
John Toates, John Toates Architecture and Design  
John Moore  
Stephanie Gregorek  
Pat McDonough, John Toates Architecture and Design  
Elizabeth Springer, Dames Design  
Nick Volpe  
Alexandra Volpe

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman, Pentz, and Stein and Mr. D'Alessandro joined him.

**ADDRESS: 2400 PINE ST**

Proposal: Demolish building; construct 3-story house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jacob Cooper and Natalie Aronson

Applicant: Jacob Cooper

History: 1963; Norman Rice home and office; Norman Rice, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to demolish the existing non-contributing one and two-story building that runs between Pine and Waverly Streets along S. 24<sup>th</sup> Street and to construct a two and three-story building in its place. The applicants previously sought and received in-concept approval from the Historical Commission for this project. The proposed building would be two stories in height along Pine Street, with a third floor stepping up approximately one-third of the way along 24<sup>th</sup> Street. A deck would be located on the second-floor roof. The proposed building would be clad in red brick and feature large steel windows and zinc-clad projections into which would be set aluminum curtain-wall windows and slatted shading devices. The building would be combined with the property at 2403-05 Waverly Street, which is outside of the historic district.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's in-concept approval in July 2017.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Dani Leiman and Darin Jellison and owner Jacob Cooper represented the application.

Ms. Leiman clarified that the windows have been revised from steel to aluminum-clad wood windows, a Kolbe Vistalux product. Ms. Leiman noted that the final design is similar to what was presented in-concept to the Historical Commission, but that they tried to respond to some of the Commission's comments in their revisions. She explained that the Commission had asked them to reconsider the Pine Street elevation and to treat it as a primary entrance. She noted that, in response, they added some glass to the Pine Street door to make it feel more like a front door. She explained that the Commission also commented on the garage doors on 24<sup>th</sup> Street, and that it appeared to be too large an expanse of blank wall. She distributed a revised garage door rendering showing a more streamlined carriage-style door with glazing. She noted that they also added glass to the door to the right of the garage doors. Ms. Leiman offered to show materials samples to the Committee members.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether the windows were double-hungs or casements. Ms. Leiman responded that they are casements. Ms. Gutterman questioned how that worked with the six-over-six appearance in the renderings. Ms. Leiman responded that the whole window swings outwards. Ms. Gutterman questioned the material of the windows in the bays. Ms. Leiman responded that they would be aluminum, curtain-wall windows with a bronze or black finish to match the casement windows.

Ms. Gutterman expressed her concern that the Pine Street elevation still feels like a secondary façade, and that it does not have an appropriate presence on Pine Street. She opined that simply adding glazing to the door was not sufficient to make the façade feel like a front elevation and to complement the neighboring properties. She argued that the corner of 24<sup>th</sup> and Pine Streets deserves more consideration, and that it appears to be an afterthought to all that was done on Waverly Street. Ms. Stein agreed. Ms. Leiman replied that she feels their design responds to the neighborhood, with the large second-floor window. She noted that one of the comments was to make the door feel more like a front door, and that that is what they tried to do by adding glass. She opined that the scale responds to the neighborhood. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the first-floor window be enlarged. Ms. Stein agreed, noting that the neighboring property has a double first-floor window. Ms. Gutterman commented that she does not really know the best approach for making the façade feel more appropriate, perhaps because it is only two stories in the context of a primarily three-story block. She reiterated that the overall design of the Pine Street elevation does not have the presence of a corner property. She noted that she also does not have any ideas for improving the design, but that she does not think that adding glass to the door is enough. Ms. DiPasquale questioned whether part of the issue might be the lack of a cornice. Mr. Jellison responded that some relief at the top of the building might be beneficial. Ms. Gutterman replied that the building needs something more. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested adding sidelites to the door. Ms. Leiman responded that they could give more thought to the door. Mr. McCoubrey noted that, when he first looked at the drawings, he thought it was a solid door with a transom, but now realizes that it is a door with partial glazing. He suggested that a door with a transom might be better.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that, other than the Pine Street elevation, the revisions made appear to respond to the Historical Commission's previous comments. He thanked the architects for their work. Ms. Stein opined that the revised garage door submitted at the meeting was a great improvement to the one initially submitted to the Committee. Ms. Pentz commented that it is a very nice design.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether there would be any pergolas or other structures proposed for the deck. Ms. Leiman responded negatively.

Ms. Stein commented that no mechanical equipment should be visible from any streets, noting that this is a corner property visible from long distances. Ms. Leiman responded that they included some sections in their submission showing the preliminarily proposed placement of mechanical equipment, and have attempted to show that the mechanical equipment will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's in-concept approval in July 2017, provided the Pine Street elevation is further developed to have more presence as a corner property; the garage door submitted at the 23 January 2018 meeting is used; and that no mechanical equipment is visible from any street.

**ADDRESS: 1701-15 LOCUST ST**

Proposal: Replace windows, door and awnings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: VIR GP, LLC (Lessee)

Applicant: Paul Drzal, Paul Drzal, LLC

History: 1923-25; Warwick Hotel; Hahn & Baylinson

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to install new storefront windows and awnings on the 17<sup>th</sup> Street elevation of the Warwick Hotel building, as well as to cut a new storefront opening. Historically, the storefront windows were divided into three parts by vertical mullions, had no transoms, and were flush with the face of the building. Today, the openings are approximately the same size as they were historically, but the windows are set very deep in the openings. This application proposes to install windows with six vertical divisions and transoms. The Historical Commission has reviewed and denied similar proposals for similar windows in these openings in the past. The application also proposes to install awnings that extend beyond the width of the openings and bolt into the masonry wall. At the second floor, the application proposes to install awnings that would disrupt the masonry trim of the windows. The application also proposes to install marquee lighting on the undersides of the window openings, where lighting current exists.

