

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

**Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Commission Offices, One Parkway, 13th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
30 October 2001**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Tony Atkin, AIA
Rudolph D'Alessandro
Herb Levy, FAIA
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

Brian McGillian, Keating Building Corporation
Daniel Keating, Keating Building Corporation
Robert Graves, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Kiki Bolender, AIA, Schade and Bolender Architects
Mark Ueland, Ueland Junker McCauley Nicholson Architects
Herb Lewis, Ueland Junker McCauley Nicholson Architects
George Gehring, Ueland Junker McCauley Nicholson Architects
M.A. Chomitz, Society Hill Civic Association
Sarah Galbathy, University of Pennsylvania
R. Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association
Steven Singer, Steven Singer Jewelers, Inc.
Gina Williams, Steven Singer Jewelers, Inc.
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents Association/Preservation Alliance
Brother Joseph Williard, F.S.C., Archdiocese of Philadelphia
John Rumm, Catholic Heritage Center
Kathleen Kohler, Kohler Consulting
Joel Spivak
Carl Zucker, Esquire
Charles Robin, Robin Real Estate
Harvey Robin, Robin Real Estate
Jay Kottoff
Eric Iffrig, Capital Program Office
William Merewether
Jeff Brummer
Ramel Cooper
Eugene Maier
Uriel Tedgi
Gil Hakim
Arthur Plaxton
Andre Stephano
Greg Recht, Soong Associates

Bill Paoletti
 Paul Porter, Kise Straw Kolodner Architects
 Robert Lane, Morgan Lewis Bockius, LLP
 Beth Duffy, Albert Einstein Hospital
 Neale Quinzel, John Milner Associates

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m.

1600 Arch Street

SAS 1600 Arch Street LP, Owner
 Robert Graves, Architect/Applicant
 Date: 1925, Stewardson and Page, architects
 Proposal: Cut new doorways

Staff recommendation: Approval of new entrance on Cuthbert Street, on the condition that the removed historic fabric be used to restore the previously created entrance; denial of the entrance on Arch Street, per Standard 2 and 9, unless the applicant can demonstrate the necessity of the egress to comply with the fire code.

Ms. Spina described the proposal for two new entrances, one on Cuthbert Street and one on Arch Street, each in the easternmost bays. The Committee and Commission already approved a new entrance further west on Cuthbert Street, which has been cut. Robert Graves, architect for the project, stated that the floor plan for the first floor has changed to accommodate a tenant in a space larger than first anticipated. The tenant, a restaurant, will occupy the entire southern portion of the floor plan, eliminating the planned hallway and fire exit on Cuthbert Street. The tenant wishes to have the door closer to 16th Street for more visibility.

The secondary egress and necessary handicap entrance now will be diverted to Arch Street. This necessitates a new entrance on that façade. Although the Arch Street entrance is lower than the interior floor, the handicap ramp will be on the interior of the space

The Committee discussed the door plan. Mr. Graves proposed frame-less double-leaf glass doors. The Committee believed that the ultra-modern doors were not appropriate for the entrances and asked for glazed doors with bronze frames. Mr. Graves agreed.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the Cuthbert Street entrance, on the condition that the removed historic fabric be used to restore the entrance already created on the façade; approval of the Arch Street entrance; all doors must be fully glazed with bronze frames.

Boathouse Row #14

Girls Rowing Club, Owner
 Kiki Bolender, Architect/Applicant
 Date: 1861, William S. Andrews and J.C. Sidney, architects; altered, c. 1930
 Proposal: New deck and railing

Staff recommendation: Approval of the new deck and railing, with the wires threaded through or installed on the deck side of the railing, per Standard 6 and the guideline for porches.

