

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

**TUESDAY, 25 SEPTEMBER 2018
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-031
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

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

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

ALSO PRESENT

Raymond Rola, Raymond F. Rola, Arch.
Sean Whalen, Esq., Vintage Law LLC
Ori Feibush, OCF Realty
Robert Bittnero
Doug Mooney, Philadelphia Archaeological Forum
Kim Valentine
Martha Adams
Craig Deutsch, Harman Deutsch Architects
Chris Younge, 241 Condo Association
Bruce Bisbano, Bisbano + Associates
Stuart Rosenberg, SgRA
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Adam Hunt, SgRA
Elizabeth Nestor, NSOR
Doug Seiler, Seiler+Drury Architects
Julie Morningstar, BLT Architects
Kyle Kernozek, BLT Architects
Matt Mowrer, O'Donnell & Naccarato
Jonathan Doran

CALL TO ORDER

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 SEPTEMBER 2018
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

ADDRESS: 2101 WASHINGTON AVE

Proposal: Remove smokestack

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2101 Washington Avenue LLC

Applicant: Atiya Groomes, OCF Realty

History: 1865; Howell & Brother Wallpaper Hangings Manufactory; additions, 1883, 1912

Individual Designation: Under Consideration

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a smokestack at 2101 Washington Avenue. The property was considered for designation earlier this year, but the designation process has not yet been completed. While the nomination was being reviewed, the City found that the property posed a threat to public safety and that demolition was necessary to abate the dangerous condition. Owing to that finding, the Historical Commission's staff approved a complete demolition permit application after consulting with the Law Department and the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The staff subsequently approved a partial demolition permit application based on the Department of Licenses & Inspections' determination that a portion of the complex did not need to be demolished immediately, but might be able to be stabilized. The partial demolition plan proposed to retain the early twentieth-century building at the southwest corner of the site including the smokestack and a portion of the original 1860s building directly behind that building. No permit was issued for the complete demolition, but a permit was issued for the partial demolition and all of the structures slated for demolition under that permit have subsequently been removed. At its May 2018 meeting, while the demolition was underway, the Historical Commission voted to table the review of the nomination until the partial demolition was completed and the Department of Licenses & Inspections closed out the demolition permit (#868420). The Historical Commission elected to wait and see what, if any, of the buildings survived before deciding on the designation. That demolition permit remains open.

The current application proposes to remove the smokestack at the southwest corner of the site, which was slated for retention under the partial demolition permit, but approved for demolition under the full demolition application. The current application includes photographs of the smokestack taken with a drone. It also includes an engineering report on the entire complex, which was previously submitted to the Historical Commission during the nomination review. The smokestack is addressed on pages 14 to 18 of the report. The report notes problems with the smokestack such as mortar loss, joint separation, and shear cracks. The report does not claim that the smokestack must be removed on public safety grounds. However, in the conclusion of the report on page 18, the engineer "recommends the full demolition of the smokestack structure."

Rehabilitation Standard 2 advises that "the historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided." The Historical Commission and Architectural Committee must determine what, if anything, constitutes "the historic character of a property" in light of the demolition of most of the structures at the site and then determine whether the smokestack contributes to any historic character that survives.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission find that, owing to the demolition of the majority of the structures on this site including most of the original 1860 building, the site has lost all historic character. Therefore, because the property has no historic character, the smokestack does not contribute to that historic character—it does not characterize— and may be removed, pursuant to Standard 2.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Sean Whalen and developer Ori Feibush represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that he wanted to understand more about the status of the two pieces of the building that are slated to be maintained and were not demolished. He pointed to the green colored sections of the complex in the rendering in the submission. He asked if the green sections are going to be retained. He noted that there seemed to be some ambiguity regarding them in the staff overview. Mr. Whalen explained that the complete demolition of the complex was approved by the City owing to the imminently dangerous condition. He stated that his client unilaterally agreed to attempt to keep the smokestack, the one-story building that is attached to the smoke stack and then approximately 20% of the 1860 building. At this time, approximately 33% or one-third of the 1860 building has been kept. There will be additional demolition of that building. The engineers are still surveying the remainder of the 1860 building and the demolition permit remains open for that building. It is still unknown how much of that building can be kept. Mr. Whalen stated that it is his client's intention to try to keep at least some piece of the 1860 building to represent the historical nature of this property. However, it might end up being similar to his client's Royal Theater, where only the front façade was saved. Mr. Whalen explained that his client "spent well into the seven figures to stabilize the façade" of the Royal Theater. The rest of the building had to be demolished. Mr. Whalen reported that his client is going to try to retain the facade of the 1860 building along 22nd Street. He stated that they also believe at this time that the one-story building can be kept, but the smokestack must be demolished. Mr. Whalen noted that his client adequately forecast to the Historical Commission in the spring, when it was reviewing the nomination, that the smokestack would likely need to be demolished. He added that it is still his client's intention to demolish the smokestack. Mr. D'Alessandro asked Mr. Whalen to elaborate. Mr. Whalen stated that, first and foremost, the entire property was designated imminently dangerous. The imminently dangerous violation was made approximately one year before his client purchased the property. Mr. Whalen explained that the imminently dangerous designation was later removed, but then reinstated at the highest levels of the Department of Licenses & Inspections (L&I). He noted that many people toured the building to see its condition including members of the Historical Commission's staff and David Perri, the Commissioner of L&I. Ultimately, L&I reconfirmed the designation of imminently dangerous. That designation remains, and that is why his client began to demolish the building immediately. There were quite literally pieces of the building falling into the public right-of-way.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the violation includes the entire building, or only portions of the building. Mr. Whalen responded that it includes the entire property, the entire 100,000 square feet of the property. What remains is still designated imminently dangerous. Mr. Whalen opined that it is questionable whether the Historical Commission has jurisdiction over the demolition, given the imminently dangerous violation. He stated that his client wants to be open and transparent about his intention to proceed with demolition to abate the imminently dangerous condition. There will be additional structure taken down from the original 1860 building. Mr. Whalen reported that the biggest issue, quite frankly, with this building was the roof structure and that no

one did anything with this building for an exceptionally long period of time. Mr. Whalen observed that he has been told that what is currently keeping the smokestack together is the cell tower equipment attached at the top of the smokestack. The telecommunications brackets are sort of holding everything in place. He noted that there has actually been shearing on the smokestack. He reported that his client has taken drone footage. He has sent a drone up and down into the smokestack itself to inspect the smokestack. He noted that the video was presented at meeting of the Historical Commission. The biggest issue with the 1860 building was the roof, Mr. Whalen observed. The one-and-a-half-story building maybe at the corner, which he called the smokestack building, actually fared better throughout the lack of maintenance. Mr. Whalen offered to show photographs of the building. Mr. McCoubrey asked how L&I designated the entire site as imminently dangerous, yet allowed the structures at the southwest corner to be retained and potentially preserved. Mr. Farnham explained that the City determined that some portions of the complex of buildings had to be demolished immediately to protect the public safety while others, the sections in green, were not necessarily posing an immediate public safety risk, but concerning from a safety perspective. The portions in green may need to be either removed or repaired, depending on conclusions of the engineer, but are essentially safe enough to allow this review to take place. In other words, L&I was not concerned that would collapse in the next 30 days. If the conditions are left to persist, they will eventually become a public safety threat. Mr. McCoubrey observed that the complex has not been maintained for a decade. Mr. Whalen corrected him and stated that it has not been maintained for about 25 years. Mr. McCoubrey asked if failing to maintain a building for 25 years constitutes demolition by neglect. Mr. Farnham reminded the Committee members that the property was only recently nominated for designation and is not yet designated. He stated that the former owners did not have an obligation to maintain it to the standards of the historic preservation ordinance because, at that point, it was not under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction. He observed that the remaining section of the complex is in exactly the same condition as it was when nominated. The complex did not suffer from demolition by neglect in the historic preservation sense. Mr. Whalen added that his client bought the property after it was significantly deteriorated. He reported that, prior to the purchase, his client confirmed with the L&I Commissioner that he would not be held to a repair or replace standard.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked Mr. Whalen if a masonry restoration contractor had been contacted about repairing the smokestack. He asked if anyone had been consulted about the feasibility of installing a liner in the stack. He noted that it could be repaired to be structurally stable, especially if it is not going to function anymore as a chimney. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the smokestack could be repaired. He stated that the real question for him is whether there is enough of the context left following the demolition to justify retaining and repairing the smokestack. Mr. Whalen agreed that anything can be fixed, but the cost to fix may be prohibitive. He again reminded the Committee that it cost his client significantly over seven figures to structurally stabilize the front façade of the Royal Theater, a much, much smaller facade. Mr. D'Alessandro replied that the Committee is not concerned with cost. Mr. Whalen stated that his client was under no obligation to reduce the scope of his complete demolition permit application, which the Historical Commission had approved. He stated that his client did so unilaterally to be a "good actor" with the city because of the importance of this project and the scope of this project. The site is 100,000 square feet. He stated that his client was not obligated to try to save the portion colored in green on the rendering, but elected to do so. Mr. Whalen explained that the property is composed of two parcels. One is a sliver of about 10% of the northern most section of the property. The other, about 90% of the property, is the southern

