

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

**TUESDAY, 24 APRIL 2018
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

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

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

David Fineman, PMC
Jonathan Stavin, PMC
Keith Braccia, PMC
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Heather Lutzker, GMF Contractors
Lee Deddens, MJRA
Antonio Castro
Dennis Probst
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
Seam McManus, John S McManus Inc.
Tom Gant, Cobra Electric
Christopher Arnold, WFW
Robert Flaynik, RFAA
Tim Shaaban, USD
Jim Austin, Jacobs/AT&T
John Salvatierra, Jacobs/AT&T

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 201 S 13TH ST

Proposal: Install fiberglass cornice

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Walnut Square Partners

Applicant: Keith Braccia, PMC Property Group

History: 1900; St. James Hotel; Horace Trumbauer, architect

Individual Designation: 8/2/1973

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a fiberglass replica of a balcony on the north or Walnut facade of the St. James Hotel at 13th and Walnut Streets. The original balcony, sometimes called a cornice, was terracotta with a steel frame. It was removed without a building permit or the Historical Commission's approval after it was determined to be structurally unsound and posing a public safety hazard. The property owner attempted to legalize the removal of the balcony with a financial hardship application, which claimed that it would be financially infeasible to replace the balcony in kind. After several iterations, the Historical Commission denied the application in October 2015, asserting that the applicant failed to substantiate the claim of financial hardship. The property owner appealed the denial, which was upheld by the Board of License & Inspection Review. The property owner now seeks to comply the violation with the reconstruction of the missing balcony.

The replacement balcony would be custom cast in fiberglass. The color and surface finish would match the surviving balconies on the building. The patching material that was installed on the facade where the old balcony was located will be retained in place and covered with the new balcony. The proposed balcony will be a simplified, abstracted version of the original balcony. Most of the original volumes of the balcony are represented in the current drawing. However, the console brackets, which support the balcony between the windows, have been completely flattened in the current drawing. The applicant has agreed to give the console brackets some volume and projection so that they appear to support the balcony, but the drawing has not yet been revised. The upper section of the original balcony was highly articulated with decorative reliefs. The applicant has agreed to give the flat panel areas some articulation, but, again, the drawing has not yet been revised. Finally, the applicant has agreed that the proposal is limited to the north, Walnut Street, façade. The applicant is not proposing to remove and replace other, similar balconies on the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the brackets and panels better replicate the original balcony, with the staff to review details including shapes and profiles, color, surface finish, and attachments, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney David Fineman and developers Jonathan Stavin and Keith Braccia represented the application.

Mr. Farnham explained that the applicants submitted a revised drawing of the proposed balcony that seeks to comply with the staff's recommendation. He noted that the proposed fiberglass balcony would not precisely replicate the historic balcony, but would instead be an abstracted version of it. He stated that, although not perfect, the revised design seems to adequately replicate the historic balcony.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 APRIL 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Ms. Pentz asked the applicants to point out the missing balcony in a photograph. Mr. Fineman stated that the missing balcony was located at the seventh floor on the north or Walnut Street façade. Mr. Fineman introduced photographs of surviving balconies on the building. Ms. Stein asked the applicants if they have undertaken a structural analysis of the remaining balconies. Mr. Fineman stated that they have. He noted that the City and his client have undergone a significant amount of litigation regarding the removal of the balcony. He explained that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation for another aspect of the building. When their engineers inspected the building, they discovered that the balcony in question was in very poor condition, posed an imminent danger, and needed to be removed immediately. He confirmed that the other balconies are not in such dire condition, but they are being monitored. Mr. Fineman confirmed that his client does not want to remove the other balconies; they have been inspected by engineers. Mr. McCoubrey noted that portions of the large cornice at the roofline had been removed at some point in time. Mr. Farnham explained that decorative features were removed and replaced before the building was designated. Mr. Farnham added that the balcony in question was removed relatively recently, after the City initiated the façade inspection program. The failing balcony was discovered during a façade inspection and then quickly removed. The City has never disputed that the balcony was failing and needed to be removed, but only objected to the fact that it was removed without a building permit or a plan to replace it. Mr. McCoubrey explained that the fact that the cornice on the north façade has already been replaced with an abstract replica may, in fact, argue for the replacement that is suggested.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the plan includes covering existing historic terra cotta. Mr. Fineman responded that they are not proposing to cover any historic material. Ms. Gutterman asserted that the drawing is “very misleading” and implies that they are covering historic fabric at the window heads. Mr. Fineman disagreed with Ms. Gutterman and stated that they will not cover any historic material. Mr. Farnham stated that he has reviewed the drawings with the applicants and can confirm that they are not proposing to cover any historic material, only the infill that they added after the balcony was removed. Ms. Stein stated that they should have provided two vertical sections, one through the bracket and one through the window head. Mr. Stavin stated that they are not covering any historic material. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D’Alessandro continued to express confusion. Mr. Stavin pointed out the infill that was installed when the balcony was removed and the original terra cotta at the windows. He stated again that they are only proposing to cover the new infill material, not any historic material. The Committee members objected that the drawings are not annotated with information about the new balcony material and no cover letter was submitted. Mr. Farnham explained that after the drawings were submitted, he provided a list of questions to the applicants about the materials, installation methods, and other aspects of the application, which the applicants answered in great detail. He stated that he included all of their answers to his questions, the same questions that the Committee members are now asking, in his overview of the project, which was stapled to the Committee members’ copies of the drawings. All of these questions are answered in the overview. Mr. Stavin stated that the staff will review all of the details of the project including materials, color, texture, profiles, dimensions, and attachment details. Ms. Gutterman stated that the applicants intend to cover historic material. Mr. Farnham disagreed. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the staff could review the final design to ensure it replicates the historic balcony appropriately. He suggested that the design of the volute or bracket under the balcony could be improved. It should curve out, not in, under the balcony. Mr. Cluver noted that the historic