Open-sided awnings that resemble those installed on a different commercial unit of the Warwick would be more appropriate. Any awnings should be installed within the masonry openings, not extend beyond them or be attached to the face of the building. The windows should be divided into three parts, not six, for compatibility with the historic character of the building and the Historical Commission's previous decisions.

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

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Paul Drzal, attorney David Orphanides, and owner Tim Lutz represented the application.

Ms. DiPasquale clarified that the window proposed on the side elevation is in the location of an infilled window opening; the staff does not object to the reopening of that window.

Mr. Orphanides explained that there have been a variety of operations in this commercial space over the years, and none lasted very long. He clarified that he is not claiming that the proposed designs are what will make or break the operation. He noted that he and his clients have communicated the Historical Commission staff's concerns and comments to the designer, who could not be in attendance. He stated that the design intent is to create a space with more appeal at the street level, opining that the current windows for the restaurant are pretty non-descript and basic. He conceded that in terms of materials and design, the current windows do resemble in large part the historic photographs. He noted that the openings on the other end of the building have different types of windows with more divisions. Mr. McCoubrey responded that those are very differently scaled windows.

Mr. Orphanides commented that the main opening to the hotel has had a major intervention and change in the design and type of materials from the historic appearance. He argued that the building has already been modified and updated in ways that do not acknowledge or respect the historic past of the building in order to give the building more curb appeal, and that that is what they would like to do here. He explained that the designer would like to get away from the large, bulky storefront system popular in the 1990s and early 2000s. He opined that it is difficult to see from the historic photograph that Ms. DiPasquale emailed the applicant the actual dimensions of the storefront system. Ms. DiPasquale distributed a zoomed-in version of the photograph to Mr. Orphanides. Mr. Orphanides opined that the current windows and awnings do not do justice to the historic nature of the building. He conceded that perhaps a compromise could be reached by keeping the awnings within the existing openings but extend them out further as permitted by zoning. In terms of the windows themselves, Mr. Orphanides reiterated that they would like to get away from the bulky storefront and get something that is more artistic and stylish. He noted that the windows on the upper floors of the building have divided lites.

Ms. Stein asked Ms. DiPasquale if the historic photograph included in the Committee packets shows the original configuration of the building when it was first built, or whether the storefronts were a later alteration. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she believes that the storefront was original, and that the original design treated the two ends of the building differently. Ms. Stein asked what this portion of the building looked like at the time of designation. Ms. DiPasquale responded that openings had already been altered to their current configuration; the opening on the side was infilled and the windows on the front pulled in from the face of the building. She noted that there were more delicate, open-sided awnings that projected further over the sidewalk. Ms. DiPasquale addressed Mr. Orphanides' earlier comment about the Warwick Hotel's entrance and marquee, noting that she is not certain that what was built is what the Historical Commission approved, and that it should not be considered precedent for the rest of the building. Mr. Orphanides agreed, noting that he was not involved in that project, but that he had heard about it. He suggested that the Historical Commission reviews work that allows for more modern updates that still honor the history of a building.

Ms. Stein opined that a restoration of the historic storefront would create an identity for the tenant, and asked the staff's opinion on that possibility. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the ideal situation would be if the owners were willing to pull the inset openings forward and increase the size of the storefront windows to what was there historically, but that the three-part division of the windows that exists currently is at least in keeping with the historic storefront. She reiterated that the Historical Commission previously denied a similar application to install divided-lite windows in these openings. Ms. Stein asked the applicants why they did not want to restore the storefront to its historic appearance. Mr. Drzal responded that part of the issue is that the sills of the windows were raised at some point because the floor on the interior was raised, so the center door is the only street-level opening. Ms. Gutterman asked if the windows could be brought back out to the street, while maintaining the higher sill height. Mr. Orphanides responded that they looked into that after speaking with the staff initially, but that the designer is concerned about the outdoor café seating, and having the recessed area allows for additional sidewalk seating. He also noted that it is not possible to fully recreate the historic base of the building, given the interior floor height.

Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the proposed awnings occupy 42 feet in width across the building, and opined that that is not appropriate for this building. Mr. Orphanides explained that the

awnings were designed to fully cover each opening, but that they might be willing to keep the awnings to the width of the openings and to have open sides like the rest of the awnings on the building.

Ms. Gutterman agreed that the existing storefront elements are chunky, but explained that thinner-profile framing and windows are possible, without having to divide the windows into additional lites. She opined that the applicants are attempting to create something that is not appropriate to this particular building. Mr. Orphanides asked if it was possible to do different width mullions and muntins that gives a thicker appearance into thirds, but still creates additional divisions. Ms. Gutterman responded that she does not believe that dividing the windows into anything but thirds is appropriate for this particular storefront. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the additional divisions are also counter to the applicant's desire to have greater transparency. Mr. Drzal noted that the mullions in their proposal are much thinner than the existing mullions. Ms. Gutterman responded that a thinner system that is divided into thirds could be used. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the current storefront is fairly far removed from what was there historically, and that this proposal takes it a step farther away from the historic nature of the building. Mr. McCoubrey noted that there is some scarring on the façade of the building around the openings. Ms. DiPasquale responded that there were previous awnings that attached above the opening.

Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Gutterman that the tripartite division of the windows should be retained, and that larger panes of glass will enable additional transparency with the sidewalk. He noted that his question is how thick or thin the mullions would need to be. Mr. McCoubrey asked if any of the photographs that they have show what the Historical Commission approved previously. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the Historical Commission approved the existing windows approximately 10 years ago, but that she does not believe that the width of the mullion was specified as part of the approval. Mr. Orphanides commented that that sort of storefront system was typical of that time period. Mr. McCoubrey explained that he understands the desire for a thinner mullion and agreed with the staff that the storefront system should not have transoms, except over the door. Mr. Orphanides asked whether it would be appropriate to include transoms in the center windows of each bay, since historically there were doors in those openings. Mr. McCoubrey responded that he would recommend a transom only over the door.