portion. He explained that his client is currently seeking to shift the property lines to create a property at the north that will be about 40% of the total, and another at the south. Two rows of townhouses would be constructed on the northern property. The plans for the southern 60% of the site, which includes the standing structures, have not been developed yet.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the Historical Commission has not yet finalized the review of the nomination. He noted that the Commission will not conclude its review of the nomination and make a final decision on designation until the ongoing demolition is complete. Mr. McCoubrey concluded that he cannot make a decision about the significance of the smokestack until the Commission has concluded its designation review. Ms. Stein stated that the piecemeal approach to the demolition and the incomplete designation process makes it difficult to review this application. She stated that the Architectural Committee should retain any vestiges of the historic complex until the designation decision is complete. She noted that, if the smokestack is proven to be structurally unstable, then some accommodation could be made. She stated that, unless the smokestack is imminently dangerous, the Committee should not recommend in favor of its demolition. Mr. Whalen observed that the Architectural Committee members, with the exception of Mr. McCoubrey, were not involved in the Historical Commission's lengthy deliberations on this property earlier this year, when it reviewed the nomination. He stated that he could have returned to the Historical Commission on the designation matter, but chose instead to follow the process and present the demolition permit application for the smokestack to the Architectural Committee and then the Historical Commission.

Mr Whalen stated that it is impossible to know how much of the remainder of the building will need to be demolished until the demolition contractor and engineer have completed their work. The Historical Commission decided not to complete the designation process for the site until the demolition is complete, so that the Commission can determine whether anything survives that merits designation. Mr. Whalen reminded the Committee members that the entire site is considered imminently dangerous from a legal standpoint. The L&I Commissioner has not removed that imminently dangerous violation. The entire property is considered imminently dangerous. Mr. Whalen stated that they are especially worried about the smokestack because it could collapse into Washington Avenue. Other sections of the property may also be dangerous, but they do not threaten the public right-of-way in the way that the smokestack does. He stated that the smokestack creates significant liability for the property owner. Mr. McCoubrey confirmed that the Historical Commission had seen the diagram with the section marked in green as the section that would be preserved if possible. He added that the Commission has not reviewed anything related to this site since it tabled the nomination review to allow the demolition to be completed. Mr. McCoubrey explained that the staff's recommendation contends that so much of the complex has been lost that the remaining piece has no historical significance and the smokestack can therefore be demolished. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he disagreed with the staff and considers the smokestack to be a significant portion of the remaining complex, especially in light of the fact that it has always stood alone on the small building on the corner and was never part of the larger, now demolished building. With the Secretary of the Interior's Standards in mind, the smokestack still does contribute significantly to the nature of the historic resource, Mr. McCoubrey concluded.

Mr. Cluver opined that there are two separate considerations here. First, is the smokestack historically significant without the whole complex? Two, is the smokestack able to be restored? He observed that the first question is more of a question for the Committee on Historic

Designation, even though the Architectural Committee could weigh in on it. He noted that there are other industrial sites around the city that have retained their smokestacks and towers, some with the full complex and others without the full complex surviving. Sometimes, these smokestacks are the identifiable feature of the industrial complex, easily the most prominent. In that sense, it is possible for a site to retain historic character without the full complex. Mr. Cluver agreed with the applicant's assertion that anything can be repaired with enough money. Mr. Cluver stated that the job of the Committee is to identify the tipping point, where the investment in repair of the smokestack outweighs its value as a historic resource. Mr. Cluver acknowledged that such an argument is a hardship argument. He conceded that the smokestack provides little or no economic benefit to the owner and, therefore, it would be relatively easy to make a hardship case. Mr. Cluver stated that he would like to see the smokestack retained. He acknowledged that it appears to be overdue for repointing. He noted that the lack of maintenance of the smokestack has led to problems with its condition. He observed that this feels like a case of demolition by neglect, but contended that it is not such a case because the property is not yet designated. It was not allowed to deteriorate while designated. He noted, however, that the City has a property maintenance code that obligates owners to maintain their properties as well. He stated that the previous owners of this property shirked their maintenance obligations. He concluded that the smokestack does contribute to the character of the site and is able to be restored, even if such a restoration might not provide a return on investment.

Mr. Detwiler asked when L&I issued the imminently dangerous violation for the property. Mr. Whalen replied that it was issued in June or July of 2017 and then reconfirmed by the L&I Commissioner during the first week of March of this year. Since that time, L&I has inspected the property and decided that imminently dangerous violation remains valid.

Ms. Pentz asked about the demolition of the smokestack. She observed that the application indicates that the demolition will start with the top and will proceed manually by hand down to 50 feet above grade. She asked if the demolition would be done from scaffolding. Mr. Feibush explained that the expectation is to have men in a bucket demolish from above. He added that two men in a basket, a lifted by crane, would demolish by hand for the first 60 or 70 feet of the smokestack. The remaining section of the smokestack would be demolished mechanically. Mr. D'Alessandro interjected that the smokestack could be pointed in the same manner as it is proposed for demolition. Ms. Pentz stated that the repair could be accomplished in the same manner as the demolition; both are manual.

Mr. Whalen reminded the Committee that it is not certain that any of the buildings that remain on the site will be able to be retained. He noted that the nomination proposed the designation of an entire complex of buildings, but most of them have already been demolished. The review of the nomination has not yet been completed. The designation remains an open issue. Mr. Whalen asked the Committee to provide guidance to the Historical Commission as to whether the smokestack itself would be considered historic fabric, without any other buildings on the site remaining. He noted that the staff has recommended that the site has already lost its historic significance, owing to the demolition to date. He asked if the smokestack alone, without its historic context has any historic value.

Mr. Feibush disagreed with the assertion by some Committee members that the smokestack merely needs some pointing to be restored to good condition. He stated that its condition is so bad that pointing alone will not be enough. He opined that some pointing might have been

enough 20 years ago, but the maintenance has been deferred for so long that it now requires much more work. He asserted that the upper 30 feet of the stack is held together by the mounting brackets for the telecommunications antennas. He reported that there is substantive shearing and the stack is displaced by one to four inches at the top 40 feet. He stated that there is significant degrading on the exterior and interior of the stack. He stated that it would be extremely dangerous to have contractors work in the interior of the stack. He claimed that he would need to build a steel structure inside the smokestack to support it. He noted that it is not really a smokestack, but is a ventilation stack. He reported that there is one almost identical to this one four blocks east at the Marine Club at Broad and Washington Streets. He noted that the same architect designed it and the same developer built it, but it is braced to an eight-story cement structure. The example to the east survives because it is braced to a stable structure. There is nothing to support the smokestack at 2101 Washington.

Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the applicant's engineering report does not indicate that the smokestack must be demolished. It states that the smokestack is in need of repair and recommends that it should be demolished. It does not state that it cannot be retained. Mr. Feibush responded that anything can be saved with enough money. If we can send someone to the moon, we can stabilize a smokestack. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Architectural Committee cannot review the proposal in the context of a designation because the site has not yet been designated. He stated that, until the Historical Commission makes a final decision on designation, the Committee should advocate for the retention of the parts of the complex shown in green in the rendering. He acknowledged the staff's opinion that enough of the complex has been lost to drain the site of all historical significance, but stated that he disagreed. He stated that the smokestack should be retained if possible at this point. He concluded that the Committee is obligated to recommend denial to the Historical Commission until such time as the Commission has finalized the designation. He stated that the condition of the smokestack is not relevant at this point.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor for public comment, but none was offered.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial because the smokestack "does represent historic fabric and is significant," pursuant to Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 147-53 BERKLEY ST

Proposal: Demolish one-story brick building at 149 Berkley Street

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: The Church of Philadelphia the Original Glorious Church of God in Christ

Applicant: Craig Deutsch, Harman Deutsch

History: 1910; Arguto Oilless Bearing Company; Mellor & Meigs, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Contributing, 7/13/2018

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a one-story brick building known as 149 Berkley Street. The owner seeks to demolish the building in order to comply an Unsafe violation, first issued in 2013 by the Department of Licenses & Inspections.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 SEPTEMBER 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance enumerates the restrictions on demolitions.