brackets under the balcony were tapered, but those shown in the proposal are rectilinear. He asked the applicants to address that aspect of the design. Mr. D'Alessandro interrupted Mr. Cluver and stated that he could recommend approval because the drawing does not provide enough detail. Mr. Fineman responded that his client had litigated this matter for a long time and would now like to come to a solution. He explained that they intend to replicate the historic balcony as closely as possible, albeit in an abstracted manner. He offered to work with the staff to correct the minor details, but asked the Committee to concentrate on the bigger picture and advise them whether the overall scheme is acceptable. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro stated that they would support delegating the details to the staff, provided the staff reviewed a real shop drawing for the balcony as well as the installation details. Ms. Pentz remarked that Mr. D'Alessandro is a contractor and the drawing does not provide enough detail for him to construct the balcony. Mr. Stavín responded that the drawings are not intended for construction, but instead to determine whether the Historical Commission would accept the replacement of the removed balcony with an abstracted, simplified, fiberglass replica. Mr. Stavín stated that, if the Historical Commission approves of that plan, they will develop construction drawings of the balcony for the staff to review. He stated that they never intended to build something from this drawing. The drawing is a means of asking for the Historical Commission's approval for the alternate material and the simplification of the forms. If approved, the Commission's staff will have an opportunity to review real construction drawings. Mr. D'Alessandro again objected to the submission. Mr. McCoubrey disagreed with him, stating that the staff is aware of the Committee's concerns and can ensure that those concerns are satisfied with the final drawings. If the staff finds that the ultimate documentation is inadequate, it can reject the application. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Committee's charge is to advise the Commission on the abstraction and the material. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he approves of the alternate material. Mr. Cluver stated that the projection of the proposed balcony should be equivalent to that of the original. He stated that it should have the same projection as the historic balcony around the corner. Ms. Pentz asked how the applicants decided on the dimensions for the proposed balcony. Mr. Stavín stated that the architect based the proposed balcony on the surviving balconies on the building. Mr. Fineman stated that the balcony will cost about \$250,000. He noted that the projected costs for replicating the original in shape and material "was something north of seven figures." Messrs. Cluver and D'Alessandro opined that it will not significantly add to the cost to replicate the shapes correctly. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the brackets or volutes under the balcony should be more convex than concave, as they are currently shown. Mr. Cluver stated that the silhouettes should match, but the detail can be reduced. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he does not object to the abstraction or simplification.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of a simplified, fiberglass balcony, provided that no historic material is covered or removed and that the profiles better replicate the original balcony, with the staff to review a shop drawing showing the profiles and attachments, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 250 S 18TH ST

Proposal: Install aluminum windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 250 S. 18th Street Condominium Associates

Applicant: Heather Lutzker, GMI Contractors, Inc.

History: 1923; 1800 Rittenhouse; McIlvaine & Roberts, architects

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 to replace historic wood windows with aluminum windows at the second and third floors of this condominium building. The Historical Commission staff has already approved the installation of the proposed windows at floors three and above. The proposed windows closely mirror the shapes and dimensions of the existing windows, within a margin of approximately one inch at the jamb, sill, head, and meeting rail. The current windows are covered by storm windows, which would be eliminated as part of this application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Contractor Heather Lutzker and architect Lee Deddens represented the application.

Ms. Stein asked if the upper-floor windows have been installed. Mr. Deddens responded that they have not. Ms. Lutzker explained that the proposed custom windows have 14 new tooling dies, and take about 24 weeks to manufacture.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked who is completing the window installation. Ms. Lutzker responded that her company, GMI Contractors, is installing the windows. Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concerns about the constructability of the windows. He directed attention to drawing 4-P on page 7 and 5-P on page 8, noting that the wood profile of the existing jamb is part of the frame and not a separate piece. He expressed concerns over the method of fastening to the limestone at the joint. Mr. Cluver commented that, on a similar line, he is concerned about the installation of two dissimilar materials adjacent to one another and the differential motion of those materials. Mr. Deddens clarified that the exact joint is unknown because they have not yet conducted any exploratory demolition. He agreed that they need to be careful about the installation, but advised the Committee members not to take the joints shown in the existing conditions drawings literally. Mr. Deddens offered to conduct exploratory demolition of one of the rear windows to determine the exact conditions. Ms. Lutzker noted that they have also looked into creating a custom clip, but that they need to pull disassemble a window in order to see the conditions.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the precedent of installing metal windows at the second and third floors, suggesting that the Committee usually recommends the use of wood windows in the base of a building. She argued that windows at the second and third floors are easily maintainable and questioned why they would be allowed to remove the historic fabric. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff was split on its recommendation, but ultimately felt that since the building is contributing and not significant to the district, and is not individually designated, combined with the close replication of the wood windows in metal, that the proposal satisfied Standard 6. Standard 6, she noted, calls for the repair rather than replacement of

deteriorated features, but where deterioration is severe enough to warrant replacement, that the new feature resemble the old in design, color, texture, and, if possible, materials. Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the windows themselves are failing. Mr. Deddens and Ms. Lutzker responded affirmatively. Ms. Lutzker explained that they ran air testing on the second and third-floor windows, and that there is also rotting on the lower-floor windows. Mr. Deddens noted that the windows are so leaky that they did not even register. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that that is common for double-hung windows, and that there is no reason that the sash only could not be replaced.