The proposal calls for the rebuilding of the riverside deck and railing. The original railing had a cross-brace design and the club wishes to replicate it. However, the design does not meet code. Ms. Bolender, the architect, proposes to thread thin horizontal stainless-steel wires through the railing at 4 inches on center. Ms. Pentz noted that threading the wires in the cross-bracing would

create numerous holes in the wood, which may cause rotting in the future. Ms. Bolender agreed and asked for the wires to be on the outside of the railing. Staff and Committee objected to that proposal, owing to their visibility from the river. Ms. Bolender countered that having the wires on the interior would create a ladder effect, violating the building code, and the club members should not have to see them on the interior of the deck. The Committee discussed several alternatives, including having the wires vertically on the interior or sandwiching the wires in the cross-bracing. Only two Committee members would consider exterior wires, on the condition that they were matte in finish.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the new deck and cross-brace railing with the stainless-steel wires threaded through the railing or sandwiched between the cross-bracing.

320 Walnut Street

Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Owner

Herbert Lewis, Ueland Junker McCauley Nicholson Architects, Applicant

Date: c. 1930

Proposal: Conceptual review of alterations; rear and rooftop additions

Staff recommendation: Approval of the project, except: front canopy should set inside the jamb of the doorway; rear and side windows retain their 3/3 mullion pattern, per guideline for windows and the design of two-story rear loading dock and air-handling unit, per Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro recused themselves from the discussion and vote.

This proposal in concept includes several parts: a metal and glass canopy over the front door; a penthouse addition and rooftop deck; new windows on all façades; a glazed light-well on the rear façade; stairtower on rear façade, and a loading dock with cooling tower on the rear. Mr. Baron stated that the rear of the building faces Willings Alley, which has several fronts of houses facing it. Mark Ueland, architect for the project, stated that the building will be converted from an office building to the Catholic Heritage Center. It will house the archives of the Archdiocese, a museum of artifacts and serve as a conference center.

The Committee had comments for each of the proposal's facets. Mr. Ueland mentioned several items that were not part of the submitted proposal, including sliding front doors, a handicap ramp and entrance on the rear, a rear canopy and a banner on the front façade. The Committee did not review these items.

Canopy – The Committee asked Mr. Ueland to explore other canopy designs, stating that any canopy should be set in the door's opening. Lorna Katz, of the Society Hill Civic Association, objected to any canopy, noting that none of the other buildings on the block have one and it will obscure neighboring buildings. The Committee postponed a recommendation on the canopy until see a resubmission.

Penthouse addition – The Committee recommended approval in concept.

New windows – The building has eight-over-eight windows on the front façade and three-over-three double-hung windows on west and south façades. The proposal calls for new windows to match the originals on the upper floors of the front façade, but fixed windows on the west and part of the south facades that mimic a six-over-six configuration and blocking up some other window openings on the south. Brother Joseph Willard stated that the new use dictates a more

secure window, hence the proposal for fixed sash. The Committee recommended approval of the fixed sash, but stated that they should retain the three-over-three configuration. Committee members agreed that windows should remain on the south façade, even if drywall will be installed behind them.

Glazed courtyard – Committee recommended approval in concept of the glazed light-well.

Stairtower – Committee recommended approval in concept of the stairtower, but asked Mr. Ueland to create a less severe design, perhaps using the current rear window openings as a model for a panel or window design.

Loading dock – The original proposal included a loading dock, with a larger cooling tower in a different material above. Mr. Ueland stated that they have found a smaller cooling unit that will match the loading dock in size. The design now calls for a uniform material on the entire section. The Committee recommended approval in concept.

739 Walnut Street

Steven Singer Jewelers, Owner

Gina Williams, Applicant

Date: c. 1928; new storefronts, 1998

Proposal: Internally-illuminated signage

Staff recommendation: Denial, per Standard 9.

The original application called for a plastic, back-lit box sign. After discussions with the staff, the applicant now wishes to install a sandblasted resin sign with raised letters, made to resemble a carved wood sign. The Committee noted that the attachment should have a flange that cuffs the corner. External illumination for the sign should return to the Committee after the applicant has investigated possible lighting fixtures.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a resin sign with a flange attachment, with staff to review details.