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

The application makes no claim that the demolition of the building is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

During the Historical Commission's review of the Wayne Junction Historic District in July 2018, the owner provided copies of a structural report for this building prepared by AR Engineers, which the staff has included with the current application materials. The minutes from that meeting are also included with the application materials. The structural report states that "the overall condition of the building is poor and it is in imminent danger of collapse; demolition would be the only way to make the building safe." While the Department of Licenses & Inspections did issue an Imminently Dangerous violation for this property in 2017, that violation was related to a flagpole at the site, not this building. The flagpole was later removed and the violation was complied. It appears that the Department of Licenses & Inspections has not officially upgraded the existing violation for this particular building from Unsafe to Imminently Dangerous. An Unsafe building can presumably be repaired rather than demolished.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6 and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition. The application does not demonstrate that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be reasonably adaptively reused.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Craig Deutsch and Kim Valentine and Martha Adams of the Original Glorious Church of God in Christ Apostolic Faith – The Church of Philadelphia, the property owner, represented the application.

Ms. Chantry distributed a letter to the Architectural Committee and applicants from Ken Weinstein, President of Philly Office Retail, LLC and Wayne Junction Properties, LLC, which outlines his opposition to the proposed demolition.

Mr. Deutsch explained that the church was trying to demolish the building at 149 Berkley Street because of violations, but has gotten caught up in the process. He stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections (L&I) has not deemed the building to be imminently dangerous in writing, but has visited the site several times, the last meeting on site having been in August. He stated that the designation photographs of the front façade make it appear to be in better

condition than it actually is. He directed the Committee's attention to the detailed photographs included in the application materials. He stated that the building is an unbraced masonry façade with a tree growing out of the corner and a bulge in the front wall, and has no roof. He explained that the L&I required a fence around the façade, which has been done. He stated that the collapsed frame roof is a potential fire hazard. He asked for permission to demolish the building. He explained that the application would not have come before the Commission if it were eight months prior, when the building was not historically designated. He stated that they were working through the demolition process, and had to pull together a lot of required information for the L&I, which is why it has taken this much time. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if there were additional drawings. Mr. Deutsch responded that it is simply a one-story masonry building that is missing its wood frame roof. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that a wood roof could be reconstructed. Mr. Deutsch responded that there would be nothing to support it, and that the walls have thick vegetation growing through them.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that 149 Berkley Street is an example of a building that has a head house to it, and a rear that is probably less significant, so if resources were put into stabilizing the front of the building, then there would likely be much more latitude given to what happens at the rear. Ms. Stein asked if the current owners have pursued the option of selling the property, if they cannot put the resources necessary into the stabilization and restoration. Mr. Deutsch responded that a sale which would happen today would in essence be a fire sale or sheriff sale, because of the condition of the property. He asserted that any reasonable buyer who would come forward with any reasonable finances would diminish the value of the land. Ms. Stein countered that her understanding is that the current owners have owned the property for decades, and so the lack of maintenance is presumably attributed to the current owners. Ms. Valentine responded that the former pastor was really the owner, and he passed away approximately five years ago. She explained that she and Ms. Adams cannot speak to what was done or not done during that time. She stated that the responsibility has been passed onto Ms. Adams within the last five years, but that they cannot speak to the lack of attention prior to that.

Mr. Detwiler asked if the letter from Mr. Weinstein is stating that there is a current application for conservatorship of 149 Berkley Street. Ms. Chantry confirmed this. Mr. Deutsch stated that he is not the attorney for the conservatorship case, but that the attorney will likely attend the Historical Commission meeting and be able to speak to the current state of the conservatorship. He stated that Mr. Weinstein is the owner of several neighboring properties and that he is trying to take the property away from the church, which has owned the property for many years. He stated that even the demolition of the building will cost the church tens of thousands of dollars. He stated that it is not a development scheme to flip the property, but rather is about creating a safe site. Ms. Valentine commented that Mr. Weinstein has constantly approached her mother, Ms. Adams, about selling the building to him, in a way that she described as somewhat like a bully and intimidating. Ms. Valentine explained that her mother is nearly 80 years old, and she has told Mr. Weinstein time and time again that she is not interested in selling the property to him. She stated that Mr. Weinstein has now filed for the conservatorship. She stated that Mr. Weinstein's people would call her mother, and so she had to ask her attorney to get involved and to ask Mr. Weinstein to please leave her mother alone.

Mr. Cluver commented that the Committee can appreciate the stresses created by all of this, but the Committee's purview is narrow. He explained that the Committee is being asked if the change that is being proposed to the property will decrease its contribution to the historic district

to which it is listed as contributing. He observed that the building's construction, scale, and history contribute to the Wayne Junction Historic District. He opined that, all other issues aside, the Committee cannot say that the demolition of the building would not impact the historic district. He explained that the Commission may have other considerations, but the Committee's focus is narrow. Ms. Valentine responded that she understands, and only mentioned the information regarding Mr. Weinstein because the question was asked about why the church did not consider selling the building to him, and she wanted to provide a reason.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that it is the Committee's responsibility to protect the historic resource. He explained that, in the absence of an imminently dangerous violation, it would be difficult to apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and to approve the demolition of this contributing building. Mr. Deutsch stated that he hopes that the Committee has the note from L&I, which he did not include in the application materials, but which states that the "owner will apply for a demolition permit." He explained that they are in that process. Mr. McCoubrey responded that that process goes on irrespective of the Committee's review. Mr. Deutsch responded that he understands, and referenced the prior review for 2101 Washington Avenue and the discussion of liability. Mr. McCoubrey responded that 149 Berkley Street is a one-story building that has not been declared imminently dangerous by L&I, and it is the Committee's obligation to protect it until it is determined otherwise.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6 and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition. The application does not demonstrate that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be reasonably adaptively reused.

ADDRESS: 1411-19 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Construct ADA ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Washington Square Partners LP

Applicant: Erin D'Alessandro, Bisbano + Associates, Inc.

History: 1912; Philadelphia Stock Exchange Building; Horace Trumbauer, architect

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an ADA ramp at the westernmost Walnut Street entrance of the Philadelphia Stock Exchange Building. The ramp would be constructed of concrete and would include a steel railing in dark bronze to match existing exterior finishes. The entrance did not historically include steps, and ADA ramps are generally best integrated at the interior of historic buildings when space permits.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 SEPTEMBER 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Bruce Bisbano represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked Ms. Keller to clarify the statement regarding the lack of steps at the entrance historically and questioned whether there was not originally an entrance at this location. Ms. Keller explained that the opening always functioned as an entrance but that the entrance was at grade. She then distributed a series of historic images, elaborating that steps have been added sometime in the past, and the windows along Walnut Street, which were historically recessed, have been relocated in the window openings closer to the outer plane of the facade. Mr. Cluver responded that he still does not understand the addition of steps at the entrance. Ms. Keller replied that the building's other Walnut Street entrance currently does not have steps.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the building historically had an interior ramp. Ms. Keller answered that she had no way of knowing the historic condition of the interior. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the interior could have contained a vestibule with steps. Mr. McCoubrey observed that the steps existed in 1948.

Mr. Cluver inquired whether the bank entrance is independent of the building's lobby entrance. Mr. Bisbano affirmed that it is. Mr. Cluver concluded that there was no way to connect the two entrances since they stood at opposite ends of the building. Mr. Bisbano agreed, adding that the current configuration also addresses security concerns.

Ms. Stein asked whether the proposed ramp will serve an automated teller machine (ATM). Mr. Bisbano answered that the ramp would serve the full branch. Mr. D'Alessandro inquired whether there is another entrance to the full branch. Mr. Bisbano responded that at one time there may have been a service entrance, but the Walnut Street entrance is the only current entrance.

Mr. McCoubrey expressed concern over the encroachment of the ramp on the archway of the window to the east of the door. Mr. Bisbano replied that the current design lines up the landing with the doorway, but that the ramp could be shifted so as not to encroach on the adjacent window sill.

Ms. Stein questioned whether the elevation is drawn accurately. She noted that photographs show a significant slope up to the doorway, adding that Mr. Bisbano chose the correct side for the ramp. She opined whether the ramp could be shortened, since it does not appear that the drawing indicates the slope of the existing sidewalk. Mr. Bisbano responded that the elevation may not be clear and directed the Committee to the construction plan in the application where the grades are labeled. He clarified that grade changes a total of 1.14 feet.

