

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

**TUESDAY, 27 MARCH 2018
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

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

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

ALSO PRESENT

Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Brian Emmons, Southern Land
Dustin Downey, Southern Land
Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr
David Gest, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Kelly Somers, Solomon Cordwell Buenz
Kristen Suzda, WRT Design
Amanda Mazie, Dranoff Properties
Jaquelin Camp, WRT
Kristen Suzda, WRT
Lou Filippone, Graboyes
George Wilson, Meyer Design
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Tim McElwain, Church of the Holy Trinity
Ben Heinzen
David S. Traub, Save Our Sites
Paul Boni, Esq., Boni Law
Mark Merlini, Brickstone
Logan Day, KCA Design
Adam Montalbano, Moto DesignShop
Andre Golsorkhi
Robert Kramer, Society Hill Civic Association
Lorna Katz, Society Hill Civic Association
Tim Kerner, Terra Studio
Bill Young, Techni Systems, Inc.
Tina Geary, InHabit

Christina Carter, John Milner Architects
Scott Woodruff, DesignBlenz Arch.
Matt Otricelli, DesignBlenz Arch.
Susan Reel-Panish, Pella Windows
Jack Burns, Jack Burns Architecture LLC
Chris Schrack, Jack Burns Architecture LLC
Christopher McGinnis Jr.
Christopher McGinnis Sr.

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 1907-15 WALNUT ST AND 1904-40 SANSOM ST

Proposal: Construct mixed-use building, alter existing buildings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1911 Walnut Street, LLC

Applicant: David Gest, c/o Southern Land Company

History: 1907-15 Walnut Street, vacant

1904 Sansom Street, c. 1855, altered by Clarence Wunder, architect, 1923

1906-16 Sansom Street, Warwick Apartments, Chester H. Kirk, architect, 1902

1918-40 Sansom Street, vacant

Individual Designation: none

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the historic buildings at 1904 and 1906-16 Sansom Street and the construction of a mixed-use 49-story and two-story complex at 1907-15 Walnut Street and 1918-40 Sansom Street.

The project site is located on the 1900 blocks of Walnut and Sansom Streets in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. Moravian Street, a narrow alley, runs east-west through the site. At the time of the establishment of the historic district in 1996, a non-historic, non-contributing theater building stood at 1907-11 Walnut Street. It was destroyed in a fire and demolished. The lot at 1907-11 Walnut Street is vacant today. The property at 1913-15 Walnut Street was at the time of the establishment of the historic district and is today a vacant lot. The building at 1904 Sansom Street, called the Coffeehouse, is a c. 1855 rowhouse that was remodeled in the Spanish Revival style in 1923; it is classified as significant in the district and is in poor condition. The building at 1906-16 Sansom Street, called the Warwick Apartments, was constructed in 1902, is classified as contributing to the district, and is in poor condition. The Historical Commission approved the demolition of the building at 1918-20 Sansom Street under the financial hardship provision in 2017 and it was demolished soon thereafter. The lot is currently vacant. The surface parking at 1922-40 Sansom Street was undeveloped at the time of the establishment of the historic district in 1996.

The historic buildings at 1904 and 1906-16 Sansom Street would be combined and converted for housing. The rear of the building at 1904 would be removed and reconstructed as an elevator and stair tower for the new complex. The building at 1906-16 currently has a single, very small elevator and a single stairway that runs across an exterior balcony at every floor. The new elevator and stair tower will provide the requisite access to and egress from every floor. The tower will be clad in brick. A roof deck will be added to 1904, but will be set back from the plane of the front façade to be inconspicuous. Windows will be replaced in the historic buildings to match the historic window appearances. The non-historic infill in the storefront opening at 1904 will be replaced with an entranceway system that echoes the historic windows. The masonry of the historic buildings will be cleaned and repaired.

A 49-story tower will be constructed on the 1907-15 Walnut Street lot. The four-story base of the tower will be articulated to replicate the rhythms of the historic buildings to the west. It will be clad in limestone and metal panels and a glass curtain wall system, and include a canopy over the entrance. The upper section of the tower will be clad in a glass and metal panel window wall system and will include balconies. The tower will cantilever five feet beyond the property line at the west.

A two-story section connected to the tower will be constructed along Sansom and 20th Streets. It will be clad in modular brick panels, metal panels, and a glass curtain wall system. It will include roof decks at the east and west ends. Parking will be located below grade with an entrance along 20th Street. A loading dock entrance will be located on Sansom Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review window, door, masonry, and deck details at 1904 and 1906-16 Sansom Street, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Dustin Downey, architect Kelly Somers, architect Kristen Suzda, and attorneys Neil Sklaroff and David Gest represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey explained to the applicants that 30 minutes has been allotted for the review. He asked the applicants to be brief. Ms. Stein agreed. Ms. Gutterman explained to the applicants that they have 10 minutes for their presentation. She remarked on the length of the agenda and the complexity of the project and asked the applicants to be brief. She noted that several people in the audience will want to speak on the matter, adding to the length of the review. She summarized the review process and the order in which various parties would be asked to speak. She again cautioned the applicants to be brief. She noted that, owing to the lengthy introduction, the applications now only have eight minutes, not 10 minutes, to present their project.

Mr. Sklaroff explained that Moravian Street is a public street and will remain a public street. He explained that City Council enacted an ordinance granting his client permission to build under and over the street. The developer will maintain Moravian Street in perpetuity. He reported that the developer has been working with the neighbors and other stakeholders for two years to reach consensus on this project. He asserted that everyone “has been in the loop,” including the Councilman, Center City Residents Association, the Streets Department, and the Department of Planning & Development.

Someone from the audience spoke out of order, claiming that a misrepresentation had been made. Mr. McCoubrey informed the speaker that the public would have time to comment after the applicant makes its presentation.

Ms. Somers directed the Committee members to a site plan and explained that there are two sections to the project, the rehabilitation of the historic buildings on Sansom Street and the new construction on Walnut and Sansom. She stated that the various parcels will be combined in a unity of use for the project. The new construction includes a two-story section on Sansom and a tower on Walnut. The two segments of the new construction will be connected above and below grade across Moravian Street. There will be two levels of parking below grade on Sansom. The residential lobby and retail will be located at the first floor along Walnut. The loading dock will have access from both Sansom and Moravian. The parking access is at 20th Street. The roof of the Sansom section will be developed as an outdoor amenity area with a pool and landscaping. Residential units will be located in the 49-story tower. The top section of the tower will hold mechanical equipment. Mr. Downey noted that the tower sets back about 10 feet at the 26th floor. Ms. Somers stated that one goal of the project is to create active pedestrian uses along Walnut, 20th, and Sansom Streets. The podium for the tower acknowledges the neighborhood context. The facades maintain the heights and rhythms of the surrounding buildings. She asserted that the proposed buildings will blend in with their context. She stated that the tower is set back so that it will not be the prime aspect of the pedestrian experience. The building sets back about 10 feet at the fourth floor. The balconies extend out about three feet, primarily to the east, not to the north or south. Ms. Stein asked how the height of the proposed building relates to the heights of the tall buildings in the area. Mr. Downey stated that the tower at 10 Rittenhouse is 400 feet tall. The Rittenhouse Hotel is about 385 feet tall. The proposed building would be slightly less than 600 feet tall.