Mr. Drzal asked whether there were any comments on the base of the windows and door in the center bay. Ms. Gutterman responded that it appears the applicants are proposing to raise the base, and questioned whether that was appropriate. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the dimensions of the doors and windows that are there currently are closer to what was there historically than what is proposed. Mr. Orphanides noted that the current proposal creates a line that extends all the way across at a higher level. Ms. Gutterman explained that the base dimension of the windows and door in the center bay should align with the base of the building, as it did historically. Mr. Orphanides noted that it appears that historically there was a step up to the door, and then a thicker base at the door, but that the bases of all the windows and doors aligned across the openings. Ms. Gutterman reiterated that the base of the windows and door should align with the joint in the base of the pier on either side of the door. Mr. Drzal questioned whether the Committee was suggesting pulling the windows and door of the center bay flush with the façade. Mr. Orphanides opined that that would create a less ideal in and out appearance across the bays. Ms. Stein questioned the material around the storefront. Mr. Drzal

responded that it is stone. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that a section drawing through the storefront would have been helpful.

Ms. Gutterman asked where the marquee lighting is being anchored. Ms. DiPasquale responded that it is being installed where the existing lighting is located, on the underside of the opening. Ms. Gutterman asked if the windows would open. Mr. Drzal responded that the current windows are operable, but the proposed windows are not.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

The Committee members agreed that they could recommend approval of a project that proposed awnings installed within the masonry openings and anchored like the existing awnings; aluminum storefronts with tripartite divided lites and a slimmer mullion and frame that is less bulky; infill at the base of the center bay that is restored to the height of the historic photograph using a metal, stucco, or stone that matches the stone of the base (approximately 8-12 inches).

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

**ADDRESS: 123 S 18TH ST**

Proposal: Paint building exterior gray

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Michael Singer Real Estate

Applicant: Jonathan Myerow, Alaska Café LLC T/A Tria Café Rittenhouse

History: c. 1835

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to repaint a brick building in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Residential Historic District. The building is a red-brick building, but has been painted many times. At the time of designation in 1995, the building was painted beige. The staff approved an application of Benjamin Moore Garrison Red paint on this building in 2003. Since that time, the building has been repainted red several times, but the paint continues to fade, which has prompted the applicant to seek approval of repainting in Benjamin Moore Rockport Gray, a color that will not fade as easily. A few years ago, the same applicant obtained the Historical Commission's approval and painted a designated, red-brick building on Fidler Square with the proposed grey color; it was painted green before the grey paint was applied. Photographs of the grey building are included in the application. Generally, preservation standards suggest that masonry buildings should not be painted unless they are already painted and paint removal is not a good option, owing to condition and/or appearance of the masonry walls. If masonry buildings are painted, preservation standards indicate that they should be painted the color of the underlying masonry. In this case, the building has been painted many times and paint removal is not a good option owing to numerous alterations to the masonry. However, the proposed grey paint is not the color of the underlying masonry.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial of repainting in Rockport Gray, but approval of repainting using red paint or stain, pursuant to Standard 6.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Joshua Otto represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the new red paint be more of an orange-red to better match the neighboring buildings on S. 18<sup>th</sup> Street. She suggested that a Benjamin Moore representative be consulted to determine the correct type of paint system. Mr. Otto commented that he cannot speak to what has been done in the past, but the applicant desires to paint the building gray and rebrand the building. He referenced multiple precedents within a two block radius. Mr. McCoubrey commented that red is important because of the two red brick buildings next to the subject building, which form a small ensemble in the midst of a high-rise area. He opined that painting the building gray would further erode the bit of original street-front character that exists today. He agreed with the staff recommendation, and suggested a red that is closer in color to red brick.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested that rebranding can be achieved at the street level with the storefront and awnings. Mr. Otto asked if the Commission approves awnings. Ms. Chantry responded that the Historical Commission's staff is often able to review and approve awnings, and looks for the awnings to be limited in width to masonry openings and open on the sides. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the bay be painted a different color, such as Rockport Gray, and that awnings be considered as part of rebranding for the Sansom Street elevation. Ms. Gutterman cautioned that the awnings should not span the entire length of the Sansom Street elevation, but rather be positioned above one or a grouping of windows, depending on the fenestration. Mr. Otto referenced continuous awnings across the street. Ms. Gutterman explained that that building is new construction and is reviewed as such. Ms. Chantry commented that the former Fitler Square location of Tria had grouped awnings along the side of the building, which were approved by the staff. Ms. Gutterman agreed that awnings could potentially be approved by the staff, depending on their design and placement. Mr. Otto asked about next steps, should the applicant choose to move forward with red paint instead of gray paint. Ms. Chantry responded that red paint can be approved by the staff. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that red paint samples are applied to the building first and then a decision is made regarding which red to choose. Ms. Gutterman reiterated that the applicant should consult with a Benjamin Moore representative to determine which color and application system should be used. She noted that there may be an issue with paint adhering to the walls, depending on how many layers of paint are already on the building. She suggested that a contractor do an adhesion test with a Benjamin Moore representative present. Ms. Stein commented that an ultraviolet inhibitor may need to be used. She commented that exterior paint typically lasts for six to eight years, so it is not surprising that the building needs to be repainted at this time. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the bay be painted a different color, and that a Benjamin Moore representative be consulted regarding paint color and paint system. Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment, of which there was none.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of repainting in Rockport Gray, but approval of repainting brick using red paint, pursuant to Standard 6.