Mr. Deddens noted that one of their other concerns is consistency of the windows between the floors. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the existing windows are the same on the second and third floors as the upper floors. Ms. Lutzker responded affirmatively. Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the windows do not necessarily need to match, but that the Committee is looking at the removal of historic fabric. Ms. Lutzker noted that there are projects where they have used wood at the first few floors, and others where they have used aluminum from the ground up. Ms. Lutzker noted that the first floor has retail windows that are different than the upper floors.

Mr. Cluver asked whether the openings had storm windows at the time of designation. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she did not know for certain, but that she imagines so. Mr. Cluver replied that the storm windows would be allowed to remain or be replaced. Ms. DiPasquale agreed, noting that the staff approves storm windows. Mr. Cluver opined that the "wood-ness" of the windows is already lost because it is obscured by the metal storm windows, and argued that it would be worse to restore or replace the second and third-floor windows with wood and then cover them with storm windows. He agreed with the applicant that, when this building was designed and built, the windows were intended to be the same from the second floor up. He opined that the use of the proposed windows is more in keeping with the original design than having different windows at different levels. Ms. Gutterman argued that, if the proposed windows are such a good match for the historic windows, there should not be any difference. She opined that one would not notice the difference between the existing and proposed windows when scanning up the building, but would notice if the lower-floor windows were not wood.

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

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

ADDRESS: 1517 GREEN ST

Proposal: Construct four-story building with roof deck

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: SPD Investments LLC

Applicant: Jason Christiansen, Morrissey Design LLC

History: Vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a new four-story building in the Spring Garden Historic District. At the time of the district's designation, 1517 Green Street was a vacant lot. The building will be a multi-family with four residential units, and will have a basement and a roof deck. The proposed setback and height will be appropriately integrated into the existing row. The applicant proposes that the new building's details will match the adjacent building, 1515 Green Street.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked how many units a building can include without being subject to accessibility requirements. Mr. Cluver answered that a building can include four units.

Mr. Cluver observed that the note on the elevation drawing states that new windows are to match the adjacent property and indicated that the windows do not match the adjacent property. Ms. Keller stated that the applicant is proposing wood two-over-two double-hung sash windows and referred the Committee to the detail drawings at the back of the application.

Mr. McCoubrey asked Ms. Keller about the pilot house's visibility. Ms. Keller responded that she is relatively unfamiliar with the application and does not know how visible the proposed pilot house would be. She stated that she was unable to determine the setback of the roof deck, and Ms. Stein added that the pilot house would be set back 29 feet. Ms. Keller clarified that the application includes the setback of the pilot house but not of the deck. Ms. Gutterman questioned the location of the mechanical equipment, and Mr. Cluver responded that the mechanical equipment is represented in the roof deck plan.

Mr. Cluver questioned whether a parapet is proposed, adding that it is difficult to judge the visibility of the deck. He opined that the roof likely extends from the top of the cornice and noted that the application does not include information on the railing material or setback. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the adjacent building is lower.

Mr. McCoubrey requested a sight-line study to show that the deck and pilot house would be minimally visible. Ms. Gutterman questioned the relationship of the building's cornice with the adjacent cornice to the west. She suggested that it be either aligned or more offset from the neighboring cornice. She added that the application needs more details and information on materials. Mr. Cluver recommended that the building be taller, clarifying that the first story

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 APRIL 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

should be increased in height. He compared the height of the windows sills to the adjacent buildings, noting that they are lower. Mr. McCoubrey observed that each floor is 9 feet in height.

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

Mr. Cluver asked what the guideline would be for the deck's visibility. Ms. Gutterman replied that it should be inconspicuous as opposed to invisible. Ms. Keller reminded the Committee that the application is a review-and-comment application.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the second-story windows were larger than the first-story windows. The Committee members discussed the window sizes and measured the drawings to confirm that the windows at the first and second stories are the same size. Ms. Gutterman questioned the accuracy of the elevation drawing, and the Committee subsequently discussed potential inaccuracies in the drawing's details. Mr. Cluver observed that the basement window extends into the first floor.

Ms. Stein suggested that the Committee recommend that the windows be aligned with the windows of the adjacent four-story structure. If the windows were raised to align with the heads of the adjacent property's windows, she continued, it would realign the whole building and allow it to participate in the rhythm of the block. Mr. McCoubrey added that the cornice should appear as an extension of the adjacent cornice. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the cornice material has been identified. Ms. Keller responded that the application does not indicate material.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee offered the following comments:

- the roof deck should be revised to be less conspicuous, set back from the front façade, and have a simple metal railing;
- the height of the first story should be increased, increasing the building's overall height and allowing the windows and cornice to align with the adjacent building;
- the positioning of the basement window should be revised, so it does not intrude on the floor level above; and
- the material of the cornice and door trim should be identified.

ADDRESS: 318 S 4TH ST

Proposal: Construct second-floor rear addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Mary Morrisette

Applicant: Mary Morrisette

History: 1970; Nancy Grace House; Stonorov & Haws, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmit@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to construct a second-story rear addition on this 1970 building at the corner of South 4th and Cypress Streets, which is classified as contributing in the Society Hill Historic District. The addition extends from the rear roof slope and appears to be clad in red brick. No changes are proposed for the front of the building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 APRIL 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Two in-concept applications for this building have been reviewed recently by the Architectural Committee. A June 2017 application proposed a three-and-a-half story colonial-style building at this site. The Committee recommended denial, and encouraged the applicant to submit an application that did not propose demolition of character-defining features. The application was withdrawn prior to review by the Historical Commission. A December 2017 application proposed demolition of portions of the building, and construction of an addition to create a three-and-a-half story modern building with metal panel bays, using some of the existing building as a base. The Commission voted to deny that application, owing to the prohibition against demolition and because it did not satisfy the Standards, and suggested that the applicant propose a plan that did not radically change the building.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Antonio Castro represented the application.