Mr. McCoubrey further observed that the elevation drawing shows the top step a full riser above the stone base. In the photograph, he continued, it appears that the stone base aligns perfectly with the floor level and that the ramp could remain within the dimension of the base. He noted that there are three steps on one side and only two coming into the building. He acknowledged that a grade change could create that condition but questioned the accuracy of the drawings.

Mr. Bisbano responded that the grade points are correct but that the drawings may contain inaccuracies. Ms. Stein asked for clarification on the need for three risers at the ramp when

there are currently two at the existing entrance. Mr. Bisbano explained that the increase by one riser results from the slope of the risers and the slope of the sidewalk.

Mr. Cluver stated that Mr. McCoubrey's observation about the relationship of the ramp to the window sill is more important than whether the steps consist of two or three risers. He then asked what material is proposed for the ramp. Mr. Bisbano replied that the ramp would consist of a polished granite base with a flame cut granite elsewhere.

Mr. Cluver noted that the railing returns at the ramp but does not return at the steps. He opined that the railing is drawn like a pipe tube in elevation but that he interprets the railing profile differently in the detail provided. Mr. Bisbano stated that once the material is selected, the elevation would need to be rendered again. He added that his preference is to eliminate the return. Mr. Cluver agreed that the return should be eliminated by extending the end post.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for clarification on the drawing notes, which call for new concrete steps with integrated stair nosing, and commented that Mr. Bisbano had stated that the steps would be composed of granite. Mr. Bisbano replied that the structure would be concrete with granite cladding.

Mr. Cluver questioned why the drawings indicate the railing is a bronze element but then the note states that it is painted bronze. Mr. Bisbano answered that the railing would be painted steel. Mr. Cluver replied that the paint on the part of the railing that gets touched will fail quickly. The proposed profile, he added, is available in brass or bronze. For long-term durability and appearance, Mr. Cluver advocated for using brass or bronze and leaving it unpainted. He then remarked that the drawings lack numerous details that would need to be resolved prior to applying for a permit. He asked that the details be provided prior to the Historical Commission's meeting. Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the cladding details should be provided and asked that the relationship of the ramp to the building base be clarified in the elevation drawing.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided all visible materials of the ramp and steps are granite and that the handrail is fabricated in brass or bronze, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Accessibility Guideline.

ADDRESS: 1401-15 ARCH ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck; rehabilitate façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1401 Arch, LP

Applicant: Kyle Kernozek, BLT Architects

History: 1898; United Gas Improvement Building; Wilson Brothers & Company, architects; Western addition, first-floor & roof alterations, 1926; Perry, Shaw & Hepbur, architects; Samuel Yellin, gates

Individual Designation: 6/24/1987

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a roof deck and repair exterior masonry at the former UGI building. The roof deck would maintain a substantial setback at the east and west elevations, and the eastern portion would be raised 2 feet. At the Arch Street elevation, the deck would include a ramp that would be set back 5 feet from the front façade, and the glass and aluminum railing would be partially visible behind the existing metal railing. Access to the deck would be provided by converting existing windows to doors.

The application further proposes to replace deteriorated terra cotta units with new units fabricated in Microcotta. Both existing and replacement terra cotta units would then be coated with either a Keim or Conproco product to improve the color match between the materials. Other repair work includes the replacement of through-wall flashing at several locations, selective brick replacement, railing repair, and masonry cleaning.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the coating is only applied to the Microcotta units, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 7, 9, and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Kyle Kernozek and Julie Morningstar represented the application.

Mr. Kernozek stated that the application includes a mockup of the storefront cleaning and restoration, although the storefront would retain its current appearance. He also noted that the application includes exterior lighting to be installed once the façade is repaired.

Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the staff reviewed the railing mockup on site. Ms. Keller replied that the mockup was done for another agency prior to submission of the application. The staff, she continued, requested that the applicants include the photographs of the mockup in the application but did not require the installation of another mockup.

Mr. Cluver stated that the Architectural Committee often discourages glass railings, such as the one proposed at the ramp, because they can be reflective. Mr. Kernozek responded that he originally proposed a more opaque railing system but that the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission requested a glass railing, so he revised the detail to satisfy their request. Mr. Cluver noted that the Committee typically prefers a picket rail system, which would be more consistent with the screen that currently exists, although he acknowledged that it would be highly unlikely that the glass railing would produce reflections. He then suggested that the railing

material be changed to a metal picket railing, but noted that it would require other agencies to approve the concept.

Mr. Cluver then inquired whether the applicants have created samples of the Microcotta to determine how close the color and texture matched the original terra cotta. Mr. Kernozek responded that no samples have been created for this specific building, though he asserted that the product has been used in other buildings of the same age. Color shading, he continued, is fairly close, but differences would be perceivable, which is why he is proposing to coat the material. Mr. Cluver replied that he is fine with a close match, even if not perfect, adding that the difference speaks to the evolution of the building and its history. He commented that replacement that results in overt “splotchiness” should be avoided. He agreed with the staff recommendation that the historic terra cotta should not be painted, but added that he would like to avoid painting the replacement material as well. Mr. Kernozek responded that he would also prefer not to coat the terra cotta or replacement material. Mr. Cluver commented that Microcotta is a custom system that allows for color matching. Mr. McCoubrey added that the company should be able to provide a close match.

Mr. D’Alessandro asked if mockups of the lighting have been done, adding that there are substantial bands of lighting proposed. Mr. Kernozek answered that he has not mocked up the lighting yet. The intent, he explained, is to uplift the ornately detailed elements at the cornices to highlight them to the public. Mr. Cluver responded that as a concept that type of lighting has been done at numerous buildings, but it needs to be properly implemented. He questioned how visible the source would be and how much damage to the building would be required in order to install and wire it. He then inquired about the note on the drawings that refer to “E-Drawings” for lighting. Mr. Kernozek replied that the “E-Drawings” were not submitted in the application. The light fixtures proposed to date, he continued, are fairly small pin lights or linear LED lights and are modest in profile. He added that sketches could be provided. Mr. Cluver stated that when the Committee has reviewed façade lighting in the past, it has been helpful to see the locations of the lights, how they will be installed, and what the lighting effect is.

Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the staff commented on the lighting. Ms. Keller replied that it did not.

Mr. Kernozek referred the Committee to the photographs of the deck mockup, stating that the railing would be minimally visible from the street, because it would be substantially set back. Mr. Cluver observed that only the top of the railing at the ramp would be visible.

Messrs. Cluver and D’Alessandro further discussed the lack of clarity of the proposed lighting. Ms. Stein suggested that the lighting portion of the application be removed. Other Committee members agreed.

Ms. Stein asked Mr. Kernozek to describe the repair work proposed to the copper cornice. Ms. Morningstar replied that currently there are areas that are failing and those areas will be replaced with new copper.

Ms. Keller stated that the staff questioned the through-wall flashing above the cornices. She asked how high above the features it would be and whether it would be visible. Mr. Kernozek answered that he could investigate the sightlines, adding that it is two brick courses above the

cornice and set back to the façade. Ms. Keller responded that the concern is with the lower cornice, noting that the detail is shown at about the third story of the building.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 7, 9, and the Roofs Guideline, with the following comments:

- The applicant should investigate whether the railing system at the roof ramp can be changed from glass to a painted metal picket railing;
- No coating should be applied to the historic terra cotta or replacement Microcotta, and the Microcotta should be color matched as best as possible to blend with the existing terra cotta; and
- The lighting portion of the application is considered incomplete and requires further details.

ADDRESS: 241-43 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Construct fire escape at front façade; alter storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 241-243 Chestnut Street Condominium Association c/o Robert Gassel Company

Applicant: Doug Seiler, Seiler + Drury Architecture

History: 1852; Lewis Building; Stephen D. Button, architect

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a fire escape on the façade of 241 Chestnut Street. Owing to building code requirements, the application also proposes moving the tenant entryway to accommodate the fire escape's hinged stair at the lower level. The need for a fire escape is related to the February 2018 fire and subsequent demolition of the adjacent building, 239 Chestnut Street. Prior to the fire, residents of 241 Chestnut Street had access to 239 Chestnut Street's fire escape. Owing to limited floor space on each level, constructing a second interior exit stair is not feasible.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Doug Seiler represented the application.