Ms. Somers stated that the Warwick on Sansom Street will be converted to 30 apartments for veterans. She noted that the building at 1904 Sansom Street, called the Coffeehouse, would be used as the entrance to the apartment building. She explained that the apartments will be used for veterans' housing and, therefore, the building must have a gracious, accessible entrance. The Coffeehouse will provide that entrance. She noted that the Coffeehouse has a large opening at grade, which is currently infilled, and can be converted to an entrance. She stated that the new entrance will be based on the historic windows. She stated that the historic entrance to the Warwick is intact and will be retained, not modified. She stated that all ramping for the entrance will be internal to the Coffeehouse building. Ms. Stein asked Ms. Somers to explain the modifications to the front façade of the Coffeehouse that were made in the 1920s. Ms. Somers stated that the 1923 front façade is in very good condition and can be retained and rehabilitated. She observed that the rear of the building is in very poor condition and will need to be reconstructed. She stated that the front or north façade is the character-defining feature of the building and will be retained. Ms. Stein remarked that the architectural drawings should include more information about the restoration of the front façade. Mr. Downey stated that the front façade will be restored, but the wood structure of the building behind the front façade will be removed and reconstructed. It is in very poor condition and cannot be saved. Ms. Somers noted that the floor levels will be altered within the Coffeehouse building, but steps have been taken to ensure that the new floor levels will appropriately relate to the windows in the front façade.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the loading dock door. Mr. Downey stated that they will make that door as attractive as possible. Ms. Gutterman asked if the new and old construction connect internally. Mr. Downey stated that they do not. Ms. Gutterman asked about the roof deck on the Coffeehouse building. Ms. Somers stated that the deck is located on the Coffeehouse at the fourth-floor level of the Warwick. She noted that it is set back from the front façade of the Coffeehouse to be inconspicuous and softens the transition from the historic building to the new stair and elevator tower at the rear. Ms. Stein asked for a sightline study of the deck. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the window replacement plans. Ms. Somers stated that the new windows will match the exterior appearance of the historic windows. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the existing glass is original and wavy. He asserted that replacing old glass with new can significantly alter the appearance of a building. Ms. Somers replied that they have had limited access to the upper floors of the Coffeehouse because the building is unsafe and therefore have not evaluated the glass. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested restoring rather than replacing the sash. Ms. Chantry stated that the staff would carefully review all window restoration and replacement details. Mr. McCoubrey added that the staff should review the deck details.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia reminded the Committee members of the grand house by Joseph Huston that stood at 1913-15 Walnut Street. It was lost to a fire in the 1990s, before the historic district was created. Mr. Steinke stated that his organization has participated in the stakeholders group that has worked with the developer to ensure that the project is compatible with the neighborhood. He stated that the Preservation Alliance does not oppose the project. He stated that it has evolved to a much more preservation sensitive project over the two years. He stated that he is very pleased that the developer is retaining all of the Warwick building. He stated that using the Coffeehouse as the entrance to the Warwick is "a creative solution that will preserve its primary street façade." Mr. Steinke noted that the Warwick currently has insufficient elevator and stair services. This plan will remedy that deficiency. He stated that the use as moderate-income housing for veterans is great. He concluded that the Preservation Alliance is "pleased with the approach."

Jim McElwain, a member of the Vestry of the Church of the Holy Trinity, addressed the Committee. He stated that the Reverend John Gardner, the Rector, has sent a letter to Southern Land, the developer in this matter, requesting that it pay for photographs of the interior and exterior of the church, which is located across the street from the site in question, and also vibration monitoring to ensure that any damage to the church during the construction can be corrected. He stated that the church has very important stained glass windows and the idea of construction across the street scares him. He stated that Southern Land has not responded to the church's inquiries and has not guaranteed to cover the church's expenses related to the construction. The fact that Southern Land has a big insurance policy is not much comfort. He claimed that Southern Land's assertion that the neighbors all support the project is not accurate. Several neighbors do not support the project. He stated that there is no neighborhood agreement. He asked that the Historical Commission delay any decision until Southern Land has provide reasonable assurances that it will protect the church.

David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that he is not necessarily objecting to the project. He asked why no images of the project have been projected on the screen in the conference room. He stated that he is interested in the proposal, but does not know what has been proposed. Ms. Chantry responded that all of the of application materials are and have been available on the Historical Commission's website and an agenda with links to pdfs of all of the application

materials were emailed to all interested parties including Save Our Sites. Mr. Traub stated that this project is of great importance to the public and it is difficult to imagine what is being proposed. Ms. Chantry again explained that the application materials have been available online as well as at the Historical Commission's office. The Committee members provided Mr. Traub with a copy of the application materials.

David Schwartz, the owner of 1902 Sansom Street, stated that he was not notified of this meeting. He stated that he has not spoken to anyone related to the project for two or three years. He stated that he is upset that this project has proceeded to this point without anyone from the development team stopping by his shop, Sophie Curzon at 19th and Sansom, to say hello. He stated that people do enter into the Coffeehouse building; some environmental remediation was undertaken at the property last year.

Mr. Downey apologized if his company has not continued to communicate effectively with some of the neighbors. He explained that Southern Land has spent two years discussing the project with various stakeholders. He stated that he was giving his guarantee on the record to whatever it takes including photographs, monitoring, and engineering reports to ensure the safety of the church and other nearby buildings. He stated that Southern Land redesigned the foundation of the proposed building to mitigate any vibration to surrounding buildings. He added that he was happy to talk to the neighbors after the meeting.

Ms. Stein asked if the zoning was by right. Mr. Downey explained that it was. It includes bonuses for underground parking and moderate-income housing.

Mr. McElwain began to discuss his concerns about the project with Mr. Downey. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that Mr. McElwain speak to Mr. Downey outside the auspices of the public meeting. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that private agreements between the developer and nearby property owners are outside the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission. The Historical Commission's charge is to determine whether the proposed design satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Ms. Stein suggested that the structure projecting over Moravian Street will have an adverse effect on the street. She stated that the structure over the street should be a bridge, not a building. It is too wide. Mr. Downey responded that the bridge area will be retail space. He stated that it is important that the retail space on Walnut Street flow into the retail space on Sansom Street. Ms. Gutterman asked if the space will be served by an elevator. Mr. Downey replied that the space will be accessed by a stair and elevator. He stated that the space over Moravian is very important to the building. He also noted that, although other blocks of Moravian Street are very attractive, this block of Moravian is a service alley. He explained that it is used for trash and loading almost exclusively. He stated that the cartway is six feet wide and their analysis showed that about seven cars a day use this block of the alley.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review window, door, masonry, and deck details at 1904 and 1906-16 Sansom Street, provided the deck at 1904 Sansom Street is not visible from Sansom Street and that the bridge over Moravian Street is restudied with the goal of reducing its width, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 701-39 MARKET ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck; install pavilion and skylight

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Independence Center Realty LP

Applicant: Mark P. Merlini, Brickstone Realty

History: 1859; Lit Brothers Store; various buildings, 1859-1906

Individual Designation: 5/26/1970, 6/30/1970

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a greenhouse and deck and install a large, retractable skylight on the roof of the Lits Building at 701 Market Street. The proposed work would provide amenity spaces for the new corporate headquarters for five Below. The Lits Building covers an entire block and was assembled by interconnecting a series of smaller buildings. The rooftop amenities would be added to two buildings along Market Street, just west of the eastern rooftop sign. One is five stories tall; the other is six.

The vast majority of the proposed additions would not be visible from the public right-of-way, would have no impact on historic resources, and could be approved administratively by the staff. However, the proposed deck would cantilever slightly beyond the face of the building above the cornice on the five-story section and would therefore be visible from the street. The deck would include a glass guardrail.

Please note that the rendering on the final page of the application materials depicts an earlier version of the project. It does not depict the retractable skylight, but it does accurately depict the deck as currently proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the deck is set back behind the face of the building such that it is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to establish the appropriate location for the decking railing with a mock-up, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Designer Molly Lutz and architect Kevin Towey, and property owner Mark Merlini represented the application.

Ms. Stein objected to the word “inconspicuous” in the staff recommendation, which is the standard set in the Secretary’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, and suggested that the word “invisible” would be more appropriate. She stated that the deck should not be visible from Market Street.