Ms. Stein asked Mr. Castro if he wanted to add anything to the staff's overview. He replied that the new concept was based, in part, by input from some of the neighbors. Mr. Castro explained that one suggested instead of building higher and changing the roofline, that they instead expand the basement to acquire the square footage that they needed, and then just build an addition at the second floor. Mr. Castro explained that they took the new roofline at the second story into great consideration, so as not to impact the natural light into the next door neighbor's home. He clarified that he had not been involved in the design of the previous in-concept applications.

Ms. Stein asked the applicant if he was proposing to dig down beneath the existing building. Mr. Castro responded that there is a partial basement and a crawl space, and they are excavating to enlarge the basement, instead of building higher.

Ms. Pentz asked if some of the existing brick was being removed from the wall at the backyard, to which Mr. Castro replied that it was, but with the intention of reusing it. Ms. Pentz asked where he intended to reuse the brick, and Mr. Castro explained that it would be used to build a wall at the location of the means of egress from the basement out into the backyard. He said he planned to build a masonry wall and finish it with the original brick so that the new wall would conform with the character of the house.

Ms. Stein stated that it was very difficult to tell from the plans what is existing and what is proposed because everything on the drawings was the same coloration. She informed the applicant that the Architectural Committee was used to reviewing plans that show the existing conditions and then plans that show the proposal, so that they can really tell what is going to be altered. Ms. Stein said that the drawings were challenging to review. Mr. Castro told Ms. Stein that they had done a study model of the proposal and asked if he could show it to the Architectural Committee. The members said yes, and Mr. Castro displayed a cardboard model of the proposed design.

Mr. Castro then walked the Architectural Committee through the model, first pointing out the existing next-door neighbor's home. He then went on to explain what was being altered at the

front façade. Mr. Castro removed a piece of the model to show what the new, lowered basement would look like. Mr. Cluver asked if a stair was being added, and if the shed roof was part of the new addition. Mr. Castro confirmed that this was correct, and that a skylight was being added to provide light, and that the new stair would be a means of egress. Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant if the work had already started, to which he responded it had not. He explained that he already had a demolition permit, but that he did not want to start anything without permission. Ms. Gutterman asked if Mr. Castro already had permission for the addition's roof, to which he responded no.

Ms. Stein requested that Mr. Castro put the model back together so they could continue reviewing the proposed changes. Mr. Cluver remarked that changes to more modern buildings were always challenging because they tended to have very pure geometries, noting that one of the strong features of this property was the double shed roof with the clerestory separating them, and adding an addition with a traditional gable interferes with the reading of that clear geometry. He remarked that because it was held back slightly, it was possible to still get a sense of what was originally there. Mr. Castro commented that they wanted to preserve the clerestory also in order to provide light into the bedroom.

Ms. Gutterman said that the change proposed to the wall was troubling because it was basically converting a site wall into a building wall and resting a structure on top, which alters the understanding of the house as an object within the frame created by the wall. Mr. Castro responded that the proposed change to the wall kept the height the same as existing, to which Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro responded that he was changing the use of the wall. Ms. Gutterman continued, remarking that, currently, there is a building that was surrounded by a wall, similar to an object within a frame. She said that Mr. Castro is now proposing to incorporate that frame into the building, thus changing the perception of this very visible building. She stated that the building is on a corner, not mid-block, making it highly visible.

Mr. Cluver remarked that, currently, the one-story piece at the back had a flat roof with a very strong, white, horizontal band around it, which was replicating what was happening at the front of the house. He said that the dialogue between the front and the back would be lost if the alterations were made as proposed. Mr. Cluver told the applicant that, compared to what they had seen before, the current proposal was a marked improvement on how it handled the massing. However, some of the detailing and some of what made the building what it was, was still being lost.

Ms. Schmitt asked the applicant if the roof of the addition had always been proposed as a gabled roof, directing him to drawing D-4. She said she may have misunderstood because she had thought the proposal was for a flat roof. Mr. Castro confirmed that the proposal had always been for a gabled roof.

Mr. Cluver asked if the footprint of the original house was being expanded other than at the location of the proposed stair. Mr. Castro confirmed that it was not.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that there were some discrepancies between the model and what was shown on the plans. Mr. Castro stated that the model had been produced based on his original concept, but, by the time they produced the drawings, they realized that they could lower the

roof. He said that he is proposing a cathedral ceiling with closets on either wall, which allows him to lower the roof, which is not reflected in the model they are looking at.

Mr. Cluver asked what is happening to the chimney, to which Mr. Castro responded that it is to remain. He informed the Architectural Committee that it was not on the model because the model was really to study the massing.

Ms. Gutterman remarked that something did not look right, saying that the elevations appeared to be inaccurate. She asked Mr. Castro whether the study model was more accurate than the plans they were reviewing, to which he responded that the plans were more accurate. He stated that the study model had been made just to see the massing, and they had almost decided not to bring it to the meeting since the plans had changed. Ms. Gutterman asked what the head height of the new master bedroom would be. He replied that that was why he was proposing a cathedral ceiling. Ms. Gutterman asked what the head height was at the eaves, and if there would be enough head height when a person was getting out of bed, to which he responded six feet. Ms. Gutterman remarked that it looked low based on the plans. Mr. Castro explained that was why he had made the side walls the closets. Mr. McCoubrey told the applicant that he could tell that he had taken an effort to keep the roof low.