**ADDRESS: 2027 WALNUT ST**

Proposal: Relocate ATM, replace awning

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: AMCS Walnut St. Assoc.

Applicant: Stephanie Gregorzek, Project Expeditors Consulting Group

History: 1855; storefront alterations

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, [megan.schmitt@phila.gov](mailto:megan.schmitt@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to relocate an ATM from an interior vestibule to the exterior of an existing storefront. The storefront is to be reconfigured to accommodate the installation of the ATM machine. The existing red fabric awning is to be replaced with a tan fabric awning.

The staff suggests that rather than dividing the new storefront into three, uneven bays, the storefront reference the width seen at the window bays that are located directly above.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the relocation of the ATM, reconfiguration of the storefront, and replacement of the awning, provided the storefront window is divided into three equal sections, pursuant to Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Project expeditors Stephanie Gregorzek and Kerrie Silsibie arrived late after Ms. Schmitt's overview.

Ms. Gutterman remarked that the applicants had come before them several months ago with the same idea. Mr. McCoubrey said that he thought they had come before them more than just once, to which Ms. Gutterman responded that at their most recent appearance they had presented the same idea and that the members had recommended denial and so had the staff. She then asked the staff why they had changed their recommendation.

Mr. Baron responded that the Architectural Committee had made some recommendations to the applicants at their last appearance and, after reviewing the current application, the staff determined that those recommendations had been followed. Ms. Gutterman said that she remembered that the last proposal included a very large red wall. Mr. McCoubrey added that the Committee had opined that it was acceptable to relocate the ATM outside, but that it should be understated. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that, with the last proposal, everything was red. Mr. Baron went on to say that the Committee members had also recommended that they remove the ramp, to which Ms. Gutterman replied that that was her question because the proposal in front of them showed the ramp to remain. She commented that the existing railing will impact the ability to access the new ATM because it is currently in front of the location proposed for the new ATM. Mr. Baron stated that, at the last review, the Architectural Committee had recommended denial, but had offered several suggestions. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the railing is extant, and Ms. Gutterman explained that the Architectural Committee had recommended approval of the railing at the time they reviewed the ramp. Mr. Baron added that the whole idea of the ramp was so that the vestibule with the ATM could be accessible.

Ms. Gutterman went on to say that the applicants now want to leave the ramp so that people can gain access to the entrance to the building, which was not the reason that they approved the ramp. Mr. Baron postulated that there are steps upon entering the building, so the residents would have no use for the ramp and that it had been intended only for the ATM. Mr. D'Alessandro remarked that, if the ATM unit is relocated to the exterior, then the ramp and the railing should all disappear. Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicants were still proposing to install an awning over the entire window, what was being proposed for the vestibule, and whether the glass would still be transparent. Ms. Schmitt responded that the vestibule would be used to service the ATM. Ms. Gutterman remarked that, in that case, the windows would no longer be transparent. Ms. Schmitt responded that the application did not specify any change to the glass. Ms. Stein asked what the public would be looking into. Ms. Gutterman said a film could be applied to the glass because the applicant would certainly not want people to be able to see into the vestibule, which means that the entire storefront would essentially be lost. Ms. Stein remarked that the application was under baked and lacking in details about materials and dimensions. She commented that though the existing condition is not great, it is better than what was being proposed.

Ms. Gutterman added that she presumed that the bank would need to have some kind of a camera and additional lighting, and that she wanted to know where they were proposing to install them. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the storefront should be divided into three equal pieces of glass rather than what was being proposed. Ms. Gutterman said that she thought that the ATM may be too wide to accommodate that recommendation. Ms. Schmitt stated that she thought the reason that the drawings showed the uneven glass panels was because the applicant was trying to reuse the existing storefront and just alter the one panel where the ATM would be located. Mr. D'Alessandro reiterated that he thought that the storefront should mirror the windows above to create evenly divided panels because, as proposed, the whole rhythm of the building was broken.

Ms. Stein stated that the application lacked detail and did not specify the materials or colors proposed for the area around the ATM unit. She said that she believed that what was there today was actually better than what was being proposed and she wondered why they would recommend a change when what they had currently was better than what was being proposed. She stated that recommending approval of the proposal would be going backwards. She said that she did not understand how the contractor would be able to install the new ATM unit because the railing was in front of it. Ms. Schmitt responded that she believed that the applicant would be pulling the unit forward. Ms. Stein said that they would not be able to do that because the railing was in the way. She went on to comment that she did not think that the project had been thoroughly designed, and that there were still many questions. She said that she did not believe that stucco was an appropriate material to surround the ATM unit, to which Mr. D'Alessandro replied that they could use a cast stone instead. Ms. Stein stated that, from a historical point of view, she thought that what was there currently was better than what was being proposed.

Mr. McCoubrey said that the ramp had been installed to access the ATM so it was no longer needed. Ms. Gutterman agreed, adding that the ramp and the steps were not either. Ms. Schmitt asked whether the Architectural Committee would recommend that the applicant remove the ramp and the railing entirely, and Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro responded

affirmatively. Ms. Pentz commented that she agreed with Ms. Stein's remark that the proposal was going backwards.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if there was any public comment and there was none. He then asked for a recommendation, at which point the applicants, Stephanie Gregorzek and Kerrie Silsbie, arrived. Ms. Stein asked Ms. Gregorzek to have a seat and introduce herself, and informed her that they were about to make a motion. After stating her name for the record, Ms. Gregorzek asked if the Architectural Committee members had any questions about the application.