Mr. Merlini stated that his tenant, five Below, is very interested in having a deck that projects out to the face of the building, to the same plane as the face of the sign. Ms. Gutterman asked if the sign runs along the entirety of the Market Street façade. Mr. Merlini responded that the sign does not extend along the entire façade. The signs are located at the corners. Ms. Gutterman asked if any studies of the design were undertaken with the deck pulled back away from the façade. Mr. Towey stated that the CEO of five Below would really like to have a deck that allowed for views up and down Market Street. He added that the construction would not alter the

historic facades in any way and would be entirely reversible. Ms. Stein stated that the review is predicated on the impact on the public views of the historic building, not on the deck user's experience. Ms. Gutterman stated that she assumed that the installation of the deck would impact the historic façade. Mr. Towey disagreed, stating that the deck would be cantilevered and would not connect in any way to the historic façade or cornice. Ms. Gutterman stated that they must be connecting the deck to the top of the cornice. Mr. Towey stated that they are not. Mr. McCoubrey stated that, as proposed, the deck is counter to the Commission's guidelines. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the deck must be pulled back to satisfy the standards. Mr. Merlini asked about an appropriate setback. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the staff could determine an appropriate setback with a mock up. Ms. Gutterman stated that the deck must be invisible from Market Street. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. Ms. Stein suggested a mock up. Ms. Gutterman also objected to a glass railing, owing to glare. Ms. Chantry asked Ms. Gutterman why she objected to the glass railing if the Committee is insisting that the deck must be invisible. Ms. Gutterman responded that, even if the deck is invisible, one will still see the top of the railing. Ms. Stein questioned Ms. Gutterman's assertion that an invisible glass railing would be seen, and stated that there was no reason to object to a glass railing if it was truly invisible from the street. Others agreed. Mr. Merlini suggested that the railing would not be conspicuous if it were held to the plane of the sign. Ms. Stein explained that sign is based on historic precedent, but the deck is not. Mr. Towey asked if they could pull the deck back to the plane of the façade below, which stands behind the cornice. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the deck and railing must be invisible from the street. The Committee members again suggested a mock up to determine the appropriate placement of the railing. Mr. Towey asked if the railing needed to be invisible from the street, or only the structure and decking. Ms. Gutterman responded that both the deck and its railing must be invisible from the public right-of-way. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that, if views are important, they construction an observation tower on the roof away from the façade. Mr. Towey stated that five Below is headquartered in the city and is making a huge investment in the building and wants to be able to engage with the street from the rooftop. Mr. D'Alessandro again stated that all aspects of the deck must be invisible from the street. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the standards and guidelines are very clear and must be followed. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the staff recommendation indicates that the deck must be "inconspicuous" from the public right-of-way. The Committee members objected to the "inconspicuous" standard and agreed that the standard should be "invisible" instead, even though the word "inconspicuous" is established as the standard in the Guidelines.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the deck is set back behind the face of the building such that it is invisible, not merely inconspicuous, from the public right-of-way, with the staff to establish the appropriate location for the decking railing with a mock-up, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 1132 S FRONT ST

Proposal: Demolish rear ell; construct 2-story rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Christopher McGinnis

Applicant: Christopher McGinnis

History: 1826

Individual Designation: 3/30/1965

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish an existing two-story rear ell and construct a two-story rear addition clad in cement board siding or stucco. The existing rear ell is in poor condition, and was not original to the building, but does appear on a 1917 map. The proposed addition spans the full width of the property, eliminating the existing three-foot side-yard setback and thereby building over the existing visible section of the rear wall of the main house. The rear of the building is visible from Wharton Street to the south (side) and Howard Street, a service alley at the rear.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as proposed, but approval of a rear ell replicating the width of the existing rear ell, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Christopher McGinnis Jr. with Christopher McGinnis Sr. represented the application.

Mr. McGinnis Sr. asked for clarification on the staff recommendation. Did it recommend approval of the removal of the existing ell and its reconstruction as it exists? Ms. Gutterman confirmed that the staff recommended that the reconstructed ell can be the same width and depth as presently exists.

Mr. McGinnis Sr. asked why the Historical Commission would require the reconstruction of the ell. Ms. Gutterman explained that the standards prohibit covering up the exposure of the original house, which is historic. Ms. Stein stated that the building is individually designated. The Committee does not typically approve the removal or covering up of historic elements. She explained that the designation is designed to protect the structure of the house. The fact that it has an ell, and represents a Philadelphia ell row house is part of its importance and significance as a historic structure. Therefore, modifying roof lines and changing the shape of the house would detract from its historic character. Mr. McGinnis Sr. responded that they are not covering up any historic fabric; they would only be covering up two windows. Ms. Gutterman responded that the windows are historic fabric and that the rear of the original block of the house is proposed to be covered up. Ms. Gutterman stated that the Committee recognized that the rear ell is in bad condition; therefore, the Committee would likely recommend that it is acceptable to take it down, but it should be reconstructed at the same width without covering the existing windows.

Mr. McGinnis Sr. stated that, if there is concern about the new ell being visible from the back street, Mr. McGinnis Jr. owns the lot and they have plans to build a new house on it. Therefore, the rear of the historic building will not be visible in the near future. Ms. Gutterman inquired if the building is individually listed or part of a district. The Committee members and owner noted that

it is individually listed. Ms. Gutterman stated that the Committee is looking at what the owner is proposing to do now, disregarding what may be proposed in the future. Ms. Gutterman noted that, at the present time, she opposes the expansion of the rear ell as stipulated in the current application.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the rear window should be retained. Mr. McGinnis Sr. asked him to specify which rear window. Mr. McGinnis Jr. pointed out the lower rear window with CMU infill. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the cinder block infill should be removed. Mr. McGinnis Jr. contended that taking out the cinder block will be a financial hardship. Mr. McGinnis Sr. pointed out that the cinder block is holding the rear wall up and that if it is removed the rear wall will be compromised. Mr. McCoubrey explained that the rear wings of these buildings are character-defining features and the main block of these houses are very typical of this city. The front block is the full width of the lot and the rear ells are typically narrower.

Mr. McGinnis Sr. restated that the rear addition is pulling the rear wall down. Ms. Gutterman acknowledged that the Committee understood that the rear ell needs repair or reconstruction. She continued that the Committee members agreed that the current ell can be removed, but did not agree that it can be widened when it is reconstructed.

Mr. McGinnis Jr. inquired if the other details of the design (elevation and finishes), such as the sliding glass doors are acceptable to the Commission. He asked if Hardie Board cement siding is acceptable. He stated that he was concerned that he had not heard any comments or feedback about other proposed details. Ms. Gutterman contended that two punched openings on the second floor are better than a sliding glass door. She continued that it is acceptable to have a sliding door on the first floor.

Mr. McGinnis Jr. expressed concern that other details were overlooked in the staff recommendation and comments. He wanted to make sure that the details are addressed by the Committee. Ms. Gutterman inquired if the entire addition or ell will be clad in the same materials. Mr. McGinnis Sr. confirmed that they would be clad with Hardie Siding. Ms. Gutterman inquired if there are windows planned for the other elevations of the ell. Mr. McGinnis Jr. noted that the ell as originally planned would have covered the breezeway and a window on the property line would have been illegal window. Mr. McGinnis Sr. confirmed this and explained that if the ell is expanded it is considered a party wall and installing a window in it would be illegal. Mr. McGinnis Sr. noted that, if the new wall is in its original location, windows can be put in. Mr. McGinnis Sr. stated that structurally it will be work to restore the rear wall and keep the existing window, as there are problems with it. Mr. McGinnis Jr. stated that he wished that he had a photograph of the upper rear window to share with the Committee, as it has a rotted wood header above it. The Committee members agreed with applicant that restoring the header and rear wall would be a lot of work.

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

Mr. McGinnis Sr. inquired if the Historical Commission normally reviews more than the front façade. He noted that he owns 1130 S. Front Street. Ms. Gutterman responded that the Historical Commissions' purview extends over the entire exterior envelope of the building, but that reviews concentrate on the areas visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. McGinnis Sr. stated that he just thought it was the exterior façade on the front that came under review. He

acknowledged that he was not aware that the Commission's jurisdiction extended beyond the front facade. Ms. Gutterman confirmed that the Historical Commission is especially concerned with anything that is visible from the public right of way, particularly because this house is individually designated.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application as proposed, but approval of the replacement of the rear ell with an ell replicating the existing width, provided the sliding glass doors at the second floor are replaced with punched window openings, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 1919-21 BRANDYWINE ST

Proposal: Construct rooftop addition; reconfigure facades; stucco rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Andre O. Golsorkhi and Autum G. Oser

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto DesignShop Inc.