Ms. Stein asked the applicant if the skylight over the stair was on the existing structure or on the addition. Mr. Castro indicated on the model that the skylight would be at the entrance court, and Ms. Stein responded that that meant there would be an expansion to the footprint. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the skylight could be lowered so that it would be less visible, to which Mr. Castro replied yes. Ms. Stein noted that, if the skylight could be removed entirely, it would retain the original wall condition. Mr. Cluver asked why a second stair was needed at all since there was already a stair to the basement. Mr. Castro explained that it was just to have a second means of egress. Ms. Gutterman asked if there were any windows in the room that would be built in the basement, to which Mr. Castro responded that there was one at the front of the house. He said that there was also the possibility of taking the pond that was in the back yard, and creating a light well for the basement.

Mr. Cluver said that the floor plan showed the master bedroom extending all the way to Cypress Street, but the model showed it stopping, and then there was the shed roof over the stair. Mr. Cluver stated that he was seeing discrepancies between the model and the floor plans, and he did not understand how the location of the bathroom would work as proposed.

Mr. Cluver told the applicant that there were a lot of details to work out. He said that he thought that perhaps the concept of the addition was going in the right direction, and that it might be something they could work with. However, there are many details missing that are leaving many things unsettled, and Mr. Castro agreed. Mr. McCoubrey said that he believed that it was the concept of the addition that was the big question for the Architectural Committee, as well as the issue of what happens along the side from the view from Cypress Street. Ms. Gutterman remarked that there were certain buildings that she thought should just be left alone, and that given the visibility of this house, she thought this was one of them. She said that she was still troubled by the concept of trying to put this object on the back of this house, because there was no way to make it inconspicuous. Mr. Castro explained that the house was currently only a one-bedroom and that the owners wanted to live in the house. Ms. Gutterman said that she understood, but that they could just build down and have a stair that accessed the basement

instead of trying to bridge between the stair and the site wall. She remarked that that could be one way to gain more space for the owners and that could be acceptable to her. She continued that, as currently proposed, she was troubled by the skylight coming from the building to the site wall, and by the changes to the site wall and how they impacted the negative space at this corner. Ms. Gutterman said that she was troubled by the proposed addition because she did not think that the plans really match the existing conditions, which meant that the applicant could end up with an asymmetrical object on the back of this building. She continued on, saying that without knowing all of the details of how this would work and if it would work, she could not personally recommend approval.

Mr. Cluver said that one of the things, along with losing the skylight over the stair, is that the one-story piece in the back that has that strong horizontal band is an important element that should be retained. Mr. Castro replied that one of the concepts that they had considered had the stair exposed to the elements but then they decided to try and protect the stair from the weather. He said that there was another entrance on the side through the living room, from the car port, so he added a landing so that a person could either go down stairs or go into the living room. Mr. Cluver replied that he still questioned the need for the second stair. Ms. Stein said that she believed that, if the space was a bedroom, some sort of exit would be required, whether it was a window or a stair. Mr. Cluver asked if the existing stair was too narrow to comply, to which Mr. Alessandro replied that code requires two ways out. Mr. Castro explained that there is already an exit window at the front, but, since they were expanding the living space at the basement level, they would need a better egress.

Ms. Stein commented that the gabled roof that was being proposed was in conflict with the very planar quality of the original building, and though a gabled roof might let additional light into the adjacent property, it does not do the building itself a service. She went on to say that, because this is such a high profile building with views from all corners, it could not be hidden. Mr. Castro replied that he understood Ms. Stein's point. Ms. Stein said that she thought a flat roof profile would be more in keeping with that original geometry.

Mr. Castro told the Architectural Committee that he had tried to reach out to the Society Hill Civic Association once he had his study model, and that his purpose at the meeting was to obtain the association's comments. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the study model had been very helpful.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if there were any further comments from the members of the Architectural Committee, and there were none. He then asked if there were any comments from the public. Bob Careless introduced himself as the attorney for the next-door neighbor at 320-28 S. 4th Street, Herb Gunther. He said that his client's property was actually partially shown on the study model. Mr. Careless said that he would not repeat many of the concerns that had already been made, but that someone had said that there were certain buildings that should just be left alone, and he noted that his client still had a continued concern about sunlight being blocked by an addition's roof. He pointed out that the study model did not show that Mr. Gunther had a set of skylights just below the second story that would also be impacted by the addition. He stated that his client was also concerned about his view, given the issues that had already been raised about the adverse impact an addition of this size would have on the character of the subject property. Mr. Careless added that Mr. Gunter also had concerns about the basement to the

extent that the excavation could have an impact on his property. Mr. Careless then thanked the Architectural Committee for its time.

Paul Boni introduced himself as the Chairman of the Zoning and Historic Preservation Committee for the Society Hill Civic Association and thanked the Architectural Committee for the opportunity to speak. He said that the applicant had reached out to the association, but that they had not yet been able to meet, which was not the fault of the applicant, adding that he appreciated the outreach. Mr. Boni explained that his committee had not yet been able to form an opinion, so he said he would offer some of his own observations. He remarked that this was a difficult application because the property was so visible from three sides. Mr. Boni stated that the current house fit so nicely into its environment that it was difficult to consider making a significant change. He said that he appreciated the comments from the Architectural Committee and that it was an important discussion to have, and that he looked forward to continuing to be a part of the process. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Boni if he anticipated that his committee would meet prior to the Historical Commission meeting. Mr. Boni replied that they could try to schedule a special meeting. Mr. Cluver said that he imagined it would be very difficult for the Historical Commission to come to a decision without a recommendation from the association, to which Mr. Boni responded that they would certainly try to meet and that he would speak to the applicant. He thanked Mr. Cluver for the suggestion.