Mr. D'Alessandro requested information on the materials being used to construct the fire escape. Mr. Seiler replied that the intention is to build the fire escape similar to the existing landings on 241 Chestnut Street. He noted that the areas were approved by the Historical Commission in 2002 when it was joined with 239 Chestnut Street's pre-existing fire escape. Mr. Seiler explained that the plan is to take the dimensions and design of 239 Chestnut Street's fire escape and flip it onto 241 Chestnut Street, modifying for the widths as necessary. Mr. Seiler stated that the materials used will be painted steel.

Ms. Stein stated that as long as she has sat on the Committee, she has never approved a fire escape; such a review is new for the Committee. Ms. Stein inquired about the review criteria from a code standpoint. She noted that the previous fire escape at 239 Chestnut Street had lightweight railings and the one the applicant is proposing has picket railings that would be very heavy comparatively. She questioned why this would be done unless required. Mr. Seiler replied that, to put a fire escape on an existing building, the International Building Code (IBC) allows fire escapes to be 2 feet wide. The code has other criteria about loading, and the openings along the fire escape need a ¾ hour protective, such as a water curtain, which was confirmed by the sprinkler contractor. He continued that the IBC is silent on the construction and details of the fire escape railings according to 2009 and 2018 code requirements. Mr. Seiler stated that they called the IBC office in Chicago to speak with a technical person. He explained that the technical person's advice was: "if it looks like a stair and acts like a stair, maybe you should treat it like a stair." He continued that they had spoken to fire escape manufacturers and asked them for guidance and the response was consistent with IBC technical person. Mr. Seiler stated that the fire escape manufacturers pointed out that people often use fire escape landings for sitting outside, reading or whatever, and should be treated like a guard but the stairways down should be kept open, similar to an OSHA railing. Mr. Seiler concluded that the IBC, individuals, and organization they consulted on the railings did not provide clear guidance and it appears that the pickets are not a requirement. Mr. D'Alessandro asked for confirmation that they didn't need the pickets on the landings based on code requirements. Mr. Seiler responded that he is reluctant as a professional to draw an open guard that could be used in a location as outdoor space. That would be a liability for the owners.

Ms. Stein commented that the bottom landing appears to be in front of the spandrel glass of the first floor, which is low. She noted that the prior landing on 239 Chestnut Street was at the cornice level. Mr. Seiler replied that the prior landing was a ladder which the building code explicitly no longer allows. For new fire escapes, no vertical descend ladders are allowed, which is what 239 Chestnut Street had. He stated that the bottom flight could be no more than 12 feet, which does work with the transom mullion. Mr. Seiler noted that the storefront is cast iron at the bottom and then the cornice above that and below the second floor windows is sheet metal. Mr. Seiler stated that they had gone to some effort in the design and it is similar to 239 Chestnut Street in how the landing is hung. He pointed out that the proposed landing at the transom is hung from above. Mr. Seiler explained there is no impact on the sheet metal cornice. He stated that he will review the details with the staff. He stated again that the bottom flight of stairs has a 12-foot maximum allowable length and the plan is to land at the sidewalk level.

Mr. Seiler pointed to photographs included in their application that show older fire escapes on Chestnut Street. He pointed out that he learned from looking at the older fire escapes that they are compacted and limited to two bays with the purpose of keeping the windows as unobstructed as possible.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated he can understand the picket railings at the doors but asked why they have to be included at the intermediate landings. Mr. Seiler responded that is he less concerned about those as they are very small landings. He stated that they could work with the fire escape contractors on this and could push to limit the areas with the picket railings. Ms. Stein noted that this could potentially mean only four landings would have the pickets.

Mr. Cluver inquired if the architect was looking at the question of pickets from a code compliance perspective or from what might be called “code plus.” He pointed out that, while the building code maybe quiet on it, the fire code is not. He continued that the International Fire Code (IFC) specifically has a section of fire escape stairways, Section 1104.16. Mr. Culver stated that the fire code seems to offer a clarification. Mr. Seiler stated that, given the guidance of the IFC and the silence in the IBC, it appears that a change to the intermediate landing railings, from pickets to a simpler design, could be made. Mr. Culver commented that from a historic perspective, the railings would be less dense. Mr. Seiler stated that the IFC provides a better basis for him to make a decision on the railing design.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the sixth landing from the top of the fire escape. He pointed out that it juts out an additional nine inches or one foot. Mr. Seiler explained that the sixth landing is not attached to the building but hung from above. He noted that hanging this section avoids putting holes through the sheet metal cornice in order to attach to building.

Mr. Culver inquired if 239 Chestnut is a separate property from 241 Chestnut Street. Mr. Seiler confirmed this 239 is a separate property and 241-243 is a single property. He explained that at one point the occupant of 239 Chestnut Street had permission to breach the party wall into 241 Chestnut Street, for access between a bar and restaurant. He noted they also shared bathrooms. Mr. Seiler noted that 239 Chestnut Street and 241-43 Chestnut Street have separate owners.

Mr. Culver asked if they planned to remove the existing concrete stoop/plinth in its entirety. Mr. Seiler responded affirmatively. He explained that the doors to the left of the first-floor bay front, as shown in Drawing A3.1, are the entrance to the elevator that goes up to the apartments and will lowered that to make them accessible. He noted that the plan is to build a lower floor at the right bay. Mr. Seiler stated they plan to bring that door down and have an internal ramp rather than building a ramp in the sidewalk. He continued that it could conceivably keep a plinth all the way across but they there would be accessibility problems.

Mr. Detweiler inquired about the first-floor panels that are below those windows that are being rearranged and asked if they are original cast iron. Mr. Seiler responded that he believes they are not cast iron but raised wood panels. He stated they would be reconstructed when the right door is moved.

Mr. D’Alessandro asked about the color of the fire escape. Mr. Seiler stated that the metal would be painted black.

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

The Committee members agreed that a recommendation of approval was appropriate, provided that the picket rails at the fire escape landings are changed to top and mid rails as required by the International Fire Code. The Committee members noted that, if the recommended change with the rails cannot be accommodated, the Architectural Committee should review an alternate plan.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the picket rails at the fire escape landings have top and mid rails, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 516 S 4TH ST

Proposal: Construct four-story residential building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Jefftown Village LP

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects, P.C.

History: Vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Non-contributing, 3/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW: This Review and Comment application proposes to construct a four-story brick residential building on what is currently a surface parking lot. The entry in the Society Hill Historic District inventory lists this address as: "Archaeological potential. Non-contributing." The inventory entry is contradictory. It claims that the site has historic significance, i.e. archaeological potential, while simultaneously claiming that it has no historical significance, i.e. it is non-contributing. The applicant has provided the meeting minutes for a Historical Commission review in 2013 with similar circumstances; for that site, the inventory also included the contradictory "Archaeological potential. Non-contributing" classification. During that 2013 review, the Historical Commission determined that its purview was limited to Review and Comment only, in other words that the site was "undeveloped," owing to the contradictory nature of the inventory entry, citing Section 14-201(14) of the Philadelphia Zoning Code which states:

Where the meaning of a restriction in this Zoning Code is ambiguous and the intent cannot be discerned through the usual rules of statutory construction, the restriction shall be construed in favor of the landowner, provided that the resulting construction does not lead to irrationality in the Zoning Code.

The lot where the new construction would occur is located at the northwest corner of 4th and Gaskill Streets. The brick-clad building would be three-and-one-half stories in height with a gabled roof. The front, narrow façade would face 4th Street. All windows would be divided-light, six-over-six, double-hung windows, but the window material is not specified in the plans.

Overall, the proposed design appears to be compatible in scale, materials and style with its surroundings. The use of new materials such as brick and stone will help to differentiate the building from the surrounding historic ones.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Stuart Rosenberg and Adam Hunt represented the application.

Ms. Stein remarked that there were no materials listed on the architectural drawings. She stated that she is uncertain of the materials for the base, walls, windows, cornice, trim, roof and fence.

Mr. Rosenberg responded that the exterior walls would be a red brick, the windows would be wood simulated divided light, architectural details such as water table, sills and lintels would most likely be made of a white marble, and the fence would be painted wood picket. Mr. Cluver asked about the shutters, and Mr. Rosenberg responded that they would be wood with hardware and installed in a fixed position. Mr. Cluver asked about the material for the door, and Mr. Rosenberg responded that it would be a solid-wood, paneled door. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the gabled end, and Mr. Rosenberg responded that he thought that it would also be red brick with a wooden cornice or eaves. Ms. Stein remarked that it was not typical in Philadelphia to take a cornice across the gabled end, explaining that usually the brick just ran all the way up without a horizontal band. She suggested that Mr. Rosenberg just remove that cornice and let it be a brick wall and Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. Mr. Rosenberg replied that this was something he could further develop with the staff.