220 West Washington Square, W.B. Saunders Building

220 West Washington Associates, Owner

Mark Idisis, Applicant

Date: 1911

Proposal: Legalize bird netting

Staff recommendation: Denial, per Standard 9.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal for legalizing bird netting in each of the openings of the stairwell. Photographs of the netting show that it is highly visible.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the present bird netting. The applicant should investigate less visible options and return to the Committee.

36 North 3rd Street

Phil Cohen, Owner

Elizabeth Zimmers, Hugh Zimmers Architect, Applicant

Date: 1852

Proposal: Rear and rooftop additions; deck

Staff recommendation: Denial of rooftop additions as designed, per Standards 9 and 10; approval of rear additions, per additions guideline.

Mr. Baron explained this multi-faceted proposal. The owner plans to rehabilitate this building into nine rental units. To accomplish this, he wishes to add a four-story addition to the rear ell, with a penthouse and roof decks. The rear elevation will have greenhouses and decks on each floor. The Committee objected to the large rooftop addition. Hugh Zimmers, architect for the project, stated that the penthouse is necessary for an elevator and that the owner wishes to have a common recreation room and rooftop decks. The Committee asked that the side of the penthouse and elevator shaft be set back, and the cornice line extend along the top of the fifth floor addition. Committee members questioned the structural details of the greenhouses. Mr. Zimmers stated that the rear decks would simply have glass enclosures. The greenhouse would not be heated. Mr. Atkin noted that a deck would have open flooring, a feature not associated with a greenhouse. Committee members objected to the wedged top of the greenhouses.

Mr. Zimmers brought revised plans of the project, including the restoration of the front façade based on discussions with the staff. The revised plans also showed greenhouses larger than originally proposed. The Committee stated that the smaller greenhouses match the building in scale better than the larger ones.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the additions with several revisions: the cornice line of the rear ell should extend across the entire addition, the penthouse and elevator shaft be set back, the greenhouses remain smaller and without a wedge at the top; addition subject to the restoration of the front façade, with staff to review details.

116-18 Chestnut Street

116-18 Chestnut Street LP, Owner

Joel Spivak, Architect/Applicant

Date: c. 1905

Proposal: Fill-in and install windows on side elevation

Staff recommendation: Approval of reducing the window openings; denial of large, single-pane windows, per guideline on new windows. New windows should be coupled, 1/1 double-hung windows.

The side elevation of this property only has windows at the second floor; however, the support system for them has deteriorated greatly. The application calls for installing CMU supports on either side of the windows, closing the openings slightly. The owner wishes to install new plate-glass single-pane windows. The staff and Committee stated that the windows should echo the window configuration found on the front façade and asked for coupled, one-over-one aluminum double-hung windows, with a baked or painted finish. Ms. Spina noted that the owner is converting the building into apartments and may wish to install new windows in the upper floors of the same façade. The approved windows on the second floor would set a pattern for the upper floors.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of CMU supports in the window openings and new coupled, one-over-one double-hung windows on the second floor of the side elevation.

2026 Locust Street

Robin Apartments, Owner

Carl Zucker, Esq., Applicant

Date: 1890, Hazelhurst & Huckel, architects

Proposal: Legalize stucco at rear; modify stucco and paint

Staff recommendation: Denial of proposal, per Standards 2 & 6. Applicant should work with staff to develop a proposal to cure the violation.

Carl Zucker, attorney for the owners, stated that the owners applied for and received a building permit from the Department of Licenses and Inspection for stucco on the mansard, cornice, lintels and window frames on the rear of this property. Harvey Robin claimed that the former owner had already stuccoed some of these areas. The Historical Commission did not review the work for the permit and the Department issued the fast-form permit in error. The owner then applied to the Historical Commission to legalize the work, which the Commission denied, and the owner appealed to the Board of License and Inspection Review. The Board remanded the issue back to the Commission in an effort to reach a compromise. Mr. Zucker emphasized that his client acted in good faith and relied upon the validity of the building permit issued by the Department. He also said that the rear of the building faces the rear of another building on a dead-end street.