Patrick Grossi introduced himself as the Advocacy Director for the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia. He mentioned that his organization had previously commented on earlier designs for the property, and that he agreed with the Architectural Committee that the current design was a marked improvement, at least in concept, in terms of how the massing was introduced and sited. He further agreed that there were still a number of details, including the proposed gabled roof, which he said was somewhat anachronistic, though he realized part of the desire was to minimize the height for the neighbors. Mr. Grossi then asked the applicant to clarify the selective demolition plan he would follow if he received an approval. Mr. Castro explained in order to expand the basement they would need to remove certain sections of the walls, and then pour the foundation. He reminded Mr. Grossi that they intended to preserve the removed brick in order to reuse it, and also the glass from the picture window at the rear. Ms. Stein asked if the first-floor wall would be retained and whether they would dig under it to excavate and then they would go above it to build the addition, to which Mr. Castro responded yes. Ms. Gutterman added that a chimney would also be demolished, to which Ms. Stein and Mr. D'Alessandro responded that the applicant had said that the chimney would remain. Mr. Castro clarified that there was a second chimney that would be removed. Mr. Grossi thanked Mr. Castro for the clarification, and he reiterated that he was not sure if this was how an addition at this property should be pursued, but he agreed with the Architectural Committee that the proposal was still not quite there.

Mr. Castro informed the Architectural Committee that he had consulted with a structural engineer about the excavation, and was informed that he would need to put in new columns and footings. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that he understood that the excavation work could be done without any real problems, and that he did not have any concerns about that aspect. Mr. Grossi stated that he had neglected to inform the Architectural Committee that the Preservation Alliance held an easement at the neighboring property at 320-28 S. 4th Street, which is a late eighteenth-century building, making it one of the oldest buildings in the Society Hill Historic District. He stated that any excavation work that would be undertaken would have to

be done with extreme care with regard to impacts to the adjacent property. Mr. Castro said that extra care during excavation would also be necessary so as not to damage the glass window pane at the rear of the property since the owner wanted to reuse it.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if there were any further comments from the Architectural Committee, and there were none.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the Committee recommend denial of the application as presented, stating that, though not adverse to the concept of a single-story addition at the rear, the concept that was presented strayed too far from the original design intent of the building to be acceptable. He reminded the applicant of what had been raised as the most significant concerns, which were the shed roof over the stair to the basement, the loss of the horizontal band on the roof at the back, the use of a gable for the roof of the proposed addition and the loss of the second chimney. Ms. Gutterman agreed.

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

ADDRESS: 1432-36 N 2ND ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Trustees of St. Michael's Church

Applicant: Sean P. McManus, John S. McManus, Inc.

History: 1922; St. Michael's Convent; John McShain, contractor

Individual Designation: 6/2/1983

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear addition to serve as a gymnasium and multi-purpose space for LaSalle Academy. The addition will not be visible from the front of the designated building on N. 2nd Street. The addition will be clad in metal panels and include a new elevator to allow for accessibility to all classroom floors. The addition connects to the side of the historic building in such a manner that requires the alteration of only one window opening.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Contractor Sean McManus represented the application.

Mr. McManus explained that the architect was unable to attend the meeting, owing to a death in the family. Mr. McManus distributed a rendering of the project. He stated that they may look to use a cement panel called Cembrit, rather than all metal panels, for value-engineering purposes. He explained that it has similar properties as the metal panel, but is significantly less expensive, and this addition is being paid for by donations. Ms. Gutterman noted that the rendering differs slightly from the plans. Mr. McManus confirmed that the rendering is correct in that it is completely open at the first floor of the addition. The roof will be available to the children for events. There will be an elevator going up and an exit stair coming down.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 APRIL 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Mr. Cluver commented that the application could be considered incomplete because there is no roof plan or ground floor plan. Mr. McManus responded that he has full architectural plans. Ms. Chantry confirmed that Mr. McManus has a full set of construction drawings, but that she had recommended to him that he only include pages that are pertinent to the exterior appearance of the project. She provided a roof plan of the new addition, which had been submitted to the staff by a different applicant when a mechanical permit was applied for. Ms. Gutterman opined that the application as submitted is incomplete. She noted that it could still be reviewed by the Commission as planned if the missing information is included.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that his concern is where the new wall meets the historic wall, and what that joint looks like. Ms. Gutterman concurred that there should be a detail of that connection. She asked for additional information about the new flight of stairs that is landing on the historic building. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that perhaps the stair could slide back in. Ms. Stein noted that it may not even be visible from the street.

Mr. McCoubrey remarked that the addition is a nice design, and a good approach to the project. He reiterated that it is important to know how the existing building and new addition meet.

Mr. McCoubrey referenced the existing masonry wall running along the rear of the building. He suggested removing the wall and continuing the fence in its place. Ms. Gutterman suggested that openings in the wall would even help to improve it. Ms. Stein suggested something transparent.

Mr. Cluver commented that there are opportunities to better tie the new into the old with small design changes. He asked if the entire ground floor under the addition is open. Mr. McManus confirmed that it is open, and will be used as a playground.