History: 1919; rebuilt after fire, c. 1960

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to modify a non-contributing building that was once a carriage house but was significantly altered in the mid twentieth century. This application proposes to demolish and reconstruct the primary façade along Brandywine Street. The existing single-leaf door at the front entry will be removed. The entry will be moved to the center of the first-floor façade and double-leaf doors will be installed. The existing windows will be removed and new openings will be created to accommodate new double-hung, fixed, and casement metal windows. The applicant proposes to replace the red brick on the primary façade with a gray brick.

A new rear addition will be constructed at the third floor. The new addition will remain set back from the existing two-story rear portion on the building. A new 42" parapet is proposed at the new roof deck on the third floor. The windows and garage door will be removed. New fixed and metal casements are proposed to replace existing windows. A new garage door with upper glazing is proposed as well. A new stucco finish is proposed for the rear walls. The building's rear wall is currently red brick.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided a red brick compatible with the surrounding streetscape, not a gray brick, is used at the front façade; the first and second-floor rear façade is brick, not stucco; and a railing, not a parapet, encloses the rear deck; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Adam Montalbano and owner Andre Golsorkhi were present.

Mr. Montalbano stated that they have worked closely with staff, having approximately five or six meetings to develop a design in a style that is complementary to the street. The discussions

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 MARCH 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

with the staff focused on modifications to the front and rear of the property in terms of window arrangement and placement, soldier coursing, articulation, massing, and scale of all these elements. Mr. Montalbano explained that these items have already received approval from the staff and the plans are currently under review at the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Mr. Montalbano continued that four specific items still needed review and comment from the Committee included the proposed change of brick color on the front façade from a red brick to a gray, change of roof deck railing from a vertical picket railing to the 42" parapet, stucco on the rear façade instead of the existing brick, and the small addition on the third-floor rear of the property.

Ms. Gutterman inquired how much taller the applicant's building is compared to neighboring buildings. Mr. Montalbano pointed out that 1923 Brandywine Street property has a roof deck and stair tower. Ms. Gutterman noted that most of the properties around 1919-21 Brandywine Street are three-story buildings, not four. Mr. Montalbano agreed but clarified that 1919-21 Brandywine would not have a fourth story rather the application proposed to expand the third story on the rear. Ms. Gutterman expressed concern that the proposed drawings makes the building appear tall and large.

Mr. Montalbano directed the Committee to look at the attached photographs in the application. He explained the proposed changes using the photographs rather than the drawings. Mr. Montalbano explained that the rear street, Wilcox Street, is eclectic mix of varying heights, materiality, set backs, colors, and massings and is a smaller street, more of a service street.

The Committee commented that section drawings should have been included in the application packet.

Ms. Gutterman inquired if the architect is having trouble matching the brick on the rear and if this is the reason for proposing stucco. Mr. Montalbano explained they have not really delved into that and that there are brick infills and repointing that have been done over time. As a result of the widening of the garage and the changes to the window openings, applying stucco at the rear would allow more funding to go to the front façade. Mr. Montalbano pointed out the eclectic mix of finishes on the rears of other buildings and thought it may be acceptable to stucco the rear. Mr. Baron noted that there is mismatched brick on the rear facade but it is areas of infill openings that are being taken out. Based on plans reviewed at the staff level, the windows that will be widened will eliminate some of the mismatched brick. Mr. Baron contended that the rear façade can be seen from the number streets, not just from this alley. He stated that, by eliminating the stucco on the first two floors, the building would be more in character with the original; then the upper additions, which are set back, could be stucco.

Mr. Montalbano showed three sample options of the proposed gray brick for the front façade, which he laid out on the table in front of the Committee. Mr. Montalbano explained that although there is a strong presence of red brick on Brandywine Street, there is a fair mix of color of material. Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Montalbano if any of the samples match the existing brick on the building's front façade. Mr. Montalbano responded that the existing building has a red brick. He also pointed out that there is a mix of red brick colors due to infill and changes over time. Mr. Montalbano explained that 1912 Brandywine Street, which has a brownish-gray brick as inspiration for the new proposed brick for 1919-21 Brandywine. 1918-24 Brandywine was also used as a reference point for the new, proposed brick color. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the

original building was most likely a red brick building. Mr. Montalbano agreed that it was most likely red brick. He explained that a 1960s historic photograph on file at the Historical Commission office was taken after the documented fire. It is a black and white photograph and he believes it showed the reconstructed brick and it appears to be red brick, but he cannot be sure.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired if the four-foot bump on the alley side is necessary. Mr. Montalbano explained that it is an expanded bathroom on the second floor.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a red brick compatible with the surrounding streetscape, not a gray brick, is used at the front façade; the first and second-floor rear façade is brick, not stucco; and a railing, not a parapet, encloses the rear deck; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 514 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition; replace garage door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: James and Anna Whitesell

Applicant: Timothy Kerner, Terra Studio, LLC

History: 1813; Peter Berry, house carpenter; rear façade rebuilt, 1946; front façade rebuilt, 1966

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story rear addition at this three-story building. The proposed rear addition will be clad in brick, with standing seam metal roofs, and will be substantially blocked from public view at the rear by the existing garage fronting Cypress Street. A non-historic one-story addition will be demolished, and the first and second stories of the rear masonry wall will be removed. Zoning records show that this rear wall was rebuilt in 1946, which accounts for the existing non-historic appearance. The rear chimney will become a working chimney and will be extended in height as necessitated by building code requirements. The rear roof slope will be extended slightly. An existing one-story garage at the rear of the property will be extended by six feet into the rear yard, and a new garage door will be installed. The staff suggests that the garage door should be redesigned with glazing along the top of the door and panels below, rather than the more modern style that is proposed in the application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Timothy Kerner the application.

Ms. Stein asked about the proposed location of the mechanical unit shown in the renderings on the roof behind the extended chimney. Mr. Kerner explained that the existing unit is on the lower roof of the one-story building. Ms. Stein responded that the proposed location is highly visible

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 MARCH 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

13

from the public right-of-way, and is not the best location for the historic character of the building. Mr. Kerner showed photographs of the view from Cypress Street at the rear, and noted that the unit is approximately 100 feet back from the Cypress Street garage front, and there are other visible units on the house immediately to the east. He commented that the only other location for the mechanical unit is the yard, which would be unfortunate for the property owners. He suggested that the proposed location, tucked behind the extended chimney, will not be offensive from the public right-of-way. Ms. Gutterman asked how the mechanical unit will be maintained. Mr. Kerner responded that one would have to get up to the roof. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the units are strictly air conditioning condensers. Mr. Kerner confirmed this. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that the mechanical unit should not be on the roof, "sitting up there, staring at us." He suggested that a mechanical engineer could figure out a way to size the unit so that the chilled water can get upstairs without the unit being on the roof. He suggested that the owner would benefit too, because of maintenance concerns related to accessing the unit on the roof.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the removal of the majority of the rear wall. Ms. Chantry confirmed that the rear wall was completely rebuilt in 1946, according to a zoning permit application. Ms. Stein asked about the red brick chimney. Mr. Kerner explained that it is an existing chimney which currently ends about 18 inches above the roof. It will be extended to comply with code requirements, which call for it to be two feet higher than anything within 10 feet. The neighbor's dormer window is the closest building part, so the chimney has to extend two feet above that window. The Committee members asked about the location of the chimney in the photographs. Mr. Kerner explained that it blends in with the neighbor's brick, but is on the edge of the property line.