The application calls for grinding down the stucco on the lintels, windows and mansard and painting it. The Committee noted that although the work is on the rear of the property, the stucco covers details that contribute to the historic character of the building. Also, the fronts of houses do face the street, just to the west of this property. Mr. McCoubrey said that the owner may have to perform some repairs to the cornice after the stucco is removed. Mr. Atkin also said that it may prove easier to remove the stucco from the mansard before installing the shingles.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of grinding down the stucco to a smooth finish on the lintels, sills and window frames and painting it; removing the stucco from the cornice; adding a wooden surround to the dormer window; and installing asphalt shingles to the mansard roof, with staff to review details.

2227 Delancey Street

Harvey Spear, Owner

Gilbert Mercado, Contractor/Applicant

Date: 1879

Proposal: Rebuild rear fence

Staff recommendation: Approval, per Standard 9.

Ms. Spina presented the revised proposal to the Committee. The owner, without a permit, installed a CMU wall from the main part of the house to the garden gate. The Committee in a previous meeting noted that the garden part of the wall should be wood, not masonry. The application now calls for attaching a wooden wall, with rounded boards, to the CMU wall. The Committee noted that the boards should be flat and squared at the top. Mr. Rivera questioned the support system of the wood boards.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the design, with flat boards squared at the top and painted, with staff to review details.

2130 Wallace Street

Jay Kottoff, Owner/Applicant

Date: c. 1859

Proposal: Restucco façade in brick-face

Staff recommendation: Approval with staff to review samples in field.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Mr. Kottoff, the owner, restored a house on the next block almost twenty years ago. When he purchased the house it had Permastone affixed to the exterior. Upon removal of the Permastone, the original brick proved too damaged to leave exposed. To remedy the situation, he installed a stucco finish that mimicked brick.

On the subject property, the same situation has arisen. The brick, after the removal of Permastone, is too damaged to leave exposed. Mr. Kottoff proposes to install the same stucco system. The contractor applies a thick coat of red stucco and then scores it to create the look of individual bricks. He then applies mortar into the joints, as if pointing real brick. The final appearance resembles a brick façade. Mr. Baron noted that although normally the staff does not support the use of faux brick finishing, it recommends approval of this application owing to the severe damage of the original bricks and convincing appearance of the finish on the other property.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with staff to review details.

Old York Road at Tabor Road, Albert Einstein Hospital

Albert Einstein Hospital, Owner

Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Applicant

Date: 1829; moved to present location, 1904 by Frank Furness

Proposal: Move columns

Staff recommendation: Denial, per landscape guideline.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Six marble columns from the second U.S. Mint building (1829) stood in a semi-circle at the entrance of the Albert Einstein Hospital. Papers in the Historical Commissions files note that the columns were placed at Einstein in 1904, probably at the direction of Frank Furness, the architect for the hospital at that time.

Robert Lane, attorney for the hospital, and Beth Duffy, Assistant Vice President of the hospital, stated that the hospital has made several changes to its campus in recent years. Through many discussions with the City and numerous civic associations, the hospital has leased Clarkson Park, the triangle of land between Old York Road and North Broad Street. A road has been built through the park to give the hospital a formal entrance on North Broad Street. The hospital has dismantled the columns and put them in storage.

The proposal calls for placing the columns in raised planting beds alongside the new road in the park. Instead of arranged in a semi-circle, the columns would form straight lines. Committee members questioned the need to move the columns into the park, noting a grassy area next to the driveway and their former position. Mr. Lane said that the landscape plan was made several years ago and trees now exist in that area. Mr. Atkin objected to the placement of the columns in the planting bed, noting that they will stand very close together, diminishing their impact. The close proximity to each other obscures their details and does not match the scale of the objects themselves. The other Committee members agreed. The Committee asked the applicant to further investigate the placement of the columns, perhaps near their original location, or in another area of the park.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial.

1929 Spring Garden Street

Christopher Jones, Owner/Applicant

Date: c. 1875

Proposal: Vinyl windows in rear

Staff recommendation: Approval of three less-visible windows, but installation of wood 4/4 windows in two openings closest to Monterey Street, per Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal for vinyl windows on the rear of the property. He explained that the rear proves partially visible from 20th Street, but Monterey Street only has rears of properties. Committee members discussed the visibility of the property.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal, with staff to review details.