Ms. Gutterman commented that part of the problem is that the plans do not entirely agree with the rendering. Mr. McManus responded that the rendering is an older rendering, so likely the elevation drawings are correct. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the window heads of the old and new align. She noted that simple changes such as that will make the addition look more planned. She remarked that the windows either need to align or miss by a mile. Mr. McManus agreed, and noted that the plans were done without the knowledge that this is a historically designated building. Ms. Gutterman responded that, even if it was not a historical building, the proportions still need to be correct.

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

Mr. McCoubrey suggested that there may be an opportunity to step the parapet and have the stair slide back. He asked for a drawing to understand the height of the parapets, and perhaps a section through the stair area. Mr. Cluver commented that it would be helpful to see existing plans. Mr. McCoubrey stated that Mr. McManus could make the small design changes and provide them and the missing information to the Commission. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that providing a siding sample may be helpful. Mr. McCoubrey summarized that overall it is a good approach to the project. Ms. Stein asked that the rendering be updated for the Commission meeting.

Ms. Gutterman recommended that the window heads of the new building align with the existing windows. She recommended that the applicant consider pulling the stair back on the existing building, and consider replacing the existing masonry site wall with fencing. Mr. Cluver argued that he does not see how the new addition fits into the context of the historic building. Ms. Gutterman responded that her motion was for the approval of the concept of the addition, to allow for the applicant to go before the Commission as long as he can provide the missing information so that it can be approved by the Commission. Mr. Cluver responded that he still is not sure how the design relates to the context of the historic building. Ms. Gutterman responded that it is different. Ms. Chantry noted that the Standards call for new additions to be differentiated from the old. Mr. Cluver retorted that the Standard is “differentiated,” not “different.” Ms. Chantry countered that the addition and the historic front façade on N. 2nd Street will never be seen together. She also noted that this is not a historic district. Mr. McCoubrey commented that there is also the hyphen between the existing building and new addition. Mr. D’Alessandro agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the applicant considers pulling the stair back on the existing building, aligning the window in the new building with the existing windows, and replacing the existing masonry site wall with fencing, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 111 S INDEPENDENCE E MALL

Proposal: Install first-floor exterior mechanical equipment

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bourse Mall Assoc. L.P.

Applicant: Joseph Brassell, Cobra Electric

History: 1893; Philadelphia Bourse Building; Hewitt Brothers, architects

Individual Designation: 1/26/1971

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 install exterior mechanical equipment at the southwest corner of the Bourse Building. The application includes the installation of a two-foot by three-foot fuel fill box, and 12-foot tall by one-foot in diameter generator exhaust pipe. The equipment would be located along Ranstead Street, but would be visible from S. Independence Mall East (aka S. 5th Street). The applicants have explored other alternatives, including running the duct on the interior, which would involve the removal of portions of the historic masonry. The application also proposes to install louvers in place of two basement windows on the front elevation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the mechanical equipment is painted/coated in a matte finish to match the base of the building, and the glass is removed from the windows and the louvers installed behind the existing window sash, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Christopher Arnold and Thomas Gant represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about the location of the louvers. They are shown in the areaway on 5th Street in an annotated photograph. Mr. McCoubrey asked what is prompting the current application. Mr. Arnold said that the present generator is not big enough to even power the elevators in an emergency. He said that there is a current generator on the northwest corner of the building but that that space is not large enough to hold a bigger generator. He said that existing pipes will be removed. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the fuel box could be placed below grade in a well. Mr. Arnold said that it could not because there is not enough room for the pump, which moves the fuel from the fill box to the main tank. Mr. Cluver inquired about the anchoring of the exhaust pipe to the wall. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the appearance of the pipe and whether it could receive a shell to make it smooth and paintable. Mr. Arnold said that they will develop those details and show them to the staff. Ms. Gutterman asked if the fuel oil will spew onto the stone. Mr. Arnold said that it should not. Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicants to investigate whether they could use natural gas to power the generator, avoiding most of these design issues. Mr. Arnold said that they have never installed a natural gas fired generator and that there are concerns about interruptions in service. Mr. McCoubrey said that the City has been having discussions to allow gas fired generators and that they are very reliable. Mr. McCoubrey asked about how many pipes would be installed and how high they would rise. Mr. Arnold said that this installation will not have a steel cage and that they will delete notes 19 and 20. Ms. Stein raised concerns about the gate to the areaway remaining operable to allow access to maintain the base of the building. She also asked about installing the fill tank in the well. Mr. Arnold said that they would have concerns about the fuel oil spilling in an area that was inaccessible. Mr. D'Alessandro had concerns about whether the fill tank could be lowered to the height of the column bases

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the equipment has a matte finish, the pipes are painted to match, the louvers are installed within the existing windows frames, a gas-fired generator is considered, and the fill box is lowered to 3'-2" if possible, with the staff to review details including the anchors for the pipes into the stone, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 124-26 N 2ND ST

Proposal: Construct rooftop addition and decks; rehabilitate front facade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 124 N. Second Street Development LLC

Applicant: Tim Shaaban, Urban Space Development LLC

History: 1916; C.B. Porter & Co.; Fred Roberts, engineer

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert this former commercial building for residential use. A single-story addition, roof decks, and pilothouses will be added to the roof. The rooftop modifications will be inconspicuous because large buildings on three sides obstruct views. At the front façade, the open balconies of the fire stair will be infilled with historic-looking windows to match the remainder of the façade. The windows installed in the open balconies should have

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 APRIL 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

a simple, non-historic pane configuration and should be recessed deeply in the openings. The storefront will be modified with the insertion of an additional column and a storefront system that is not based on the historic configuration. The storefront should replicate the historic configuration as seen in the historic photographs, with an asymmetrical design with the doors on the left and the large storefront window on the right. Windows on the rear façade will be reopened.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the rooftop additions, but denial of the proposed balcony windows and storefront modifications, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Randal Baron presented the application. Architect Robert Flaynick and developer Tim Shabaan represented the application.