Mr. McCoubrey called for public comment. Paul Boni, Chair of the Zoning and Historic Preservation Committee for the Society Hill Civic Association, and Lorna Katz Lawson, member and former Chair of the Association, explained that they held a community meeting for this project, but there was an incredibly small turnout and therefore no quorum. Mr. Boni commented that several Committee members would prefer that the mechanical unit is relocated to a location that is not visible from the public right-of-way, and the proposed mid-century garage door should be solid to be more in keeping with the style of the building. Mr. Kerner responded that the garage could be considered to be mid-century, with its angled skylight and continued horizontal transom.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the material of the existing garage door. Mr. Kerner responded that it is aluminum panel. Ms. Gutterman suggested that Mr. Kerner work with the staff on a redesign of the garage door. She considered the proposed door to be "too high-design" for its location. Mr. Kerner asked about the staff's suggestion for windows running horizontally at the top of the new door versus the Civic Association's suggestion for a solid door with no windows. Ms. Gutterman opined that the door does not need to have windows, since there is an existing skylight to allow light into the garage. She suggested a solid panelized garage door, but not the existing aluminum door. Ms. Stein commented that having glass that low to the street is not preferred from a maintenance point of view. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that if the owner wants glass in the garage door, it should not be in the proposed vertical configuration.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the location of the mechanical equipment and design of the garage door,

but approval of the remainder of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 2205 BAINBRIDGE ST

Proposal: Restore front façade; install egress dormer window

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Timothy Kerner

Applicant: Timothy Kerner, Terra Studio, LLC

History: 1875

Individual Designation: 9/30/1969

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the front façade of this single-family residence. All aspects of the restoration are able to be approved at the staff-level, except for the front dormer window, which the staff believes was historically two double-hung windows with arched tops. The applicant seeks to retain the existing rectangular opening and insert an egress-compliant casement window to fit the opening.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the dormer sash have arched tops, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Architect Timothy Kerner represented the application.

Mr. Baron showed some photographs, one of a similar building that has been restored with arched windows in the same block. He also showed the designation photograph of the whole block with a mix of windows and window alterations. He said that he believes that they all once had arched windows, many of which have been cut out to create square openings. Mr. Baron pointed to the diamond shape motif above each window that mirrors the arch of the curved windows. He also pointed out that it is still possible to see the round moldings above many of the windows that have been cut into rectangles.

Mr. Kerner said that he has a different interpretation. He thinks that just as there are some cornices with brackets and some with panels that the developer constructed the row with a variety of windows. He showed a photograph of his house with a modern jalousie window at the time of designation. A subsequent owner added the current arched windows after 1969. He handed out a photograph of the board at the top of his dormer window which he thinks is original and does not show evidence of a former curved opening. In addition he explained that the current windows do not allow in a lot of light and that he would like to provide code-compliant egress windows to his daughter's bedroom. He proposes a two-leaf French casement window for that reason.

Mr. Baron agreed that the board in Mr. Kerner's photograph is original; however he thinks that it was cut above the arches. He pointed to all the other modern moldings and boards that have been added to that piece. Ms. Stein said that since we do not have hard evidence of the original window's appearance that she would prefer the rectangular openings. Ms. Gutterman agreed

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 MARCH 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

15

but said that the new casements should look like double hung sash. Mr. Baron asked about material and Ms. Gutterman said that the new windows should be wood since they are on the primary façade. She inquired whether the proposed shingles are rubber to look like slate. Mr. Baron said that they are made from recycled tires.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the windows are wood, not clad, and have the appearance of double-hung windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 404 S 6TH ST

Proposal: Construct addition and roof deck; install elevator; replace windows; rebuild side wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dania Hallak

Applicant: Tina Geary, InHabit, LLC

History: 1925

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconstruct a bowing side wall and construct a rooftop addition and deck with pilohouse. It also proposes to replace the garage door. The south facade of the building, along Waverly Street, is bowing and needs to be rebuilt. The application proposes to reconstruct it in concrete masonry units and clad it is stucco. A large rooftop addition is proposed; it would be set back from the front façade about 6'-6". A deck with pilohouse would be included on the addition. The pilohouse would be fairly large because it would include a stair and elevator.

The staff contends that a rooftop addition would be acceptable on this building, which is of limited historic significance and has limited architectural character. However, the staff suggests that the addition should be redesigned to better integrate with the building. As proposed, the enlarged building with large addition and roofdeck would overwhelm its neighbors and have an adverse impact on the historic district. The staff suggests either setting the addition back farther on the building or designing it as a mansard, which would be less conspicuous.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the rebuilding of the side wall and garage door; denial of the addition and deck as proposed, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Randal Baron presented the application. Architect Tina Geary and owner Hazem Hallak represented the application.

Ms. Stein said that this is a very difficult application because in 1925 someone tucked a new building into the backyards of other three-story houses. The building is already the right scale for its environment. It would be a challenge to add another floor without towering over the neighbors. She said that the proposed addition is incompatible with the neighborhood. Ms. Geary said that she designed the addition to fit into the zoning constraints but would be happy to modify the design with an alternate roofline. Ms. Gutterman said that the amount of addition with the pilohouse and roof deck is excessive and will tower over the neighbors. She

recommended either an addition with a smaller footprint or a deck on the current roof, but not both. Ms. Geary asked if the Committee is only concerned with the view from the front. Ms. Gutterman said that she is concerned with the visibility from all four sides. Still she said that it would be best to pull any deck or addition back from the front facade first. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that perhaps the architect could reduce the height by lowering the floors, since the side wall is being rebuilt. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed and asked if the applicant would propose an addition with a small deck in front of that so that the owner could reach the deck from a door rather than a stairtower. He asked if they need a deck. Ms. Geary said that they need an elevator because the owner plans to retire to this house.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Zoning Committee said that, although they have not formally reviewed this project for a variance yet, they are concerned with the height and the impact on neighbors facing Pine Street. He advised that any new facades should be brick. He asked if a deck is really needed since people often construct roof decks but seldom use them. Ms. Geary asked if they could get an approval of the changes to the rear windows. Ms. Gutterman said that those changes should be presented as part of a whole design.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 236 S 22ND ST

Proposal: Construct addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Shawn Murray

Applicant: Scott Woodruff, Designblendz LLP

History: 1845

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a small addition and deck on the two-story rear ell of this corner building. The addition would be clad in stucco and the deck would be enclosed by a parapet wall, not a railing.

The front-facade windows were replaced with vinyl windows without the Historical Commission's approval since designation. The windows are not addressed in this application, but should be brought into compliance under a separate application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the addition is differentiated with a cladding material other than stucco and a black metal picket railing is substituted for the parapet wall at the deck, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Scott Woodruff represented the application.

Mr. Baron displayed a photograph of the rear wall of the main block covered with aluminum siding. He said that it appears that the back of the main block has already been altered. The staff recommends that the addition also be clad in siding, although not aluminum siding. Ms. Gutterman asked about the rear window and the setback of the deck. Mr. Woodruff said that the addition will contain a window and door similar to the existing. He proposes to set the deck back five feet to comply with zoning. The addition will contain a bathroom. He added that the building has only a very small rear yard which is not accessible to the owner because the first floor is rented out to an art gallery. The building previously had a deck and the door already exists. Ms. Gutterman advised that the deck be shortened to sit east of the skylight. Ms. Stein asked about the construction of the deck. Mr. Woodruff said that the roof will be reconfigured and the deck pavers will sit directly on the roof. He explained that there will be a step down of eight inches from the door to the deck. Mr. Baron explained that vinyl windows were installed in the front façade without a permit. He said that the plans indicate “existing windows to remain.” He opined that this approval should not legalize those windows. He also asked about the new four-foot high skylight. Mr. Woodruff said that if they are shortening the deck, they will not raise the skylight.