Mr. Cluver asked about the gutter and downspout, and Mr. Rosenberg explained that he would try to convince the client to use copper because, at the end of the day, there was not so much of a difference in price, but that he could not commit to it at that time. Mr. Cluver clarified that it would be an exposed gutter not a built in gutter, and Mr. Rosenberg confirmed that was correct, and that it would be a half-round gutter and a round rainwater conductor. Mr. D'Alessandro remarked that it really should project, looking at the brick and the cornice at the south elevation. Mr. Rosenberg responded that that level of detail would be discussed when they were ready to submit for the final review and would include shop drawings. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that it should project at least eight inches and Mr. Rosenberg agreed. Mr. Cluver remarked that the comment about the staff reviewing details was a key one, because an application like this one was schematic. Mr. Rosenberg agreed, adding that those refinements were really necessary and part of both the design review and approval processes.

Mr. Cluver said that it seemed that the intent was really to construct a building that was not just compatible with the district but was really one with the district, citing that the choice of materials, the proportions of the stiles and rails of the doors, and the muntin profiles were all really replicating details that were there within the district. Mr. Rosenberg confirmed that this was, indeed, clearly their intent.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked Mr. Rosenberg to help him understand the proposed dormers, remarking that they just did not look right to him. Mr. Cluver said that they were too wide at the sides. He explained that the cheek walls were too wide at the side and the problem was the insulation requirement. Mr. Cluver said that before, dormers would have the framing done on flats, to which Mr. Rosenberg added that there were ways to make them thinner and that would be part of the refinement process. Mr. Rosenberg further commented that they could be turned on the flat, or a spray foam insulation could be used, or even no insulation, and that these were the kinds of refinement that they intended to make. He said that designing these kinds of buildings was an extremely complex endeavor that required a lot of time.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the house was going to have an occupied fourth floor, and Mr. Rosenberg responded that this was their intent, explaining that there was adequate head room and natural light through the use of dormers. Mr. Cluver told Mr. Rosenberg that these were the kinds of details that he would take to the staff, and that the staff would decide if they could review or if it would need to come back to the Architectural Committee for review.

Mr. Cluver noted that the Committee had not yet discussed the bigger question, whether the review level was plenary jurisdiction or Review and Comment, adding that he did not even know if it was within their purview to comment. Mr. McCoubrey remarked that he wanted to point out a small contradiction with the staff's recommendation where it talked about the materials differentiating the proposed house from its surroundings, because it seemed that the intent was more to use the same materials, so as not to differentiate it. He said that, with regard to the proposed design, he did not see differentiation but rather replication or imitation.

Mr. Rosenberg asked if he could speak to the issue of the review level being either plenary or Review and Comment, adding that he recognized that the Architectural Committee members might not be in a position to make that determination. However, he requested that the Committee at least offer a recommendation to the Historical Commission, which would obviously make the final decision. Mr. Rosenberg said he was requesting this because he had referred to a case that had come before the Architectural Committee and the Historical Commission approximately four years ago, that was almost identical in many ways to the current case. He explained that, at that time, it was the decision of the Historical Commission to review the application as Review and Comment only. Mr. Rosenberg said that the reason the Commissioners took this position, notwithstanding the fact that the property was located within the Society Hill Historic District, was that the record indicated that it had always been a row house type of neighborhood without clearly significant use or individuals or impact to the history of the city. He said that he recognized that there could be artifacts below grade, but because of its use, he did not anticipate that they would be of any major value. Mr. Rosenberg said that as they all knew, one could travel anywhere in the entire world and find pottery shards which, in and of themselves were interesting, but did not necessarily contribute to the knowledge and understanding of the past. He noted, however, that significant sites did contribute to our knowledge. He remarked that he was not denying that there were artifacts at the site, but he was saying that they were commonplace and as a result of that, he was asking for this recommendation to be consistent with the previous case.

Mr. Cluver remarked that it was an interesting thought to consider if there had been a building on the site, and the proposal was to expand back into the yard within applicable zoning limits, and the Architectural Committee reviewed the project, he did not think that they would ever make the recommendation that the applicant had to check for archaeological resources. He wondered whether this situation was causing the Committee to make a request that it would not otherwise make. Mr. Cluver stated that telling the applicant that archaeological resources must be taken into consideration was a condition that could be applied to every single property in Society Hill. He said that the request to consider archaeological resources was, in a way, changing what they would normally be discussing, adding that maybe they should be discussing these matters for all of the projects but they had not been. Mr. Cluver remarked that it was probably worth making this issue a part of the discussion and for clarification as well.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that the archaeological potential of a property was brought up as part of the designation process. Mr. Cluver responded that he did not want to ignore the letter that they had received from Philadelphia Archaeological Forum, which explained that the Statement of Significance for the Society Hill Historic District said that, with some exceptions, all properties in the historic district had the potential for archaeological resources. He said that if it was something that they were supposed to be paying attention to, it should be clarified, but absent that, he did not think that they should impose archaeological considerations on this

property when they had not been doing it on other properties in the historic district. Mr. Rosenberg responded that he was not requesting that the members of the Architectural Committee oppose it, but rather that both the Architectural Committee and the Historical Commission had had cases like this in the past, where non-contributing buildings that were defined as having no historical value were considered as Review and Comment only, and he was just trying to maintain that this application was the same and therefore the interpretation should be consistent. Mr. Rosenberg stated that consistency in interpretation was a very important feature for applicants because they use the precedent to understand the view of the Historical Commission, how it analyzed properties, how it ascertained buildings' inherent value, and so consistency was extremely important. He remarked that if there had been a case just like this just a few years ago, it seemed to him, that on the basis of consistency alone, there should be an opinion so that he as the applicant had clear guidance. Mr. Rosenberg said that, as the members of the Architectural Committee well knew, applicants used their professional opinions and methods of working with each other based on an intellectually honest approach and without that, they were nowhere. He asked if it would mean that every property in the city would have to have an archaeological excavation, to which Mr. McCoubrey responded that that was determined as part of the designation process, and Mr. Rosenberg agreed. Mr. Rosenberg reiterated that he was looking for a sense of consistency of interpretation of the rules so that he had a clear direction of how to move forward and he thought that both the applicant and the Historical Commission were entitled to rely upon some sort of precedent. Mr. McCoubrey said he thought this acknowledged the ambiguity of the situation, which was unfortunate from Mr. Rosenberg's perspective and from the Architectural Committee's perspective as well. Mr. McCoubrey read the property's entry in the inventory which described it as "Archaeological potential. Non-contributing," so he could certainly understand the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum's position that there was potential for significance below grade but that above grade there was nothing of architectural significance. He continued on, stating that, because it had been determined to be Review and Comment only, he thought the Architectural Committee could continue to comment on the matter.

Mr. D'Alessandro said that, in most circumstances, during construction, if anything was ever found, the job would be stopped, adding that he had had to stop many jobs even when the area was not considered to have archaeological potential. He restated that when something was found, the work must stop. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that this case was different because the owner was actually being told ahead of time, unlike when a job was started and then had to be stopped. Mr. Rosenberg responded that he agreed; however, at the same time, the inventory said that the property was non-contributing, and that by definition, this meant there was no historic significance. He said that therein lay the inherent conundrum which was why he was there before the Architectural Committee, to restate that this conundrum had already been addressed four years ago, and the decision was made in the favor of the applicant simply because the zoning regulations stipulated that if there was a conundrum, the ruling must be in favor of the property owner. Mr. Rosenberg told the Architectural Committee that, although he was not an attorney but rather simply an architect, the provision in the zoning code was the basis to resolve this matter. He further commented that, as they all knew, Philadelphia's historic preservation ordinance was a multi-tiered, complex document. Mr. Rosenberg cited the previous case with the fire escape that made reference to the Fire Code, and the International Code Council's Building Code and dozens of other codes including zoning.

Mr. D'Alessandro told Mr. Rosenberg to have an archaeologist on site when they started the work, to which Mr. Rosenberg replied that they would be happy to follow a suggested protocol; he noted, however, that the Architectural Committee was obligated to conduct one of two types of reviews, plenary or Review and Comment. He stated that, if the Architectural Committee members wanted to make their recommendation of approval subject to the presence of an archaeologist, he was happy to entertain that condition. Mr. McCoubrey responded that it had been suggested that the Architectural Committee consider this proposal as Review and Comment only, so anything related to the archeological potential would be part of a Review and Comment at this point and nothing beyond that. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that they tell Mr. Rosenberg to have an archaeologist on site, and Mr. McCoubrey said that they could do that. Mr. McCoubrey asked if there were any other comments from the members of the Architectural Committee and there were none.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment.