2135 Green Street

William Merewether and Eve Chaloner, Owners/Applicants

Date: c. 1859

Proposal: Rear and rooftop additions and deck

Staff recommendation: Approval of rear bay, double-leaf doors and stair tower, per window guideline; denial of rooftop addition and deck, per guideline for additions.

Ms. Spina described the proposal for an addition on the rear of the property, a fourth-story addition on the rear ell and main house and a roof deck on the main part of the house. The proposed addition would be visible from 22nd Street and, perhaps, Green Street. William Merewether, owner of the property, stated that he has had problems with the architect, including a miscalculation of the measurements of the building's height. Mr. Merewether is searching for a new architect. The Committee suggested withdrawing the submission until he hired a new architect and had accurate drawings.

The Committee did give guidance for a new design. The members stated that the rooftop addition should have a simplified design, use the same materials on all façades and windows should align with existing ones. Mr. Baron suggested erecting mock-ups of the proposed addition so that Committee and Commission members could see the height of the proposed design to determine its massing.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial.

1600 Mount Vernon Street

Uriel Tedgi, Owner/Applicant

Date: c. 1859

Proposal: Façade alterations

Staff recommendation: Approval of 4/4 windows, with vertical muntins 1-½" wide and horizontal muntins 7/8" wide, per guideline on windows, with staff to review details. Denial of proposed front door; door should replicate original found on 1614 Mount Vernon Street, per guideline for wood elements, with staff to review details. Approval of restoring the two storefronts with the following changes: corner storefront – beveled entrance should remain, eliminate the panels above the transoms and elongate the windows to fit the openings, have single panels below the windows; 16th street storefront – include a doorway in the storefront, all per Standard 5 and the guideline for storefronts.

The proposal includes the rehabilitation of this long-vacant house. The building originally had four-over-four windows on the second and third floors and two-over-two windows on the fourth floor. The four-over-four windows should have larger vertical muntins, to mimic a casement window. The proposal for the front door has a single-leaf, four-panel door with a transom above. Ms. Spina explained that the doors of this row of houses didn't have transom windows, but very tall half-glazed, double-leaf doors. A photograph of a neighboring house shows the original doors.

A nineteenth century storefront was carved out of the corner of the building. As was typical of the period, the door to the storefront was beveled, allowing access to both streets. The proposal calls for eliminating the bevel and squaring off the storefront corner. The proposed storefront has wood panels at the top, transom windows, and then three windows with wood panels below. The Committee agreed that the beveled door should remain, the storefronts should eliminate the upper panels, and the area below the windows should have a single panel. The corner door, even if inoperable, should have a double-leaf, half-glazed design. Mr. Atkin asked the owner to investigate for evidence of a cast-iron column supporting the second floor.

For the storefront on 16th Street, the Committee in a previous meeting stated that it should have a door, since a stoop exists as evidence of a former door. The proposed storefront has a four-light storefront window with wood panels above the transoms and below the windows. Staff recommended a single-leaf door in the storefront and eliminating the upper panels. Eugene Maier, a neighbor, objected to having a door in the storefront, even if it is inoperable. He stated that the area behind the storefront is a bedroom and that an inoperable door could easily become an operable one. Mr. McCoubrey noted that since the entire building is now residential, the context of a door in the storefront is lost. The Committee agreed to keep the storefront without a door, but eliminate the top wood panels, have only two panels below the windows, and increase the measurement of the central vertical muntin.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of four-over-four windows, with larger vertical muntins, and two-over-two windows on the fourth floor; approval of a double-leaf, half-glazed front door or a single-leaf door made to mimic a double-leaf design; approval of storefronts, with a beveled corner door and simplified panels below windows, without upper panels; staff to review details and shop drawings.

2005 Brandywine Street

Andre Stephano, Owner

Sabrina Soong, Architect/Applicant

Date: c. 1859

Proposal: Façade rehabilitation; rear decks and stucco

Staff recommendation: Approval of the new door, new 2/2, true-divided light windows, new transom and missing cornice details, with staff to approve details and shop drawings, per guidelines for windows; approval of a front garden, but one that does not extend beyond the steps and a simple, iron picket fence instead of replicating a neighbor's, per Standard 3; denial of the decks per guideline for roofs.

Ms. Spina presented the multi-faceted proposal. The owner wishes to install a front garden and replicate a neighboring garden fence; install a two-part deck on the rear with a spiral staircase; and install new two-over-two windows and a four-panel door on the front façade. The Committee discussed the front garden and stated that the size of the garden should match others on the same block. Mr. Levy questioned the recommendation of a modern garden fence, stating that the neighboring fence appeared original to the house.

The Committee discussed the roof deck. They agreed that although it proves visible from 20th Street, the deck on the rear ell would meet the *Standards*. However, they objected to the deck on the main building. Andre Stephano, owner of the property, argued that other houses on his block have the two-part deck and he is replicating the same design. Also, the view from the rear ell is the rears of other houses, but the view from the top deck is the city's skyline. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Committee and Commission may not have approved the decks on the other houses. Art Plaxton, a neighbor, noted that the rear of this property is visible from Green Street because the Spanish Village houses are only one story high.

Ms. Spina noted that the owner recently painted the virgin marble lintels, sills and water table. Mr. Stephano did not realize that the Commission needed to review the paint and agreed to remove it from the marble.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the new windows and door with staff to review details and shop drawings; approval of a front garden, dimensions to match neighboring gardens, with either the replicated historic fence or a simplified fence; approval of a deck on the rear ell, but denial of the deck on the main building; approval of removing the paint on the marble elements, with staff to review details.

1701 North Street

Sean Trainor, Owner

Sabrina Soong, Architect/Applicant

Proposal: New house

Staff recommendation: Approval, per Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal for a new house on an empty lot. He explained that the Commission will only review and comment on the submission because the vacant lot existed at the time of designation. Although the Commission discourages garages in the front of the house, North Street has numerous carriage houses converted to garages. Greg Recht, architect for the project, stated that a dedicated pedestrian walkway exists on the east side of the house. The owner wishes to have the east façade finished in brick rather than stucco. Committee members stated that the windows should have a two-over-two pane configuration rather than six-over-six.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with two-over-two windows instead of six-over-six.

1705 North Street

Sean Trainor, Owner

Sabrina Soong, Architect/Applicant

Proposal: New house

Staff recommendation: Approval, per Standards 9 and 10.

The owner wishes to build a similar house on this empty lot as well. Again, although the Commission discourages garages in the front of the house, North Street has numerous carriage houses converted to garages. Committee members stated that the windows should have a two-over-two pane configuration rather than six-over-six.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with two-over-two windows instead of six-over-six.

2000 Fairmount Avenue

Savva Navrosidis, Owner/Applicant

Date: 1949

Proposal: Awnings; wall infill at 2nd floor

Staff recommendation: Approval of individual awnings at each window opening, but no awning at the corner, per Standard 9.

This proposal for this non-contributing building involves three parts: erecting a wood board wall on the second floor along North 20th Street, an awning wrapping around the building's two façades, and painting the building a putty color. Alan Rubin, a member of the Spring Garden Civic Association's Zoning Committee, stated that the Zoning Committee wanted a wooden wall erected to form a continuous wall at the building's second floor. The Zoning Committee also wanted the owner to install awnings along the façades to cover the metal window roll-down grates. Although the Historical Commission routinely approves awnings at each window opening, the presence of the grates' housing leaves only a small gap between windows; a single, continuous awning would be more appropriate in this instance. Committee members discussed the awning treatment at the corner, which has a bevel entrance, and decided that a bevel awning would reflect the storefront feature. Mr. Rubin stated that the awning will have a fabric cover, without an apron, and signage will be on the slope. Lights affixed above the awning will illuminate the logos. The Committee stated that the lights should return to staff for approval. Mr. Rubin also noted that the building would be painted a putty color to make the various materials uniform in appearance.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the wood wall at the second story; approval of a continuous awning wrapping around the building, with a bevel edge at the corner; approval of painting the building a putty color.

2528 South 18th Street

Bill Paoletti, Owner

Jay Felkoff, Applicant

Date: 1908, James and John Windrim, architects

Proposal: Vinyl windows

Staff recommendation: Denial of vinyl windows on visible facades, per Standards 2, 5, and 6, and the guideline for windows. Staff recommends storm windows and the repair and weather-stripping of existing windows.

The proposal calls for vinyl windows on the front and visible side of this house in Girard Estate, except the front window on the porch. Bill Paoletti, the owner, has hired a painter to refurbish the front window. Mr. Paoletti said that he wishes to install new windows in the house to improve its energy efficiency. Mr. Tyler met with him and approved vinyl windows in the rear and non-visible side of the house. Mr. Paoletti said he contacted several window companies to order wood windows for the front of the house. He could not get estimates from some companies and received very high estimates from others. Owing to the difference in cost, he wishes to install vinyl windows on the front as well. Mr. Baron noted that the Girard Estate Residents Association sent a letter opposing the application. He also stated that numerous applications for wood windows have been approved in Girard Estate.

Committee members asked if the other four visible windows could be refurbished like the one on the porch. Mr. Paoletti said that the front three windows are damaged and the storm windows need replacing. The Committee suggested replacing the storm windows instead of the main windows. Again, the owner stated that he wanted to replace the original windows, but cannot afford wood windows. Committee members advised that a financial hardship application could be made to the Commission and its Financial Hardship Committee.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal. Committee members suggested replacing the storm windows on the front façade and refurbishing the original windows.

1 East Penn Square

Granite Penn Square, Owner

Neale Quinzel and Lorraine Schnabel, Architects/Applicants

Date: 1930, Ritter and Shay, architects

Proposal: New glazing in windows

Staff recommendation: Denial, per Standard 6 and guideline for windows.

Mr. Baron stated that the Committee and Commission previously approved the new windows for this project, with staff to review details. The window frames match the historic window configurations and the salmon color was determined after paint analysis of the original window frames. However, the proposed glazing for the windows proves highly reflective and the staff did not want to approve it without the Committee's review. Neale Quinzel, architect for the project, stated that the glazing has a low-E film to aid in the energy efficiency of the windows, and other projects around the city have similar film in their windows. He showed photographs of the sample window with a white sheet behind the glass. Mr. Quinzel also noted that the reflectivity of the glazing might seem stronger because the other openings around the sample window are open and dark.

Mr. Atkin noted that perhaps a grey lining on the new hotel curtains would cut the reflectivity of the glass. Mr. Quinzel said that he would consider that option.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

Design Review-Visibility Discussion

Mr. Rivera stated that the Commission, at its last meeting, questioned the definition of a public right-of-way. Some Commission members asked if the effect of a project on the view from a neighboring building should be considered. Mr. Tyler stated that the jurisdiction of the Commission and its staff is defined by the Ordinance [§ 14-2007 (7)(k)]. The Ordinance states that the Commission must consider “the compatibility of the proposed work with the character of the historic district or with the character or its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape.” The only reference to public rights-of-way in the Rules and Regulations can be found at § 6.3.c.1.f.

Mr. Baron stated that the Ordinance and *Standards* are flexible enough to allow for various opinions and interpretations of visibility, and that each proposal presents different questions. He also noted that even where lack of visibility allows for staff review, the Rules and Regulations still call for the application of the *Standards*. Mr. Tyler emphasized that the variety of proposals and types of buildings necessitate that each be heard on a case-by-case basis. Ms. Spina noted that the Committee and Commission only review the proposals that may prove visible. Staff reviews work on buildings that are not visible from public rights-of-way or interiors, approximately 85 percent of the total permit applications. Committee members agreed that it would be difficult to establish set guidelines for visibility.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.