Ms. Gutterman made a motion to approve the addition so long as it is differentiated in material with a wood cladding. Approval of the deck so long as it is reduced in length to the east edge of the skylight and given a picket railing rather than a parapet wall, no visible mechanical units, no legalization of the front windows and with the staff to review details. Ms. Stein seconded the motion which was approved unanimously.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the addition is differentiated in material with a wood cladding; the deck is reduced in length to the east edge of the skylight and has a picket railing rather than a parapet wall; and the mechanical equipment is not visible from the street, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 340 S 17TH ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Neil Gordon

Applicant: Jack E. Burns, Jr., Jack Burns Architecture, LLP

History: 1868; front façade rebuilt, 1971

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck with a 5'-0" setback from the front façade and a pilot house. A smooth, board and batten cement siding is proposed for the pilot house, and a 3'-0" glass railing with a black top rail is proposed to enclose the deck. Because of the building's location close to a corner and in front of a surface parking lot, the deck and pilot house would be highly visible from the public right-of-way. The rear of the property appears visible from Panama Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 MARCH 2018

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION: Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Jack Burns and Chris Schrack represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there was a site plan in the drawings, and Mr. Burns directed her to the third page of the packet. She then asked if there had been any consideration of reducing the size of the proposed deck and locating it on the rear ell so that it would be less conspicuous. Mr. Burns responded that a big reason for the project was to get more light into the interior of the house, which is why they put so many windows on the pilot house. Ms. Gutterman asked about the length of the house and the size of the proposed deck. Mr. Burns noted that the house is 15' 4" wide. Ms. Gutterman noted that the length of the roof is 54' and that the length of the proposed deck is 49'. She stated that, while she understood wanting to get more light into the interior of the house, there needed to be a way to do it without making the pilot house 9' 6" tall. She also remarked that it was her opinion that the size of the proposed deck needed to be reduced by at least half, but there was still the issue of visibility. Mr. Burns asked if the issue with the proposed deck was the square footage or if it was the visibility, to which Ms. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey replied that it was the visibility of the deck from the street.

Ms. Gutterman acknowledged the surface parking lot in front of the property. She wondered how far back the front railing would need to be located in order to be inconspicuous when viewed from the sidewalk on the opposite side of 17th Street. She further commented that the deck would also need to be pushed back from the rear to minimize visibility from Panama Street, suggesting that perhaps the size of the entire deck should be limited to 25'-30'. Ms. Gutterman explained her concern with a deck as large as the one being proposed was that any additional pergolas, umbrellas and plantings would make the deck even higher and more visible.

Mr. Burns directed the Architectural Committee members to drawing HC 102 so they could review the sightline studies he had prepared as part of the application. He stated that his clients were willing to push the front railing back. Ms. Gutterman said that both the front and back railings needed to be pushed back away from the facades, and that the pilot house needed to get pushed back and be made smaller.

Ms. Stein pointed out that the deck was to be constructed on top of the existing roof, making it taller and even more visible. Mr. Burns explained that he did not want to load the existing roof, and Mr. D'Alessandro responded that he should reframe the roof to get it lower. Mr. Burns stated that he had concerns about the long-term durability of the roof if they had to reframe it, to which Mr. D'Alessandro responded that the roof could be reframed without having to load weight on to the parapet walls.

Mr. Burns asked the Architectural Committee members to further explain their concerns with the visibility from Panama Street. Ms. Gutterman explained that the proposed location of the deck was too close to the rear façade and would be seen from Panama Street, but that if it was pushed back around 8', the railing would be less visible. She suggested that Mr. Burns prepare a mock up to determine the precise location on the roof where the railings will become less conspicuous from the right-of-way. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro reiterated their concern with the height and size of the proposed deck. Mr. Burns responded that the design could likely be recessed down into the existing parapet.

Mr. Burns directed the members of the Architectural Review Committee to drawing HC 110 to look at a photograph of the view of the subject property from Panama Street and asked if this was the view that they were most concerned with, to which Ms. Gutterman replied that they were concerned with both views equally. She went on to say that she believed that the proposal was just too large for this particular site, and that the size seemed like it was to accommodate four or five apartments, not a single family residence.

Mr. Baron of the staff suggested that the roof of the pilot house could be sloped back in order to reduce the height, and that skylights could be used to increase light to the interior of the home. Mr. Burns said that he understood the idea, but that if they were to reduce the height of the pilot house and push it back, it would no longer be visible from the public right-of-way.

Mr. McCoubrey told Mr. Burns that their main concern was with the visibility from the right-of-way on both 17th Street and from Panama Street. He stated that he realized there was a slot view of the subject building from Panama Street, and that perhaps there would be a bit more flexibility with that side; however, the deck still needed to be pushed back to make it as inconspicuous as possible. Mr. McCoubrey went on to say that he did not consider the parking lot across the street to be public property.

Mr. Burns asked the members of the Architectural Committee about materials, noting that it was the owners' preference to have glass panels. Ms. Gutterman stated that if the deck was not visible, there was a slightly different guideline than there would be for materials that were visible, and that she did not like to approve glass visible from the right-of-way. Mr. Burns asked if the board and batten cement was acceptable, but then commented that it would not be visible anyway, so it should not be a problem.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that Mr. Burns work with the staff to review a mock up to determine where to place the railings, reminding him that he needed to take the height of the decking structure into consideration when he is measuring for the railings and the pilot house. Mr. Burns then confirmed that the members of the Architectural Committee's preference would be to push the deck structure down closer to the surface of the roof, to which they agreed.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Review Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

ADDRESS: 1833 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct roof deck; replace garden wall; alter entrance location at rear; reconfigure window openings at rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Tyler and Alejandra McNeil

Applicant: Christina Carter, John Milner Architects, Inc.

History: 1858

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck on the rear ell of this contributing building in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District, and to enlarge an existing garage opening at the rear along Cypress Street, which is considered to be a service alley on this block. An existing fourth-floor door will be modified into a dormer to allow for deck access. An existing rear chimney is to be raised to 7'-0" above the finish deck per code. The garage entrance is to be enlarged and a new steel roll-down garage door will replace the existing garage door. The existing CMU garden wall and metal door will be replaced with a red brick wall and metal door. The application also proposes to remove two windows at the rear above the garage, raise the sills, and install a new lintel and two new windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the location of the exterior mechanical housing for the garage door is less conspicuous, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Schmitt presented the application. Architects Christina Carter and Kara Litvinas represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants if there was any way to reduce the height of the structure for the deck. Ms. Carter replied that the challenge was that it was a hipped roof starting on the western side and pitching eastward, so they have to span the brick walls approximately 15' across. Ms. Gutterman asked if any other houses on the block had a deck at the rear ell at the height the applicant is proposing. Ms. Carter replied that the house right next door at 1831 Delancey Place did, and that it was partially shown in the elevations they submitted to the Architectural Review Committee. She went on to explain that the house at 1829 Delancey Place had a deck that was even higher, both of which could be seen in some of the photographs in their packets.

Ms. Stein asked if it was the roof deck height that was causing the dormer to pop up, to which Ms. Carter responded that it is not, but rather that there was palette that sits directly on the roof structure at the location of the window that was converted to a 4'6" roof access door, and from there, a person must step up on to the main deck structure. Ms. Stein asked if the profile of the dormer would change, and Ms. Carter said that she would describe the modification as a reverse shed dormer, explaining that the original height of the sill and the original width of the masonry open would remain the same, while gaining a small amount of head room.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the reason for the four steps up to the main deck area was due to the fact that the roof on the rear ell was that much higher than the roof that a person would exit out

on to, and Ms. Carter confirmed that was correct, explaining that the highest point of the roof was what determined the height of the deck.

Ms. Stein asked whether there were any other roof lines that were broken at the rear of the property like that of the subject property. Ms. Carter stated that the roof line at 1829 Delancey Place was broken by additions that had been constructed over time.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff had a preference for one of the two alternatives showed for the chimney designs, which were between a copper flute termination cap extending the existing brick chimney higher up and stuccoing it. Ms. Schmitt said that she recalled discussing the brick and stucco option, and Ms. Carter explained that that was their preferred solution; however, they wanted to have a second design to show to the Architectural Committee and the Commission owing to the visibility of the chimney. She explained that the existing chimney was exposed brick on the western side, and stuccoed on the other three sides.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there were any ideas to mitigate the operating mechanism for the garage door so that it could look more attractive. Ms. Schmitt explained that during the staff's meeting with the applicants, there was discussion about whether the boxes could be placed on the inside. Ms. Carter said that the issue was about not having enough head height. She commented that currently, the motor is located above the door, and so their proposal was trying to relocate the boxes to at least make them line up with the door. Ms. Gutterman asked if the garage slants down, and Ms. Carter confirmed that it did. Ms. Gutterman asked if a panel door could be used instead, and Ms. Carter explained that they did not have the extra 10"-12" required for a traditional track door.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if there were any additional comments from the Architectural Committee members, and Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the existing roof material. Ms. Carter responded that it was a membrane that they would be replacing in kind. Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro asked the applicants if they would consider reframing the roof since they were already planning on replacing the membrane. Ms. Carter said she would need to check the ceiling heights of the property in order to determine if lowering the roof would be possible. Mr. D'Alessandro said that he would suggest denying the roof deck until the applicant returned with a plan for a reframing of the roof structure so that it would be lower. Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the deck as proposed would be quite visible.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the applicants consider ways to minimize the visibility of the deck and revise the plans. She stated that she thought that approving a deck this visible could be setting a bad precedent. Ms. Carter asked if the roof could be lowered sufficiently, would the deck proposal be something that could be approved by the staff. Ms. Schmitt responded that was not something that could be determined without plans to review, and Ms. Gutterman agreed.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the applicants push back the railing that was currently shown in the drawings to make it less visible, and Mr. McCoubrey agreed.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if there were any comments from the public, and there were none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the roof deck, owing to its visibility, and approval of the changes to the garage door and the new garden wall, with the staff to review details.

ADDRESS: 950-52 S FRONT ST

Proposal: Remove frame addition; construct addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: SAM9803 LLC

Applicant: Logan Dry, KCA Design

History: 1820

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 5/31/1966

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a two-story frame portion of the rear ell and to construct a three-story rear addition in its place. The new addition would connect to the existing brick rear ell and would be clad in HardiePlank lap siding. A deck would extend between the new addition and the third floor of the main block. Portions of the existing roofs of the main block and the rear ell would be modified to create greater consistency between spaces. The window of the rear dormer would be cut down to create a door onto the deck, which would be enclosed with a metal picket railing. The application also proposes to replace an existing CMU wall and wooden gate across the property's side yard with a brick and iron fence.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Logan Dry represented the application.

Mr. Dry explained that the three-dimensional renderings provide the best understanding of the massing of the proposed addition. He noted that it is an oddly shaped property, and the photos show the frame addition that they are proposing to remove. In order to create more usable space, they wanted to push the addition as far back in order to maintain the trinity in the front and the existing brick rear ell. He noted that the rear ell has a steeply pitched roof, which they are proposing to flatten and to construct a deck on. He explained that they wanted to keep the deck and pilot house as inconspicuous as possible and make use of the two-story span between the original two and a half story trinity and the addition in the back. He explained that the railing for the deck would be set back the depth of an existing chimney, away from the visible edge of the rear ell.

Ms. DiPasquale directed the Committee members' attention to the photograph of the property from Front Street, noting that the rear of the property is not visible from any public right-of-way, but the side is partially visible from the open parking area to the south of the house.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the depth of the existing frame portion proposed for demolition. Mr. Dry responded that the portion being demolished is angled and is about eight feet in depth. He explained that the chimney is at the end of the brick portion of the rear ell, where it meets the frame addition. Mr. Dry explained that the proposed addition would be 16 feet in depth, but that

it will be pulled away from the property line so that it can be straight rather than angled. Ms. Gutterman asked whether there would be any changes to the masonry rear ell or the rear wall of the main block of the house. Mr. Dry confirmed that there would not be any changes to them. He explained that the only modifications to the main block of the house and masonry rear ell are to the roofs. Mr. Dry noted that there have been alterations to the sloped roof of the main block, and that the proposal is only to modify those areas to create greater consistency. Ms. Gutterman asked if the application proposes to modify the rear dormer. Mr. Dry confirmed that it does, but only to lower the sill to create a door from the window. Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the rear dormer window is original. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she does not know for certain, but there appear to have been several modifications to the rear slope, and also potentially the rear dormer. She noted that the rear dormer is not visible from the public right-of-way and that the staff determined that the proposal retains the overall integrity of the original design of the building, since it is proposing to cut the window down and not to expand or reconfigure it. She directed the Committee members' attention to the birds-eye view images in the application. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that the rear roof and dormer appear to have been modified.

Ms. Stein questioned the proposed pilot house on the existing rear ell. Mr. Dry explained that they pushed the stair enclosure to the far side of the house, away from the public right-of-way, sloped the roof, and used the minimum required height to minimize the impact of the addition. He noted that it is not a pilot house, per se. Ms. Stein asked Ms. DiPasquale if it would be visible from the public right-of-way. Ms. DiPasquale responded that, if it is, it would be inconspicuous.

Ms. Stein asked where the egress well would be located. Mr. Dry explained that it would be located at the rear of the property, in the back yard. He stated that the application does not propose to install any egress wells in the front sidewalk.

Mr. Dry noted that, following the submission, he and the owner had discussed restoring the front steps using marble slabs turned front-facing, rather than the side-facing configuration currently. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the applicant is proposing any grading or window wells on the front. Mr. Dry reiterated that he is not. He explained that the front basement windows will be replaced but not enlarged, and that all basement egress will be through the rear.

Mr. McCoubrey confirmed that the new addition would start where the existing masonry ell ends. Mr. Dry responded affirmatively.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant would repair stucco and replace windows on the rear of the existing house. Mr. Dry responded affirmatively, noting that they are proposing to enlarge windows along the side of the existing rear ell that are not visible from the public right-of-way.

Ms. Stein noted that the building is individually designated and asked whether the staff has any concerns about the proposed modifications. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff's only other recommendation would be to retain a return of the masonry wall at the rear of the existing ell, if it still exists between the masonry portion of the ell and the frame addition.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application as well as the restoration of the marble steps, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

ADDRESS: 201 S 13TH ST

Proposal: Restore entrance; cut new entrance

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: PMC Property Group

Applicant: Jonathan Weber, Meyer Design, Inc.

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

Individual Designation: 8/2/1973

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install two new entrances the ground-floor commercial space of this corner building. Along Walnut Street, the application proposes to restore the historic entrance location in the westernmost bay and to convert the existing entrance back into a window, as it was historically. On the 13th Street elevation, the application proposes to create a new entrance in the second window bay from the north by cutting down the window sill. The stone sill would be used to restore the window on the Walnut Street elevation.

The staff notes that, had the 13th Street door been eliminated, the restoration of the historic entrance and window along the Walnut Street elevation could have been approved at the staff level. The staff suggests that the interior configuration be reevaluated to eliminate the door cut on 13th Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect George Wilson represented the application.

Mr. Wilson noted that Meyer Design has been working with Bryn Mawr Trust on a number of their locations, and they have a private banking business that they are exploring and rolling out in Philadelphia. He explained that the proposed entrance along 13th Street would access a lobby that would lead to a mezzanine for the private banking. He noted that the proposal also relocates the Walnut Street entrance to its historic location.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the spandrel material above the window currently in the historic doorway. Mr. Wilson responded that it is original cast iron and would be restored.

Ms. Stein clarified that there is one entrance now and two are proposed. Mr. Wilson responded affirmatively. Ms. Stein questioned why there needs to be two doors, and why both spaces could not be accessed by a shared lobby with one entrance. Mr. Wilson responded that the bank wants to keep the two functions separate. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if this was a new concept. Mr. Wilson responded that it is. Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the issue with banks is that they make frequent changes to their signage, awnings, interiors, etc. They are always

changing. Mr. Wilson responded that that keeps everyone in business. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that the Architectural Committee is tasked with looking at a given project's impact to the building. Ms. Stein agreed, noting that the Committee must look at the future life of the building, beyond the current tenant. She opined that an approximately 2,000 square foot retail space does not necessarily need two separate entrances. She suggested utilizing one door and cleverly designing a vestibule, from which each tenant location could be located. She noted that the second door being requested does not serve the main lobby of the building. Ms. Stein asked if there is an accessible entrance to the main lobby of the building. Mr. Wilson responded that he does not know. Ms. Stein asked if the proposal has anything to do with accessibility. Mr. Wilson responded that it does not, but that the current door's location on Walnut Street was approved by the Historical Commission in 2003. Ms. Stein responded that the proposal to return the entrance to its historic location on Walnut Street is positive, as it reestablishes a historic condition and the symmetry of the façade.

Ms. Stein asked how the mezzanine is currently accessed. Mr. Wilson responded that it is accessed through the existing door, but was previously used as storage. Mr. Wilson noted that the redesign allows the bank to have a greater presence in Philadelphia.

Ms. Pentz questioned the scalloped detail on the window sills. Mr. Wilson responded that it is a metal detail, which they will restore.

Mr. Wilson noted that this was previously a Royal Bank, which Bryn Mawr Trust took over. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that that is his point, that banks are ever-changing.

Mr. Wilson opined that there is a shaft in the floor plan that makes it difficult to use one door. Ms. Stein responded that the area that appears to be a shaft in the proposed floor plan does not appear in the existing floor plan, so it may not actually be a shaft. Mr. Wilson responded that the shaft may be coming off the basement. Ms. Stein reiterated that it is not on the existing first floor plan. Mr. Wilson responded that he would look into that. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that it really is necessary for the Committee to have accurate drawings in order to determine whether the proposed alteration is actually necessary.

Ms. Stein asked whether any new signage is included in the proposal. Mr. Wilson responded that the existing signage will remain. Ms. Stein asked if the proposed new door would have signage. Mr. Wilson responded that it would have vinyl lettering on the door itself but no other signage.

Mr. Wilson opined that, when the building was designed, all of the openings were designed on grade. Ms. DiPasquale responded that that is not true, as the historic photograph in the submission clearly shows. Ms. Stein agreed with Ms. DiPasquale, noting that the historic photograph shows two doors on Walnut Street, one in the bay where the ATM is located, and one in the corner bay where the door is proposed. She stated that is appropriate to restore that doorway. She reiterated that she does not see any reason why the historic entrance could not enter into a new glass vestibule from which separate doors to the tellers and to the mezzanine and private banking could be located. She suggested that, with good design, an interior vestibule could provide the privacy and elitism that the private banking side of the business desires. She explained that limiting the bank to the one entrance would provide greater leeway for the St. James at some point in the future to apply for an accessible entrance. Mr.

D'Alessandro agreed, noting that he is concerned about the lack of necessity for the second entrance. Mr. Wilson responded that it is a matter of preference. Mr. McCoubrey responded that there needs to be a much more compelling reason for the installation of the 13th Street door, such as a demonstrated physical limitation on the interior. Mr. Wilson suggested that, if they were to explore the vestibule idea, it might work better to have just the 13th Street entrance, and not relocate the Walnut Street door to the historic location. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that that would not be appropriate, and recommended denying the application. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the proposed relocation of the entrance on Walnut Street was a restoration, and that the applicants could have received a staff level approval for that work. Ms. Stein agreed with Mr. D'Alessandro and stated that the cutting of the 13th Street entrance without the restoration of the Walnut Street entrance was not a good deal for the historic building.

Ms. Stein suggested, with a caveat, that if two separate entrances are truly necessary, that the applicants utilize the second historic entrance to the space, where the ATM is currently located on the Walnut Street façade. She noted that the ATM could be relocated to the interior. She stated that she believes the Committee and staff would be comfortable with that option as it is a restoration.

Mr. Wilson asked whether it would be acceptable to put two entrances, one at each corner bay on Walnut Street and 13th Street, into a shared vestibule. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that that would also not be appropriate. Mr. Wilson commented that they want a sense of separateness for the two types of banking. Mr. D'Alessandro asked why that needs to be achieved by cutting through historic masonry, rather than through a shared interior vestibule.

Ms. Stein questioned the height of the base of the windows. Mr. Wilson responded that it is a substantial sill, at least 18 inches or more in height, and that they would reuse the sill that they cut from the 13th Street window to restore the window on Walnut Street. Mr. DiPasquale clarified that the base of the window sill in the historic doorway is made out of concrete and is taller than the historic sill.

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

Ms. Stein commented that, when the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission review alterations to openings such as these, they are usually for compelling reasons such as ADA accessibility. She opined that, in this case, putting a second entrance in such a small retail space is inappropriate, especially for a highly significant building by prominent architect Horace Trumbauer. She encouraged the applicants to explore alternatives to installing an entrance on 13th Street.

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

ADDRESS: 114 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Legalize parapet wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Michael Samschick

Applicant: Core Realty Inc.

History: 1840

Individual Designation: 5/26/1970

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the construction of five-foot-tall CMU block walls on top of the building's party walls. The walls, which begin approximately 28 feet back from the front façade, are visible from several public rights-of-way. The Department of Licenses & Inspections inspected the property and issued a violation for the work in November 2017. The applicant has not provided a reason for the extension.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property managers Kathy Parisi and Nina Prester represented the application.

Ms. Parisi opined that the parapet wall was built a few years ago. She noted that the owners were throwing around ideas such as raising the ceiling in the executive offices on the top floor, or to construct a roof deck for the staff, but never did anything except to construct the parapet. She explained that they were bringing up wood planks for work to 116 Chestnut, and had a representative from the Department of Licenses & Inspections come out, and that inspector noticed the parapet wall that had been constructed without permits. Ms. Parisi reiterated that they have not done anything with the wall since it was constructed a few years ago. She explained that the owner, Michael Samschick, still wants to have the option to use the parapet in some way, either to raise the ceiling or to construct a roof deck, but wanted to get the parapet legalized first. Ms. DiPasquale responded that this application does not propose to elevate the ceiling or to construct a roof deck, and that the legalization of the parapet would not constitute an approval of such work. Ms. Stein commented that it is hard to imagine legalizing a highly visible parapet wall that looks completely out of place on the building and which does not have a purpose. She explained that the owners could come back with an application that utilizes the parapet in some way, but at this time, there is no value to the property or to the Historical Commission to legalize the parapet now. Ms. Parisi responded that the problem is that the owner does not want to remove the parapet since it is there and has been there for a while. She asked whether the Committee was suggesting that they move forward with plans for additional construction. Ms. Stein responded that the property is individually designated, and anything that the owner does to the exterior of the building has to go through the Historical Commission. Ms. DiPasquale clarified that the property is both individually designated and is located in a historic district, so the Historical Commission is charged with looking at the impact of work both to the building itself and the district as a whole. Ms. Parisi asked whether she should go back to the owner and see what he wants to do with the parapet and then come back to the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that she could do that, but that the Architectural Committee is unlikely to recommend approval of the parapet as constructed. He noted that the applicants should not use this review as an indication that it is

acceptable to start using the block wall, and should not formulate their new design as though the wall is legal and in an acceptable location. Ms. Stein noted that the walls are visible from various public rights-of-way, and that any rooftop additions should be inconspicuous or invisible from the public right-of-way and not alter the character of the original building. Ms. Stein argued that it is highly unlikely that such a highly visible rooftop addition would be approved. Ms. Parisi noted that she was not involved with the construction of the parapet wall, so she does not know exactly when it occurred.

Mr. McCoubrey expressed confusion over what the drawings and the letter from the engineer. Ms. Parisi noted that once they received the violation, they had to have an engineer come out and draw the walls. Ms. Pentz explained that they are engineer's drawings and that the letter basically states that the engineer believes the walls are structurally sound. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the drawings were done in February and asked when the wall was constructed. Ms. DiPasquale clarified that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued the violation in November 2017, so the walls were definitely there by then, but that she does not believe they were there in July 2017, based on Google Streetview imagery. Ms. Pentz questioned whether they are now proposing to construct additional height to the existing parapets. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she does not believe that the applicants are proposing any additional work, but that the drawings were created to legalize the work after the fact.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.