Mr. Flaynick presented a revised design at the meeting. Mr. Baron explained that the application has been revised to better reflect the historic photographs and evidence on the building. The windows within the balconies are now shown as single panes of glass. Mr. Baron said that the applicant should work with the staff to address issues like the design of the transom. Mr. Cluver suggested that the doors should receive single panels. Mr. Baron suggested that the area below the window should include a panel. Ms. Stein suggested that the very bottom of the base should be stone to prevent water wicking up into the wood. Ms. Stein also inquired about the windows installed in the openings of the former fire stair balconies. Mr. Flaynick said that he is now showing single-pane windows. Mr. McCoubrey said that they should be further distinguished with very simple frames. Mr. Cluver said that he did not object to installing six-over-six windows in the balconies, but that he would agree with the majority regarding the windows. Mr. Flaynick offered to install a meeting rail, but all Committee members objected to that possibility. The Committee asked Mr. Flaynick to recess the new windows back in the balcony opening as far as possible while still landing the bottom of the window on the terra cotta sill.

Ms. Gutterman addressed the rooftop additions and visibility. Mr. Flaynick explained that the front of the building has a 6'-6" parapet, which will hide the rooftop additions. Mr. Cluver said that the elevator penthouse will have to be tall and may be visible. Mr. Flaynick said that they will build mock-ups for the staff to confirm that the additions will be inconspicuous.

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

Ms. Gutterman made a motion of approval of the modified drawings pursuant to Standards 9, 10 and the Roof Guidelines with the provisos that the six-over-six windows and the storefront will be wood, while the new balcony windows will be metal with thinner frames and a greater setback. The storefront will get paneled doors and a stone base. The staff will review all details for approval and a mock up to determine that the rooftop additions are inconspicuous and the mechanical equipment invisible. Mr. D'Alessandro seconded the motion.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised application, provided the six-over-six windows and the storefront are wood, the new balcony windows are metal with thinner frames and a greater setback, and the storefront has paneled doors and a stone base, with the staff to review details and mock-ups to show that the rooftop additions are inconspicuous and the mechanical equipment is invisible from the street, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 1400 JOHN F KENNEDY BLVD, CITY HALL

Proposal: Replace sign post; install cell equipment and signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: SEPTA

Applicant: Samantha Berman, Jacobs Telecommunications

History: 1871-1901; City Hall; John McArthur Jr., architect

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter a subway entry stair and sign in the courtyard of City Hall. The decorative cast iron stair would be altered with the addition of an antenna, radio box, and conduit. The antenna would be disguised as a sign very similar to the existing SEPTA sign, but raised on a taller post. The radio box would be hidden within another SEPTA sign, similar to the existing but enlarged in depth. The conduit would be run on the underside of the existing railing. When the Historical Commission's staff contacted the Department of Public Property, the Department responded that it was unaware of the project and had not authorized the work on City property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the existing railing is retained and the Department of Public Property authorizes the work, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Samantha Berman, Jim Austin and John Salvatierra off Jacobs/ATT represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicants to explain the purpose of the project. Ms. Berman said that this ATT small cell project will help provide 5G service to people in the courtyard, the subway and inside City Hall. It will give better data speeds. Ms. Stein asked how this location was identified. Ms. Berman said that they have been working with the City Streets Department on light pole installations and three of those are currently being processed. In addition, they have a system-wide agreement with SEPTA. They intend to run the conduit up the stair from the SEPTA station alongside an existing conduit. Ms. Gutterman asked if the Department of Public Property and SEPTA gave their consent to this project. She said that it is her understanding that these SEPTA stairways will be removed in the next five years. Ms. Berman said that they have been working with the SEPTA Leasing Department but that they have only reached out to the Department of Public Property in the last few days. Ms. Gutterman asked if they will be proposing a new sleeve to fit on top of the existing newel post and if that sleeve be strong enough to deal with drunken hooligans who sometimes attempt to climb posts. Ms. Berman said that they will be designing a sleeve to fit on the newel post and that they have engineers designing it for strength. She asked if this was an historical concern in the review of all projects. Ms. Berman also inquired about the review process to remove these historical entryways. The Committee members explained the process. Mr. Cluver asked why the sign on the pole is getting so much larger than the antenna. Mr. Salvatierra said that he was trying to scale the sign to match the new height of the post. He said that they could make it smaller. Mr. Cluver said that it looks top heavy. The Committee asked Mr. Salvatierra to provide a detail of the conduit and how it will travel up the pole and reach the antenna. Will it be welded to the newel post? Will it transfer to the inside of the pole at the top of the newel post? Ms. Stein asked if they are using light poles in other parts of the City. Will they be cutting through the metal bases of the light

poles? Mr. Austin said that the existing light poles have a fiberglass tube which they will be replacing with new metal tubes that will contain the wires. Ms. Stein asked if there a reason why they chose to use the SEPTA stair in this location rather than a pole. Mr. Austin said that they were concerned not to trench in the courtyard. Ms. Gutterman said that the basement might be uses to get wiring to a pole and there are also plant beds that might help to hide wiring. Ms. Gutterman urged the applicants to speak to Richard Mariano at the Department of Public Property for ideas.

Mr. Austin asked if the Historical Commission would have jurisdiction if they were to move the proposal to a light pole. Mr. Cluver responded that the Historical Commission would still have jurisdiction.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:33 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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.