Doug Mooney introduced himself as the president of the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum and mentioned that he also sat on the Committee for Historic Designation. He said that, as stated in his organization's letter to the Historical Commission regarding this project, his organization believes that the arguments put forth for Review and Comment only have no merit. Mr. Mooney explained that his organization believes that there is no contradiction or ambiguity in the inventory entry, and has requested that the Historical Commission maintain full plenary jurisdiction over the project. He further explained that the reason they believe that there is no contradiction in this listing is because they believe that the statement that there is archaeological potential was correct, and the fact that it is listed as non-contributing referred to the absence of contributing above ground resources. Mr. Mooney said that the only way that the listing could represent a contradiction was if there had been an actual finding that there were no archaeological resources on the site that could contribute to the historic significance of the historic district, which would require an archaeological investigation. He said that, to the best of their knowledge, this site had never been archaeologically investigated, and as a result, if the term non-contributing was applied to archaeological resources, it was meaningless because there was no way to determine whether or not there is anything contributing or non-contributing present. Mr. Mooney stated that if there is no meaning, then there is no contradiction.

Mr. Cluver asked if the City's regulations in general had any obligation to an owner who happened to disturb a site and find something that could be of archeological interest, and Mr. Mooney responded that no, it did not. He stated that in the particular case of the Society Hill Historic District, as part of the designation, it was found to be significant for archaeological resources, which is the sole requirement of Criterion I. He explained that, in this case, the historic district has the potential to contribute information that was important to the history and pre-history of the area. Mr. Mooney further explained that it was not necessary to demonstrate it for the purposes of listing, rather the determined potential of an area was what was required. He said that, absent any kind of archaeological investigation of this particular site, it still has potential, and as a result under the historic district designation it fell under the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission for archaeological resources.

Ms. Stein asked Mr. Mooney what would satisfy the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum. Mr. Mooney replied that in this particular case what they asked for was that the Historical Commission assert full plenary jurisdiction and also that the Historical Commission come up

with some sort of a plan to ensure that, if there are any significant archaeological resources, that they are not disturbed during construction. He added that putting some sort of a plan in place to recover information from significant resources was a standard procedure for archaeological sites. Mr. Mooney stated that they are not stipulating anything specific at this point in terms of how the Historical Commission approached significant archaeological resources that may or may not be present on the site, but asked that they do not review this as a Review and Comment application, where their recommendations would be non-binding. He said that the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum believes that the Historical Commission needs to give this proposal more thought and make sure that it retains its full plenary jurisdiction.

Mr. Cluver said that what was fascinating was whether this argument could be made for virtually any site in the Old City Historic District or the Society Hill Historic District or the Washington Square area. Mr. Mooney responded that, at this particular point, they are not considering a site in Old City, rather they are considering this specific site under this set of circumstances. Mr. Cluver said that they had considered other sites in the past that had been listed as non-contributing that had equal validity for potential for archaeological resources but had always asserted Review and Comment jurisdiction. He further commented that he thought the fact that they were having the discussion back and forth was kind of the definition of ambiguity, although he was sympathetic to the concept of archaeological potential. Mr. Mooney responded that there is absolutely no ambiguity in this case, adding that the fact that these types of things had been decided incorrectly in the past did not mean that there was ambiguity here. He said that had the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum known about the case from 2013, it would have opposed the argument, but they only found out about it after the decision had already been made. Mr. McCoubrey stated that they did not know the particulars of the argument that had been made in 2013.

Mr. Cluver said he thought they should make their recommendations independent of whether it was a plenary review or a Review and Comment because they would be equal either way, and it would go forward from there. He added that he thought it was a discussion bigger than the site. Mr. McCoubrey said that it was a question that the Historical Commission had addressed once and that they had the ability to make the Historical Commission address it again if they agreed that the listing said that there was archaeological potential district-wide, because he could certainly understand why something could have archaeological potential without having any architectural merit or significance.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia introduced himself and stated that he was inclined to agree with Mr. Mooney and the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum's assessment in the instance. He said that it might not be the appropriate purview of the Architectural Committee, but it was something that the Historical Commission should seriously consider. Mr. Grossi said that the Historical Commission did have the authority to mandate some level of archaeological overview of this site. He stated that he could appreciate the desire for consistency and for precedent, and it was not to suggest that a building could not or should not be constructed at this site, and if and when it was, the Historical Commission's jurisdiction was appropriately deemed advisory in terms of the built, architectural merit of the proposal since this was a non-contributing lot. He further commented that the inventory very clearly stated that there was archaeological potential, and the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum's letter pointed out language in the historic district nomination that suggested the Historical Commission's oversight. Mr. McCoubrey said that one of the Criteria for Designation was archaeological

potential, and Mr. Grossi added that it was applied across the historic district. Mr. Grossi said that he could appreciate Mr. Cluver's point that this was a discussion that went beyond this particular site and that this was not the way things had been done in the past, but it was something that the Architectural Committee and the Historical Commission needed to figure out, particularly as development within the historic districts was going to continue to disturb sites that had remained undisturbed for a long time.

Mr. Rosenberg said that he agreed with the opinions of Mr. Mooney and Mr. Grossi in concept. However, he just wanted to raise the issue that the city of Philadelphia probably had the greatest number of architectural historians anywhere around the country, adding that there was a huge amount of expertise here. He said that with the city's vast resources, countless people were studying the history of the buildings, everyone from graduate students to professionals like those present. Mr. Rosenberg remarked that, during the creation of this written history, there was ample opportunity to identify those portions of the city that really did have known historic value, adding that there was a difference between where George Washington lived and his house. He remarked that we must acknowledge that there was an extreme spectrum of value that existed within the history of this city, and it was a question of applying some sort of judgment across the subject to ascertain where our resources were spent. He asked the Architectural Committee members if they were going to treat this house the same way they would treat George Washington's house. Mr. Rosenberg stated that the process that was used to create this specific historic district was thorough and professional and comprehensive, and therefore there was no major, historic or archaeological significance assigned to the property, rather it was just assigned the potential. He said that, if every potential site in the city was designated, the argument could be made that no construction could occur without an archaeological excavation. Mr. Rosenberg further commented that, from a practical point of view, one had to decide where resources would be spent, and he did not think it was the City's policy or anyone's desire to drive construction in the city to a grinding halt, which in theory this approach would have. Mr. Rosenberg remarked that every site within a historic district had potential archaeological resources, and the city had a huge number of historic districts, so therefore it was incumbent upon them to use their judgment as to what was appropriate. Mr. Rosenberg stated that he did not think that this contradicted the previous arguments that Mr. Mooney and Mr. Grossi had made, explaining that he agreed that archaeology played an important part in preserving culture, but the question was about where and how the standard should be applied. He said that the Architectural Committee had the privilege and the authority to make that judgment and decision, and that was what he was asking them to do.

Mr. Mooney said that he wanted to respond, explaining that, because archaeological resources were one of the Criteria for Designation for this historic district, the Historical Commission had an obligation to deal with archaeological resources. He said it had already been established that this fell under the Historical Commission's purview and that they had an obligation to deal with it.

Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Mooney why this site was different from other sites, to which Mr. Mooney responded that it did not need to be different. Mr. Cluver asked why this objection had not been raised with every other single project that they had reviewed in this historic district, to which Mr. Mooney responded that they did not always get word of projects within this historic district. However, if the Historical Commission was not considering archaeological resources for every project in this historic district it was not fulfilling its obligation under the code, which would be the

fault of the Historical Commission, adding that it was not the responsibility of the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum to police everything that went on in this historic district because it should be something that the Historical Commission was already aware of and fulfilling.

Mr. Grossi asked for the chance to respond to Mr. Rosenberg's remarks, commenting that he felt as though his concern was overstated for the simple reason that less than three percent of the city of Philadelphia was historically designated and under the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission, and of that three percent, an even smaller percentage was cited for archaeological significance under Criterion for Designation I, so relative to the city as a whole, they were really only talking about a small percentage of properties. Mr. Grossi stated that they were not talking about some sort of a citywide overview of archaeological potential, at least not as part of the current discussion. Mr. Grossi further commented that extraordinary material was not a threshold for significance, pointing out that more than half of the properties on the current agenda were contributing properties within historic districts, and that a broad spectrum of significance could be applied to archaeological resources the same way it was applied to the built environment.