Ms. Gutterman responded that they had several comments. She said that she knew that the applicant had already been before them at least twice and Ms. Gregorzek confirmed that this was true. Ms. Gutterman informed Ms. Gregorzek that she did not believe that there was enough information on the drawings to tell them what was actually going on as far as how the ATM was actually going to fit into the proposed location. She commented that the ramp and railing would need to be removed entirely if the ATM was relocated to the sidewalk since the only reason they were approved was to allow access to the ATM within the storefront. Ms. Gutterman said that further information was needed about what would be happening within the vestibule space, including details on what type of film was being proposed for the storefront glass to prevent the public from being able to look in. The applicant was also informed that she would need to provide more information about the colors that were proposed for the building. Mr. McCoubrey stated that stucco was not an appropriate material to use to finish the areas around the ATM, and reiterated the staff's recommendation that the storefront configuration should mirror the tripartite window system seen above.

Ms. Gregorzek asked to address some of the comments, beginning with the ramp. She explained that she had inquired at the Department of Licenses & Inspections about the removal of the ramp, and because there is an apartment complex in the building, they cannot remove the ADA access, even though it was originally installed for the ATM vestibule. Ms. Gutterman asked if there were steps once you entered the entrance for the apartment building. Ms. Gregorzek replied that according to the Department, if a ramp leads to nowhere, then it can be removed; however, if it leads to a space, it cannot be. Mr. McCoubrey, Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro all commented that, if the ramp leads to steps inside, then it is essentially nowhere and not needed. Ms. Gutterman asked that it be confirmed whether or not there were steps in the apartment building's hallway. Ms. Gregorzek stated that she did not know. Ms. Schmitt responded that it was the staff's belief that there were.

Mr. D'Alessandro said that they had an incomplete plan and that they could not evaluate it without knowing if there were steps or not. Ms. Schmitt stated that she thought that the steps were at the end of the hallway of the apartment building's ground floor, to which Ms. Gutterman responded that the ramp was not needed if the hallway did not lead into a unit. Ms. Gregorzek commented that the ramp would not lead into a unit, but rather an area of the apartment building that had mailboxes. Ms. Stein asked if there was an elevator in the building and stated that she doubted there was. Ms. Gregorzek said she did not know, and repeated that when they reached out to the Department about code and accessibility, this is what they had been told. Ms. Stein stated that she could actually see the steps in one of the photographs in the application. Mr. D'Alessandro said that, from the standpoint of the Architectural Committee, the ramp and railing had to be removed until proven otherwise.

Ms. Gutterman told the applicant that she could continue to address the other comments. Ms. Gregorzek began by explaining that her client was planning on retaining the vestibule area for servicing the machine, and that the glass would be glazed, per comments they had received previously from the Architectural Committee. Ms. Gutterman and Ms. Stein requested further detail about the glazing. Ms. Gregorzek said that they were intending on changing the glass so that you could no longer see into the vestibule; however, she could not specify the treatment. She explained that in preparing the application, she had been more concerned about the banner and the surround of the ATM since that is what the Architectural Committee members had commented on the last time. Ms. Stein informed Ms. Gregorzek that those details were actually quite important to the Architectural Committee because it was their task to look at projects at a greater level of detail since the Historical Committee does not spend as much time reviewing each application. She went on to explain that the treatment of the glass is important because they do not want to create empty urban spaces. Ms. Stein continued that in a city it is really important not to look inside and see ladders and other things that are not contributing in a positive way to the public realm, so whether the glass will have a frit or some kind of a film, are important details for the Architectural Committee to understand and they need to be shown on the drawings. Ms. Gutterman asked if the enclosure around the ATM could be made narrower, to which Ms. Gregorzek responded that they were working with pre-fabricated ATMs, so she did not think it could be made narrower. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro informed Ms. Gregorzek that they needed plans that showed more detailed information about the materials, colors, and dimensions.

Ms. Gregorzek asked the members what they thought about the color and design of the banner, to which Ms. Gutterman replied that she did not know what it meant on the drawings and that she needed to see a physical sample. Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the canopy was so big, and Ms. Gregorzek responded that at their last appearance before the Architectural Committee, they had proposed a shorter awning to be installed only over the ATM, but they were told that a longer banner would be more aesthetically pleasing and that the red color was too much. She informed the members that she had a sample of the tan banner they were proposing, as well as a brown one as back up, and that she also had renderings showing what a shorter banner over just the ATM unit would look like, based on the comments they had received in the past. Ms. Gutterman asked if there was an existing awning, and Ms. Gregorzek confirmed that the longer length awning was existing. Ms. Gregorzek was joined by her colleague, Kerrie Silsbie, who added that the new awning is the same size as the existing one, but it will be a new color. Ms. Gregorzek explained to her colleague that they had already discussed the need for more detail about the glazing, and that the Architectural Committee members recommend that both the ramp and railing be removed. Ms. Gutterman stated that they were approved in order to do the ATM, and not for access to the building, to which Ms. Silsbie responded that ADA access cannot be reduced per code. Ms. Gutterman explained that the problem was that there are steps inside so the ramp was not installed for accessibility to this building. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he could see the steps in one of the photographs. Mr. D'Alessandro told the applicants that they needed to have a set of plans showing the demolition of the ramp and the railings, and plans for the entrance door and the interior vestibule. Ms. Gutterman added that the railing's current location will impact the new ATM. Ms. Silsbie stated that there were existing steps if someone did not want to use the ramp, to which Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro responded that there were steps once through the entry door in the interior of the building. Ms. Silsbie said that per code and the Department of Licenses & Inspections, the ramp could not be removed. Mr. D'Alessandro replied that the applicants had not shown the Department of

Licenses & Inspections enough information, including floor elevations of the first floor of the building. Ms. Silsbie said the Department of Licenses & Inspections will not allow the removal, and Mr. D'Alessandro replied that they do not know that because they did not provide enough information when they spoke with the examiner.

Ms. Silsbie stated that their architect would not be able to draw plans for the first floor of the building, and Mr. D'Alessandro replied that the ramp and railing would have to come out then. Ms. Silsbie and Ms. Gregorzek told the Architectural Committee members that they believed there were mailboxes on the first floor. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that they believed but they needed documentation. Ms. Silsbi offered to provide the members with the section of the code that states that accessibility to a building cannot be reduced. Mr. McCoubrey said that they knew the code. Mr. D'Alessandro said that the members knew the code, but the applicants were not proving compliance with it. Ms. Silsbie tried to clarify that since the ramp leads to a space where there are stairs and no elevator, the ramp cannot be removed. Mr. D'Alessandro repeated that they needed to provide an plan of the first floor of the building in relationship to the ramp, and in relationship to the sidewalk. Ms. Silsbie said that maybe they could reach out to the property owner, because their client only had access to the ATM vestibule area per their lease, which is why their architect does not have any plans for the other area. Ms. Gutterman commented that they could take a photograph through the door, because the stairs are visible from there.

Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Baron if something was installed because of a particular use, and the use goes away, was there any precedent to require that the feature be removed? Mr. Baron replied that the Historical Commission has the ability to condition approvals per the ordinance; however, he could not say whether there was a precedent for a case like this. Ms. Gutterman stated that it was her understanding that the ramp was strictly added not for accessibility to the building which the applicants may now be trying to grandfather in, but rather strictly for purposes of getting into the ATM. Mr. Baron agreed. Ms. Gutterman continued, saying that, if the ATM was removed, then everything else that was installed as a part of it should also be removed. Ms. Silsbie responded that she did not think that was correct, and Mr. Baron added that he did not know the answer to the question. Ms. Gutterman told the applicant that if they now wanted to keep the ramp to access the building, they would need to return with a new application and seek approval again. Ms. Silsbie stated that she thought that, even if access is being provided to a secondary space after the original reason for the ramp is removed, it cannot be removed. Ms. Gutterman responded that a ramp that provides access to mailboxes on the first floor is not necessarily the same thing as providing access to the building. Ms. Gutterman added that should the ramp and railing remain, the location of the railing will impact the installation of the new ATM because the side closest to the building extends in front of the where the new ATM would be located. Ms. Silsbie stated that she thought that part of that railing was going to be removed, to which Ms. Gutterman replied that they could not do that because the ramp is too wide not to have railings on both sides. She added that they could not pick and choose which parts of the code they wanted to follow. Ms. Silsbie pointed out that a note on the plans shows that the proposal is to remove the existing handrail. Ms. Gutterman responded that it was not clear.

Mr. McCoubrey said that they had already asked if there was public comment and there was none. Ms. Gutterman suggested a recommendation of denial owing to the incompleteness of the application, and that further information was needed about materials, clarification of the cut

of the ATM and its proposed materials, the removal of stucco, clarification of the interior and exterior elevations, more detail about what is proposed for the ramp and railing, clarification about how the glazing will be treated, details on how the awning will be anchored to the building, and the location and anchoring system for any cameras and lightning.

Ms. Silsbie asked the Architectural Committee members if they could make any suggestions for what they would approve. Ms. Stein responded that they were not able to design projects and that their job was to respond to the applications in front of them. Mr. McCoubrey added that he wanted to reiterate the staff's concern about the varying widths of the storefront glass panels and the recommendation that a new system that better respects the mullions above be installed. Mr. Baron said that looking for a way to make the material around the new ATM more narrow could help. Ms. Gutterman added that perhaps it could allow them to impact just one window rather than 1-¼ of a window. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that, if the applicant took the center lines of the windows above and just transferred them down, they could determine the storefront configuration based on that, it could make everything work.

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

**ADDRESS: 1834 DELANCEY PL**

Proposal: Replace windows; construct roof deck, elevator shaft, additions at rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Barbara Eberlein

Applicant: Barbara Eberlein, Eberlein Design Consultants, LTD.

History: 1855

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to remove a rear bay and replace several arch-top casement windows on the rear façade. In the location of the bay, the application proposes to construct an elevator tower and some infill of the piazza. The plans also call for a roof deck and pilothouse on the main block of the house. The Historical Commission's staff has reviewed a mock-up to determine the setback needed to ensure that the rooftop additions will not be visible from Delancey and 19<sup>th</sup> Streets. The application also proposes inserting a garage in the rear façade along an alley and replacing windows.

Although it is barely visible from the alley, the removal of the bay does not comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Similar garages have been approved for many properties on this block of the alley. Additional details are needed for the proposed replacement windows on the front façade; the windows require a subframe, but it is unclear whether the subframe can be inserted behind the existing frame and brickmold.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the garage; approval of the pilothouse and deck, provided that they are not visible from the public right-of-way and do not require the extension of the front chimney; denial of the elevator tower and window replacement, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. John Toates and Patrick McDonough, architects and owner Barbara Eberlein represented the application.

Mr. Toates showed the Architectural Committee members the interior plan of the house and explained that the proposed location for the elevator is the only one that makes sense with the layout of the space. He said that, although it requires the removal of the metal bay, the bay is neither highly visible nor is it original to the house. He presented a draft letter from consultant John Carr to say that it is made up of stock parts from the early twentieth century. He also explained that the arched windows that they wish to remove date from the 1940s. On the question of replacement windows, they wish to remove the existing original front windows and replace them with Lepage units as they have also done on two other houses on the block; those windows were approved by the Historical Commission. They pointed to their detail drawings showing that the windows will match the existing and only reduce total glass size by about one half of an inch. They promised that they would retain and reuse the existing shutter hardware. Mr. Toates showed his color renderings of the proposed additions. He explained that, if he were to place the elevator within the study, it would block the bay from the inside and destroy the panelling in that room. He made a case that the building should be allowed to evolve.

The discussion shifted to the windows at the rear. Mr. Toates showed a photograph of the arched windows at the rear and noted that they were not original or very old, but resulted from a change within what one might call the period of significance. He acknowledged that the arched windows were not part of the original architecture of the house and would require reconstruction to make them more functional. He said that there is a spandrel panel above them and they do not fill the entire opening. He said that the proposed windows fit the building better. Mr. McCoubrey noted that this block of Panama Street is a street of many garages but no fronts of buildings. Mr. Baron clarified that the bay is only visible from Panama Street, but that the arched rear windows in question are visible from both Panama and 19<sup>th</sup> Streets.

Ms. Stein asked about proposed balconies shown on one drawing. Mr. Toates replied that one of the balconies had been deleted from the design.

Mr. Toates pointed out that the neighboring building has an elevator tower. Mr. McCoubrey asked if it is necessary to extend the elevator up to the fourth floor. Mr. Toates asserted that the elevator shaft would be less noticeable if it is the same height as the building. He added that there is a need for an elevator that reaches all floors. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the age of the bay. Mr. Baron reported that it is not original, but has achieved its own significance. The Architectural Committee members complimented Mr. Toates on his level of presentation.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the potential visibility of the proposed roof deck and pilothouse from the public right-of-way. Mr. Baron explained that he visited the site to assess the visibility of a mockup. The original proposal, which was set back about six feet from the front façade, was visible from the street. After moving the mockup back about four feet, it was no longer visible from the street. Ms. Gutterman also inquired about the potential visibility of the proposed HVAC equipment from the street. Mr. Toates responded that it is proposed to be located along the party wall in the least visible location. Mr. Baron noted that the staff recommended conditioning any approval on the deck and pilothouse not being visible from the street and not resulting in the

extending of the front chimneys. Mr. Baron pointed out that the deck is shown with planters with tall trees, which would be visible from the street. Mr. Toates said that many people have tall plantings, but offered that they could keep the plantings low.

Ms. Stein asserted that the elevator should not have an override and not extend above the parapet. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the elevator shaft could be clad in metal. Mr. Toates said that he thought it should be brick to better match the existing building. Mr. McCoubrey said that he approved of the elevator addition, but that he thought that the arched windows should not be removed. Ms. Eberlein opined that arched windows were not graceful because they do not occupy the entirety of the masonry opening. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the condition of the windows. Mr. Toates replied that they were inexpensive windows and that there are gaps between the windows, frames, and openings. Mr. Baron reported that storm windows have been installed over them. Mr. Toates said that the glass in the arched windows is not special glass, but is merely obscure glass.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the rooftop additions are not visible from the public right-of-way and do not require extension of the chimneys; that the front replacement windows replicate the appearance of the historic windows; and that the front window shutter hardware is retained; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

**ADDRESS: 109 ELFRETHS ALY**

Proposal: Remove non-historic addition; construct additions and roof deck; replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Burgundy & Gold Properties, LLC

Applicant: Alvin Holm, Alvin Holm AIA Architects

History: 1798, John Pechin House

Individual Designation: 6/26/1956

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to demolish a non-historic addition and construct a new addition at this house at the east end of Elfreth's Alley. The property is located at the northeast corner of N. Front Street and Elfreth's Alley. Front Street was relocated when I-95 was constructed. The Historical Commission approved a small, one-story addition to the side of the rear ell in 1988. The Historical Commission approved the larger rear addition in 2005 and it was constructed in 2008. The house was abandoned at about the time of the completion of the larger addition and sat empty for many years, suffering from water infiltration, mold, and deterioration.

The proposed addition would replace the non-historic additions. A three-story section of the addition would be constructed on Elfreth's Alley, to the east of the historic building, on an open lot. The three-story section facing Elfreth's Alley would be set back and slightly lower than the main block of the historic house to leave the original roofline exposed. It would be red brick and follow the fenestration and beltcourse of the existing structure. Certain details such as the materials and placement of windows on the Front Street side would differentiate the addition from the historic building, while allowing it to be compatible. A one-story link addition would

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 JANUARY 2018**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

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

**16**



replace the existing link addition and lead to a two-story rear section of the addition. The application offers three alternates for the rear portion of the addition, but the architect prefers the cross gable design shown on drawing 8C. The plans propose to retain the original house and the east wall of the rear ell exposed to public view. The application proposes to rebuild the roof of the rear ell and to recover the entire roof with Timberline asphalt shingles.

The current proposal design has taken into account the comments of Historical Commission at its December 2017 meeting. At that time, the Commissioners suggested that the additions should be less grand in massing and detail than originally proposed and that the second-floor east wall of the rear ell should be exposed. The Commissioners also rejected the proposed front dormer and a transom over the front door.

The Philadelphia Archeological Forum has submitted a letter requesting that the owner protect archeological resources, but no specific resources were identified. The Historical Commission has not typically required homeowners to undertake archaeological investigations when erecting additions. The property owner is discussing the request with the Archeological Forum.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided that as much of the rear ell roof structure is retained as possible and that the owner continue to confer with the Philadelphia Archeological Forum, with the staff to review details, pursuant Standards 9 and 10.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Alvin Holm, owner John Moore, and engineer Elizabeth Springer represented the application.

Mr. Moore explained that he contacted Douglas Mooney of the Archeological Forum, who sent him a list of archeologists able to consult on the project. The site has had a previous archeological dig with the construction of I-95. Mr. Moore said that he has enjoyed the research and will continue to confer with Mr. Mooney. Ms. Gutterman asked about the materials and changes to the design since the last meeting. Mr. Holm said that the owner inspired the revisions. He noted that he is pleased with the final design. They have reduced the height of the rear addition from three to two stories. He displayed a model he constructed to demonstrate their preferred roof configuration. Mr. Baron explained that previously the applicant proposed to demolish the roof and side wall of the rear ell; however, in this revised design, the applicant proposes to retain it. Mr. McCoubrey noted that they have moved the mass from the side of the ell to the “dog patch” park on Elfreths Alley. Mr. Baron reported that the staff supports the new design, but with the suggestion that, as they reconstruct the roof on the rear ell, they retain as much historic fabric as possible. Ms. Springer remarked that the roof is in very poor condition. In response to Ms. Gutterman’s question, the owner indicated that they will retain the existing skylight. Mr. D’Alessandro asked about the roof gutter system on the front roof. Mr. Holm said that it will be placed in the notch between the new and old construction. Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment, of which there was none. Mr. McCoubrey thanked the applicant for his flexibility in the design of this addition.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that as much of the rear ell roof structure is retained as possible and that the owner continue to confer with the Philadelphia Archeological Forum, with the staff to review details, pursuant Standards 9 and 10.

**ADDRESS: 2108 GREEN ST**

Proposal: Replace door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Alexandra and Nicholas Volpe

Applicant: Alexandra Volpe

History: Built c. 1859; alterations to front entrance

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-683-4682

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to replace the front door located at 2108 Green Street. The present door was installed without a building permit or the Historical Commission's review and a violation was issued. An application for a new door was approved by staff on 12 December 2017. The property owner decided not to install the approved door and submitted this new application, proposing a door without the detailing of the approved or historic door.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owners Alexandra and Nicholas Volpe represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey requested clarification on which door design was originally approved on 12 December 2017 for 2108 Green Street. Ms. Mehley pointed out the pages showing the approved panel door (Dallas Millwork Inc.) and Mr. Baron pointed out the historic photograph of Green Street that showed an appropriate 4-panel door design with bolection molding on an Italianate row house.

Ms. Gutterman asked the owner if she does not like the approved door. Ms. Volpe responded that the new proposal was made to look just like the approved door, that the only change was it would be manufactured by a different vendor. Ms. Gutterman stated that the Committee does not care who manufactures it as long as it looks like the approved door. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the application that is being reviewed is different than the one approved by staff on 12 December 2017. He commented that, even though it is a four-panel, it does not have the moldings or profiles that the more original doors would have.

Mr. Baron explained to the owner that bolection molding is a kind of a molding that projects outside beyond the stiles and rails and that the proposed door under review is a kind of raised panel door. Ms. Volpe acknowledged that she understood. Mr. Baron commented that the proposed design did not contain bolection molding and that it was not an issue of a different vendor rather it is a matter of different design. Ms. Volpe stated that she believed that she submitted drawings that matched the approved design. Ms. Volpe pointed out the cross section drawing. Mr. Baron and Ms. Mehley noted that there was a cross section drawing submitted for the new door but it did not match the approved design as the moldings are not projecting. Ms. Stein remarked that the new vendor, Lemieux, may be able to manufacture the approved door and then it could be approved by staff and the application would not have to come before the Architectural Committee again. Ms. Stein added that it would need to look like the original and approved door and needs to match the profiles. Ms. Gutterman stressed that the new

manufacturer would need to make a door that mimics all these details. She referenced the Dallas Millwork drawing showing the design approved on approved 12 December 2017.

Ms. Volpe asked again if the new manufacturer can be considered. Ms. Gutterman restated that a new manufacturer can be used as long as they can make the door with approved details. She referred to the proposed door drawing (Lemieux Doors Inc.) and noted that the details shown are not as refined as what is shown in the approved (Dallas Millwork Inc.) details. Ms. Volpe confirmed that she understood Ms. Gutterman's explanation.

Ms. Volpe countered that she was given other addresses by the Historical Commission staff to mimic and one of the addresses was 2130 Mount Vernon and it did not have beveling like the approved door. Ms. Stein noted that 2130 Mount Vernon may or may not have come in front of the Historical Commission so it may not be an approved door. She stated that the Committee is only looking at the owner's property. Ms. Stein further commented that the owner bought in a beautiful neighborhood and bought the property because of the character of this block. Ms. Stein pointed out that it is the Architectural Committee's and Historical Commission's purview to make sure that that character is upheld. Ms. Stein noted that it is all in the details and the details of the door itself make a difference to the Committee.

Ms. Volpe responded that she completely understood. She explained that the only reason she considered the new proposed door was because someone on the Historical Commission staff suggested using the door at 2130 Mount Vernon as a guide. Also, she needed a door that had glass for safety reasons and the door suggested by staff did not have glass. Ms. Stein responded that glass was previously approved. Ms. Volpe agreed that the glass was previously approved. Ms. Stein pointed out that one of the important things is that the approved design shows the solid molding all around the glass and all of the details that are affiliated with this door are important. Ms. Stein suggested that the new vendor may be less expensive for example and can match the detailing that was approved. Ms. Volpe responded that she will inquire if the vendor can do this.

Ms. Gutterman commented that it is preferred to have that amount of detail in the new door so that it more closely matches neighbors in context as well as the rest of the owner's house. She recommended sending the approved drawings (Dallas Millworking) to the new vendor to see if they can make it. She pointed out that the current proposal (Lemieux Doors Inc.) is a very simple streamlined door and is missing many of the decorative elements. Ms. Gutterman inquired if the glass will be installed in the top panels only. Ms. Volpe confirmed the glass will be only be installed in the top panels.

Ms. Gutterman stated that Historical Commission's staff can work with the owner to find other manufacturers who might be more local. She remarked that the staff can provide contractor names and the owner can obtain multiple quotes and that the owner will not have to come back to see to see Architectural Committee again because they can approve it at staff level. Ms. Volpe acknowledged Ms. Gutterman's remarks. The Committee members asked that applicant to work with staff on new door design that matches the door and associated detailing approved on 12 December 2017.

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

## **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.