Mr. Mooney commented that the fact that something extraordinary or out of the usual may or may not have occurred on this site was not the way that archaeological significance was determined, leaving that argument without merit. He said that archaeological investigations and analyses were very good at bringing to light unknown aspects of everyday life so it did not have to be something extraordinary or out of the usual to make it important. Mr. Mooney expanded on this point by explaining that this site sat at the north side of Gaskill Street, which was called out in Gary Nash's book *Forging Freedom* because in the early nineteenth century it was at the heart and soul of the emerging free African-American community. He said that this section of Gaskill Street was one of the first integrated neighborhoods in Philadelphia, with African-Americans and white Philadelphians living side by side, in some cases in the same building or on the same lot. He remarked that this meant that any possible archaeological resources that could be present at the site could shed light on life in that early integrated neighborhood.

Mr. Cluver asked if, in the interest of time and fairness to the other applicants, the Architectural Committee members could agree that the issue was not going to be resolved at the current meeting. He suggested that they comment on the above ground design that was before them, and let the archaeological conversation continue on at the Historical Commission. Mr. McCoubrey replied that they could give their opinion about both matters, saying that they could decide that the review of the above ground work was Review and Comment and the archaeological significance needed to be explored as part of the designation of the historic district under Criterion I.

Mr. Cluver suggested that, in response to the design that was presented, the review shall basically be a Review in Concept, and that the basic concept of the massing and materials as was verbally presented at the meeting were acceptable, with further details to be reviewed by the staff, with the expectation that this concept was to be done with the intent to respect and replicate the character of the historic buildings found elsewhere in the historic district. Mr. Cluver explained that he wanted to make this its own, stand alone recommendation, and that if they were going to deal with the archaeological issue, it would be in a separate, stand alone recommendation. Mr. McCoubrey commented that he did not know if the recommendations needed to be separated. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that they could just add that the

archaeological importance of the site be included in the planning of the project per the City's historic preservation ordinance 14-2007 subparagraph five.

Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. Farnham if they could have two recommendations on a single project, to which Mr. Farnham responded that they certainly could. He said that, as an advisory body, the Architectural Committee could offer whatever kind of advice it wanted to the Historical Commission. Mr. Farnham said that determining whether the review was a Review and Comment or plenary jurisdiction was a matter for the Historical Commission to resolve, and that this Committee's recommendation could inform the Commission. He stated that the Committee's phrasing was up to the Committee members.

Mr. McCoubrey said that he would go back to his original recommendation, which would be valid regardless of whether it was plenary review or Review and Comment, which is why he wanted it to stand on its own. He said he was done offering a recommendation and asked if others agreed with it. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with the recommendation to review the above grade work as Review and Comment with the staff to review the details. The Committee unanimously adopted the suggestion.

Mr. McCoubrey then directed the members of the Architectural Committee to the matter of the archaeological consideration. Mr. D'Alessandro remarked that it was really about planning for the archaeological potential throughout the course of the project. Mr. Mooney said that the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum's thought on the importance of the Historical Commission retaining full plenary jurisdiction was so that it could maintain oversight over any archaeological work that was undertaken at the site. He said that he would not stipulate what that work needed to be, adding that if the archaeological potential was to be viewed as Review and Comment, whatever the Historical Commission had to say could be disregarded. Mr. Mooney stated that this was something the Historical Commission needed to maintain jurisdiction over, adding that taking archaeological resources into consideration at the site did not mean there would be a full blown archaeological excavation, but rather it only meant that it was taken into account as far as review and that some sort of a plan was put into place that took into account what might be on the site.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the archaeological planning needed to be addressed for this project per the City's historic preservation ordinance 14-2007 subparagraph five.

Mr. Cluver suggested that, in regards to whether the property itself was contributing or non-contributing, in terms of the above ground resource, it was non-contributing, which was the intent of the designation, but that consistent with the Statement of Significance of the historic district designation that says that all properties in the historic district have archaeological potential, it was contributing with regard to subsurface resources. The other Committee members unanimously agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the architectural design, with the staff to review details and to recommend that the Historical Commission retain full or plenary jurisdiction over potential archaeological resources at the site, pursuant to Criterion for Designation I in the Society Hill Historic District nomination.

ADDRESS: 2314 GREEN ST

Proposal: Construct side and rear additions and decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2314 Green LLC

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects, P.C.

History: 1859

Individual Designation: 12/5/1974

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear addition to this rowhouse. The Architectural Committee reviewed a similar application for this property in June 2018. At that time, the Architectural Committee determined that that application proposed a demolition, not an alteration, and recommended denial. The current application proposes to remove much less. Sections of the basement side wall of the rear ell would be removed. However, the plans leave much of the rest of the wall intact. The side addition would set back from the rear wall of the rear ell and would cover the basement, first, and second floors. The rear ell has been significantly altered with stucco as well as non-historic door and window openings. The upper section of the side of the rear ell is visible at a great distance, about 200 feet, from the public right-of-way across a courtyard as well as from Pennsylvania Avenue. Historically appropriate windows would be installed in much of the rear ell. The application also proposes an addition at the second and third floors of the rear ell, but no longer proposes an elevator penthouse on the main roof. The application also proposes two roof decks on the rear ell.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Stuart Rosenberg and Adam Hunt represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Baron if the proposed work to the front façade is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Baron replied that it is in his opinion. The steps and retaining wall need to be reset and the staff will review details for the windows and cornice work. Mr. Cluver then asked about the decks at the rear. Mr. Baron answered that that work also meets the Standards. He noted that the roof at that level will be raised. Mr. Cluver asked for a clarification regarding the rendering labeled HC9. He stated that it looks like the side addition will be constructed on the steps of the building in the adjacent courtyard. He opined that the new massing on the third-floor roof is hard to understand in the rendering. He urged the applicant to correct the rendering to match the elevation on Drawing 3.8. He asked if the additions will be visible from Pennsylvania Avenue. Mr. Baron said that they will be somewhat visible, although the back of the building is currently hidden by trees. Mr. Cluver asked whether it is better to slope the new addition to the side to match the current shed roof or to continue the slope backward to match the roof on the main block. Mr. Rosenberg said that he has shown it matching the current shed roof at the request of staff and that this is better for headroom as well.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 938 S FRONT ST

Proposal: Legalize windows; install doors and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Gary Steere

Applicant: Gary Steere

History: 1760

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize windows, install shutters and a door, and construct a deck. The owner of the house began consulting with the Historical Commission's staff regarding potential renovations to this very early house prior to purchasing it. Although the owner obtained a permit for interior alterations, he did not obtain a permit for work to the exterior of the house.

The owner installed windows without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit. The owner is now seeking to legalize the illegal windows. The new windows, while made of wood, are of an inappropriate design for this house. They are two-over-two windows with a stock frame. The correct windows can be seen on the neighboring house, which was constructed at the same time. They are six-over-six with plank frames.

The application also proposes shutters of an inappropriate design and a pre-hung door with an inappropriate frame.

On the rear garage, the application proposes a deck with a five-foot side setback and a simple picket railing.

It should be noted that a former owner removed the chimney and altered the dormers and roofing inappropriately. This application does not address that non-compliant work.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the deck, but denial of the windows, doors, and shutters pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

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

Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Baron for additional photographs. Mr. Baron pointed out the windows on the neighboring house, which are appropriate, with small glass panes. Mr. Baron showed the photographs of the windows that this owner has installed with the two-over-two panes and the stock frame. The Architectural Committee members agreed that the windows do not replicate the appearance of the historic windows. They also objected to the illegal removal of the chimney. Mr. Baron explained the staff's opinion that the proposed deck is appropriate because it sits on a later garage, five feet back from the street edge. It was noted that the shutters and

door frame also seem inappropriate to the house. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the flower boxes would damage the house.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the deck, but denial of the windows, doors, and shutters pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:37 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

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

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

Accessibility Guideline: Recommended:

- Complying with barrier-free access requirements in such a manner that the historic building's character-defining exterior features, interior spaces, features, and finishes, and features of the site and setting are preserved or impacted as little as possible.
- Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the user while preserving significant historic features.
- Finding solutions to meet accessibility requirements that minimize the impact of any necessary alteration for accessibility on the historic building, its site, or setting, such as compatible ramps, paths, and lifts.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs—their functional and decorative features—that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. This includes the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features such as cupolas, cresting, chimneys, and weathervanes; and roof material such as slate, wood, clay, tile, and metal, as well as its size, color, and patterning. Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

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

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

14-203(88) Demolition or Demolish.

The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface.