

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

**TUESDAY, 24 NOVEMBER 2009
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DAVID AMBURN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

David Amburn, Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Mark Bottin, Hazen & Sawyer
Joseph Powell, Buell Kratzer Powell
Joe Sorrentino, Vitetta
Joy Griffin
Robert Koochagian
Joe Domosh, Temple 2000
Dan Grossman, Temple 2000
Joann Greco, Planphilly
Ben Weinrich, Juniper Hotel
Christine Kimmel, Esq., Pepper Hamilton
Christine Ritter, Episcopal Diocese
Stefanie Brennan
Nancy Kilpatrick, PREIT
Noah Morganstein, Stanev Potts Architects
David Brawer, Brawer & Hauptman Architects

CALL TO ORDER

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

7 LOCK STREET

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Michael Lewandowski and Joseph Powell

History: c. 1970

Classified as an Intrusion in the National Register Historic District inventory for the Main Street Manayunk Historic District, designated by ordinance in 1983

Project: Construct sewer basin with headhouse, performing arts center, landscape grounds

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to redevelop a portion of Venice Island in Manayunk. The property is owned by the City of Philadelphia. A Department of Recreation facility with non-historic features including a pool, sports facilities, parking lots, and an amphitheater currently occupies the site. They are classified as an Intrusion in the National Register Historic District inventory, the inventory the Commission uses because it did not designate the district under the historic preservation ordinance. A classification of intrusion is equivalent to the Commission's classification of non-contributing. The project involves constructing a sewer basin, which will capture and hold overflows during major storms. Currently, the raw sewage overflows are discharged into the Schuylkill River. The City has been ordered by the federal Environmental Protection Agency to construct the facility. The recreation facility will be demolished and reconstructed as part of the project. The new recreation center will include a performing arts center, athletic facilities, and a spray park. Also, public parking, which is currently located at the south end of the island and is important to the local business community, will be reconfigured. The site is located in the Main Street Manayunk Historic District and subject to the Manayunk review standards, not the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to PM-704.2.7.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Engineer Mark Bottin and architect Joseph Powell represented the application.

Mark Bottin explained that the project was initiated to solve a sewage overflow problem. He said that the sewer with an outlet on Venice Island overflows into the Schuylkill River approximately 10 times per year. He noted that the Water Department has been ordered by the federal Environmental Protection Agency to construct the facility. He explained that there will be an underground basin that will collect the sewage during major rain events. It will then be pumped into the sewer and sent to a treatment plant, rather than being discharged into the Schuylkill River. He stated that the basin will be on the cutting edge of storm water control technology.

Mr. Powell explained that the obsolete, Class C recreation center will be replaced as part of the project. A new recreation center including the performing arts center, athletic facilities, and spray park will be constructed along the river. The parking will be relocated to the area along the railroad tracks. The performing arts center will be built above the flood plain and will have flexible interior spaces.

Mr. McCoubrey, whose office is located across the canal from the site, asked about the materials for the performing arts center. Mr. Powell explained that it will be precast concrete with an exposed aggregate. The signage will be "iconographic" to conform to the Manayunk standard signage designed by the Venturi Scott Brown architectural firm. He noted that the building will not be highly visible from Main Street. It will have a green roof and storm water collection and will be a best-practices demonstration site for the Water Department. Overall, it will have an industrial style to fit with the other buildings along the canal.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the project would be phased. Mr. Bottin replied that it would. The demolition would be undertaken first, then the construction of the basin, and finally the recreation center. Mr. Powell stated that it was very important for the business community to maintain the parking facility during construction. Therefore, temporary parking would be created during the project. Mr. Bottin added that both the Manayunk Neighborhood Council and the Manayunk Development Corporation support the project.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the new center would be conducive to pedestrians. Mr. Bottin explained that there will be a pedestrian spine down the island to accommodate walkers.

Joy Griffin, a long time resident of Manayunk, voiced her concerns about the lack of community involvement in the project. She asserted that this project was spearheaded by the local business community, not the residents. She claimed that her "due process under Section 106" had been violated because she was denied an opportunity to comment on the project. She objected to the demolition of the pool, which she said was important to the African American community in Manayunk. Mr. Bottin stated that the Department of Recreation has a policy of replacing pools with spray parks because they are less expensive and less dangerous. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Historical Commission has authority over historic resources only. The programming and operation of recreation facilities is beyond the purview of the Commission. Ms. Griffin stated that this project was spearheaded by outsiders. She insisted on "no more hurt, harm, or damage to people or property." Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission and its Architectural Committee have a very narrow purview in this matter, to determine whether this project will have an adverse impact on historic resources in the historic district. He stated that the Committee has no authority to require the Department of Recreation to provide particular recreational facilities such as a pool. He suggested that she contact Michael DiBerardinis, the Commissioner of Parks and Recreation or Curtis Jones, her district council person. He asked Ms. Griffin to limit her comments to the historical significance of the existing facilities and the compatibility of the new facilities with the historic district. Ms. Griffin stated that the center has historical significance for the African American community in Manayunk. She stated that the community remembers its construction in the 1970s. Ms. Griffin claimed that she had not had an opportunity to learn about and comment on this project. She stated that the Water and Recreation Departments had not solicited public comment. Mr. Bottin testified that the project had been reviewed publicly in many forums over several years. He stated that it had been presented four times at public Art Commission meetings, to the Planning Commission at a public meeting, and to the Streets Department, and that it had been granted a zoning variance at a public meeting before the Zoning Board of Adjustment. He said that he had participated in at least six public meetings in Manayunk before various bodies including the Manayunk Neighborhood Council. He stated that the master plan for the site prepared by Andropogen had been presented numerous times to the public. He concluded that there would be a significant improvement in facilities for the community, not a loss in facilities. Ms. Griffin responded that she did not oppose the project, but only wanted to be involved in it.

Ms. Pentz remarked that she deemed the new recreation center and water facilities to be a significant enhancement to the neighborhood. Ms. Gutterman and Messrs. Amburn, D'Alessandro, and McCoubrey agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to PM-704.2.7.

1723 RACE STREET

Owner: Cathedral of Sts. Peter & Paul

Applicant: Robert Koochagian

History: c. 1846-64, Napoleon Le Brun and John Notman, architects

Designation: 5/28/1957

Project: Install new windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the replacement of windows throughout the Cathedral Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul. The application proposes the replacement of windows at three primary locations; the windows at the dome, the windows at the nave and transept, and lastly the windows at the Sacristy and Chapel of Our Lady of the Blessed Sacrament. The windows at the transept and nave are wood windows with exterior copper cladding. These windows protect stained glass windows that illuminate the interior of the basilica. The current windows have an operable center panel. The age of these windows is unknown. It is also not known whether the existing copper cladding is an early twentieth-century alteration to original mid nineteenth-century wood windows, or if the entire units date from the early twentieth-century, presumably when the dome and drum were redressed in copper (c. 1928). The windows in the dome also protect interior stained glass windows. These windows also have operable middle panels. However, they are all non-functional today. The nave/transept windows and dome windows have similar proportions and detailing. The sacristy and chapel windows are located in a newer portion of the basilica that dates to the 1950s. The windows at that location are steel casements. The steel casements are painted, while the nave and dome windows have a typical green copper oxide finish.

The applicant proposes an aluminum extruded unit as a replacement. The units will be factory finished in a dark bronze finish. The general contractor engaged Vitetta to conduct a survey of the existing windows and a comparison of the existing conditions to the shop drawings of the proposed units. The report is very complete and helpful in the review of the nave and dome windows, since those are typical and of little variation. However, it is not as complete at the chapel. The report compares just one casement type at this location and excludes the more character defining large casements with side-lights and arched transoms that are found along the north wall of the chapel. The proposed units for the nave and the dome would be nearly identical to the existing. However, the Vitetta report raises a point of concern on these units. The existing windows have operable center panels to allow for the ventilation of the space between the exterior window and the interior stained glass. The proposed replacement units will be fixed and will not allow for ventilation of this space. This change may cause deterioration of the stained glass windows. The proposed units at the chapel do not match the muntin configuration for at least two of the casement types. The application does not include enough information to review the arched-top casements. Lastly, the Vitetta report notes that the proposed aluminum units will not create a galvanic reaction to the copper present in the building owing to their factory finish.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff offers no recommendation until it has gathered more information on the application.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Robert Koochagian and Joseph Sorrentino represented the application.

Mr. Koochagian stated that the phased project will restore the dome and windows to their appearances in the 1920s, after a major renovation. He explained that the dome was rehabilitated in the 1920s, when new copper-clad windows and new copper cladding on the drum of the dome were installed. It was also rehabilitated in the 1960s. He stated that the copper was tinted a dark brown to look like brownstone. The new aluminum windows proposed for this phase and the cladding, which will be proposed in a later phase, will have the same dark brown color to imitate the appearance of brownstone. He observed that some of the coloring has worn off the extant windows, revealing the green copper patina. He explained that none of the natural copper color was intended to show. The Committee members inspected several historic photographs showing the dome before and after the 1920s renovation and concluded that the brown color for the windows and other metal features was appropriate.

Ms. Pentz expressed concern about the attic ventilation between the inner and outer domes. Mr. Koochagian assured the Committee that the existing gravity vents will not be changed and that the drum and dome are properly ventilated. He added that Beyer Stained Glass Studio had advised them on the ventilation issues raised by the Vitetta report.

Mr. Danta noted the incompleteness of the chapel window portion of the submission. Mr. Koochagian stated that the intent is to match the chapel windows precisely. He stated that revised shop drawings will reflect the exact match.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposed aluminum windows in the dark brown finish, provided the chapel casement windows match the existing windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 4 and 6.

2000 N. BROAD STREET

Owner/ Applicant: Daniel Grossmann

History: 1895, Willis Gaylord Hale, architect, John Stafford

Designated: 4/30/1986

Project: Remove deteriorated carved reliefs, patch brownstone

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the brownstone stoop of this mansion. The applicant currently has a permit to repair other brownstone on the base of the building. The stoop was covered in carved brownstone decoration including a cartouche and floral designs. Water trapped by several paint coats has destroyed much of this carving. The applicant proposes to remove the paint and with it the remainder of the carving. The stoop would be repaired to a smooth finish without the carved details using a brown mortar.

The staff does not recommend approval of the proposal as submitted because of the removal of historic fabric and design. Instead, it recommends creating molds of the remnants of the existing floral design and reinstalling these as well as recreating the cartouche in the proposed material. This does not include creating conjectural designs that have no basis in documentation. The work could be completed at a later phase based on an agreed upon time table.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developers Daniel Grossman and Joseph Domosh represented the application.

Mr. Grossman noted that he and his partner have executed extensive restoration work at the property since they acquired it. He stated that the proposed project is intended to beautify the entrance of the building. He added that, in its current condition, the entrance looks decayed and unsightly. He stated that his contractor is able to restore the lower carved decoration but not the central panel, which is significantly deteriorated. He noted that the extant fragments of carved decoration remain only because several layers of paint are holding them in place. He reported that testing shows that the stone behind the paint has turned into sand. Mr. Danta confirmed this claim. When the paint is removed, the remaining relief carving will be lost.

Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro both expressed concerns about eliminating the decorative elements. They noted that even though only a fragment of the relief carving remains and the stone has deteriorated into sand, it is important to preserve the historic remnant. They rejected removing it and creating a smooth finishing. Mr. Amburn noted that, if the remaining relief is lost, some record of its existence should be retained.

Mr. Grossman contended that a restoration of the relief was not possible owing to lack of information about the original ornament. Not enough survives to recreate it, he claimed. He also claimed that the remaining traces of the ornament are paint only. The stone behind it has degraded and fallen away. It would be impossible to take molds because there is no sound stone.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the proposed stucco finish of the restored entrance. She noted that such a large area would need expansion joints, which would change the look of the entrance. She also suggested that the specifications of the proposed patching material should be reviewed by the staff prior to application to ensure that it is appropriate and will not cause additional damage.

Mr. Danta suggested photographic recordation of the façade and in particular of the eroded elements. He also suggested making rubber molds of the surviving ornament for a future restoration. Ms. Gutterman suggested making rubber molds of the remaining reliefs with the paint still in place and then creating plaster positives from the molds because the rubber will deteriorate over time. She also suggested that the documentary photographs should be rectified. The Committee members agreed that they could recommend approval of the proposal with the recordation. They suggested that the applicants propose a timetable for future restoration to the Commission.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided rectified photographs of the entire porch are taken and deposited at the Commission; rubber molds of the existing pieces are made before the paint is removed; plaster positives are made from the molds and stored on site; and all large fragments removed during the scaling are retained on site for a future restoration, with the staff to review details.

1326-28 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: 1326 Chestnut Street Associates; Barzilay Development

Applicant: Jonathan Broh, JKR Partners

History: Keystone National Bank, 1887, extended to Sansom Street, 1891, Willis Hale, architect
storefront altered c. 1900, c. 1920, c. 1940, c. 1960

Designation: Individually designated, 12/6/1973

Project: Rehabilitate building for hotel; replace storefront, add roof deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate the former Keystone National Bank building as a hotel. The first-floor space on Chestnut would be developed as a restaurant. The building has been underutilized and poorly maintained for many years.

The building was designed by famed architect Willis Hale and constructed in 1887 for the Keystone National Bank. The original building fronted on Chestnut Street and ran south along Juniper Street to about Drury Lane. The bank failed in 1891 and its leaders were jailed. Real estate tycoon William Weightman, an in-law and patron of the architect Hale, purchased the property in 1891 and renamed it the Hale Building. In the early 1890s, Hale added to and extended the building to south to Sansom Street in the same style.

The storefront on Chestnut Street, which has served as a barometer of prevailing taste, has been replaced numerous times. The building originally had a rusticated stone, arched entranceway with gable at Chestnut Street. This entrance was appropriate for the bank, but not for its later retail uses. The original entranceway was removed and replaced with a one-story, balustraded, Beaux-Arts storefront about 1900 by Hale when he built the Garrick Theater to the west for Weightman. The Garrick was stylistically related of the Hale Building and created an ensemble with the central turret linking the two buildings. The c. 1900 storefront was removed and replaced with a two-story, Renaissance storefront with tile roof about 1920. The c. 1920 storefront was removed and replaced with a streamlined, Art Moderne storefront matching the neighboring Woolworth Building when the Garrick was demolished about 1940. The c. 1940 storefront was removed and replaced with a Modern storefront with Googie style sign about 1960. Although altered, the c. 1960 storefront remains in place today.

At Chestnut Street, the application proposes to remove the c. 1960 storefront, preserve any original masonry behind it, and add a simple bronze and glass storefront system. Missing masonry would be replaced. The shape and windows but not the rusticated masonry of a cylindrical section to the west would be restored. Windows would be replaced and signage added. Drawings A3.1 and A3.2 document this section of the proposal. The Commission should authorize the staff to inspect the site after the demolition of the existing non-historic storefront to ensure that all original material behind it is preserved and restored.

The first to third-floor masonry of the northernmost bay on Juniper was lost to the storefront alterations. The arched masonry opening would be recreated and windows added. The watertable of this bay would be glazed rather than reconstructed in masonry to allow light and visibility into the restaurant space. The sill of the large window would be recreated and new windows installed. Drawing A3.3 documents this section of the proposal.

The entrance to the hotel would be located on Juniper Street at Drury Lane. The entrance would be located at a pedimented opening, which is currently infilled. New doors with transoms and a glass canopy shaped like the pediment would be installed. Other infilled openings would be reopened and fenestrated. Vents and louvers would be removed. New windows would be

installed and existing windows would be repaired. The masonry would be cleaned and repointed. Drawings A3.4, A3.4E, and A5.1 document this section of the proposal.

On the Sansom Street façade, a fire escape, metal doors, and louvers would be removed. Windows would be repaired. New windows and doors would be installed. The masonry would be cleaned and repointed. Drawings A3.5 and A3.5E document this section of the proposal.

At the roof, a deck with retractable glass roof would be added at the south. A lobby with restrooms would be constructed to the west of the existing elevator penthouse. A pilot house for the emergency stair would be constructed at the southwest corner of the roof. A conical roof at the northwest corner of the building was demolished years ago; a standing-seam metal shed roof would be added where the conical roof once was. The rooftop additions would be inconspicuous owing to the height of the building, narrowness of the streets, and number of tall, neighboring buildings. Drawings A1.9, A1.9E, A3.6, A3.7A, A3.7B, A3.8A, A3.8B and A3.9 document this section of the proposal.

The state's Bureau for Historic Preservation and the National Park Service reviewed this project, which is seeking federal tax credits, requested and received revisions for compliance with the Standards, and then approved the project. Letters documenting the approvals are attached to the drawings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided all original masonry cladding discovered under the non-historic storefront is preserved and restored, with the staff to inspect the storefront area after the demolition of the non-historic storefront before additional work is undertaken, and to review shop drawings for windows and doors, and specifications and samples for masonry replacement, pointing, and cleaning, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jonathan Broh and developer Ben Weinrich represented the application.

After presenting the overview and staff recommendation, Mr. Farnham displayed Powerpoint slides of the succession of storefronts. He reported that the Keystone Bank failed almost immediately and, in 1900, the new owner engaged Willis Hale, the architect of the original building, to design a new storefront that was compatible with its new retail use. The rusticated, gabled entranceway was demolished and a new storefront constructed. At the same time, Hale designed the Garrick Theater for the site to the west as a twin to the building in question. About 1920, the 1900 storefront was demolished and a two-story Renaissance revival storefront constructed. That storefront was demolished in the late 1930s, when the Garrick Theater was demolished for the Woolworth Building. The new two-story storefront, added about 1940, was in the Art Moderne style like the Woolworth Building next door. That storefront was replaced about 1960 with a simple geometric Modern storefront, which is in place today. Much of the original stone cladding and the windows at the lower three floors along Chestnut and at the first bay around the corner on Juniper were removed during the construction of the succession of storefronts. He explained that the staff had recommended approval of the proposed glass storefront and surrounding restoration, rather than insisting on the reconstruction of one of the storefronts, for several reasons. First and foremost, neither the original entranceway nor any of the later but still historic storefronts had survived more than 20 years; the original entranceway survived only 13 years and was demolished by the architect who originally constructed it. Constant change more than any one storefront is the essence of the history of this part of the building. Second, as part of their tax credit review, the state and federal historic preservation

offices have already opined that this proposed design meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Third, no precise documentation of any of the earlier storefronts is available. Any reconstruction of the complex rusticated masonry would be conjectural, based on a single photograph. He concluded that the introduction of a simple, transparent, contemporary storefront is appropriate in this instance, given the unusual circumstances.

Mr. Broh stated that he had a contractor remove a few of the tiles of the Modern storefront to see what survived beneath. He stated that he could see original window openings and parts of the stair tower, but concluded that none of the original stone cladding survives at the first and mezzanine floors. He stated that the stair tower is missing at the first floor. It is unknown what survives above that level at the mezzanine and third-floor levels. Mr. Broh remarked that his drawing makes the new stair tower cladding look very smooth; that is not his intention. He intends to create a more appropriate finish on the cladding that will replace this missing stair tower cladding. The original stone at the base of the stair was less rusticated than the stone above. Mr. Broh pointed out the proposed signage at the street level.

Mr. Broth described the frameless storefront element that is intended as a canopy and entrance point for the hotel. He noted that the storefront would have two sets of entrance doors, one at the sidewalk and one set behind those at the plane of the front façade of the building. Mr. Farnham asked Mr. Broh to comment on the piers that are brought down to the ground level at the storefront. He noted that they are not replicas of any historic feature. Mr. Broh agreed that they are not historic, but were suggested by the state reviewer. Mr. Broh stated that he just saw the 1900 photograph moments before the meeting for the first time. Mr. Farnham explained that he had only discovered the photograph showing the 1900 storefront late in the day before the meeting. Mr. Broh stated that he would be willing to redesign the storefront to make it more like the storefront shown in the 1900 photograph.

Ms. Guttermann asked how much of the original wall remains beneath the existing storefront. Mr. Broh replied that they would restore window openings and other material that they discovered beneath the non-historic storefront. Mr. Weinrich added that it is clear that no historic masonry survives at the ground floor of the storefront.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the masonry piers behind the storefront should not have a historic appearance if they were not there historically. Mr. Broh stated that the state officials requested that the piers have the same rhythm and proportioning as the Juniper Street façade. Mr. McCoubrey observed that the storefront is really a canopy with sides. Mr. Amburn agreed, saying that it was like a scrim. Mr. Amburn stated that he liked the concept. Mr. Weinrich stated that the state and federal reviewers asked them to refer to without recreating the earlier storefronts. He noted that they were seeing the 1900 photograph for the first time. He suggested that it validated their approach. Mr. Broh said that the glass box was essentially signage. It would be illuminated and would display the logo of the hotel. Ms. Pentz asked the applicants if they would be willing to recreate the 1900 storefront. Mr. Broh stated that they would consider employing its massing and lines, but could not precisely recreate it. Mr. Weinrich noted that the 1900 storefront is much larger than the one they are currently proposing. If they recreated it, it would extend to the base of the third floor and would cover the stair tower. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the earlier designers have struggled with integrating the storefront and the stair tower. Mr. Broh noted that the stair tower will be used for egress and the volume must be maintained to the sidewalk level. Ms. Gutterman agreed with Mr. McCoubrey. Mr. Broh commented on the chicken-and-egg problem. They cannot dismantle the storefront to see what

lies beneath until they have an approved construction plan and are certain that they can move forward.

Mr. Farnham summarized the other aspects of the application including the canopy on Juniper and the roof deck with telescoping roof. The Committee discussed the canopy and decided that it was appropriate. Mr. Broh explained that they would remove the fire escape on Sansom and reconstruct the stair tower internally. The Committee members asked about louver and infilled window openings and the new windows. Ms. Gutterman asked about the new windows in infilled openings and asked if they would alter the historic openings. Mr. Broh stated that they would not. They would reopen the openings and install appropriate windows based on the historic design.

The applicants and Committee members discussed the retractable roof deck and other rooftop additions. Mr. Broh commented that the state reviewers had requested and received numerous revisions to make the rooftop additions less visible from the street. The Committee deemed the proposals appropriate because they would be inconspicuous from the street. Ms. Gutterman and Pentz agreed that the entirety of the proposal with the exception of the new storefront on Chestnut was appropriate. They asked the applicants to restudy that section of the design including the signage and the lighting.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance agreed with Mr. McCoubrey's negative assessment of the stonework proposed for the base of the stair tower. He said that the stonework should not be smooth, but should be banded as well as rusticated. Mr. Gallery suggested that the applicants should propose some alteration to improve the appearance of the two non-historic recesses at the top of the stair tower on the Chestnut façade. He conceded that the section probably could not be restored since it had been significantly modified, but he contended that the overall appearance could be improved. Mr. Gallery rejected the glass box storefront. He also opined that the Committee should at least discuss the option of a restoration of the original gabled stone entranceway shown in historic photographs. He also suggested that the Committee consider a simplified version or abstraction of the original gable over the door as well as an arched entrance as shown in photographs of the original building. He suggested replicating the form of the gabled or pedimented 1887 entrance. It would raise the proposed storefront, which is conventional, to the exceptional, he claimed. He noted that the newly discovered photograph of the 1900 storefront may also provide some options. He stated that this project should be applauded for saving the important building. He contended that such a project, which shows great promise, should be done as well as possible.

Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants to reconsider the design of the stair tower from top to bottom. The Committee suggested that the applicants restudy the design of the storefront in light of their comments and the recently discovered 1900 photograph. The Committee suggested that the applicants submit a new application for the Chestnut Street façade rehabilitation once they have studied the design questions.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application with the exception of the design of the storefront and rehabilitation plan for the stair tower on Chestnut Street.

6008 WAYNE AVENUE, ST. PETER'S CHURCH

Owner: Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Christine Ritter

History: 1873, G. W. Hewitt of Furness & Hewitt, architect

Designated: 11/30/1965

Project: Remove stained glass windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the remaining stained glass windows in the church, excepting the rose window, and install clear plate glass in their places. The original frames are to remain. The applicant cites security, vandalism, and theft as reasons for removal. The staff suggests that protective measures could be taken on site, such as installing Plexiglas security windows, without removing these character defining features.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. The Reverend Christine Ritter of the Episcopal Diocese and attorney Chris Kimmel represented the application.

Ms. Kimmel stated that the Diocese is seeking to remove the windows in order to preserve them. She asserted that not one of the potential buyers for the property has expressed an interest in the preserving the windows since the property was placed on the market five years ago. She also stated that the Bishop White window, which they would like to remove, is very important to the Episcopal Church. The Diocese would like to display it for the public at the Diocesan office. The Reverend Ritter stated that no other Episcopal church or churches of other denominations have expressed an interest in purchasing the property. She added that one school considered the property, but then declined to purchase it.

Ms. Pentz asked where the windows would be stored. Ms. Kimmel responded that they would be removed by and stored at the Beyer Stained Glass Studio. The Reverend Ritter reiterated that the Bishop White window would be retained by the Episcopal Church.

Mr. Amburn recalled that the Committee recommended denial of a similar application submitted by the Episcopal Diocese to remove stained glass windows from this church because the removal of stained glass windows does not comply with historic preservation standards and an approval would set a bad precedent. Ms. Kimmel reminded the Committee that the Commission approved that application for the removal of the Tiffany and Violet Oakley windows, which are now at the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts (PAFA). She stated that the Diocese has offered these windows to PAFA, but it has no interest in them. She stated that the intent of removing them is to not only to protect the windows, but also to find a home for them. If a church will not accept them, they will then be sold on the open market. The Reverend Ritter stated that the windows are in danger in their current location. The Plexiglas coverings of the windows have been vandalized and broken.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the Commission approved the previous application under very special circumstances that are not found in this instance. PAFA testified that the windows were of great artistic significance and would be displayed and interpreted for the public at the school's museum. Also, the City was made a party to the sales agreement between the Diocese and PAFA that specified that the Tiffany and Oakley windows would remain at PAFA in perpetuity. Mr. Farnham added that the City could

seek to enforce the agreement in court if PAFA attempt to deaccession the windows from its collection.

Mr. Farnham asked the applicants if they were proposing the removal of the windows in order to desanctify the church. Ms. Kimmel stated that the church has already been desanctified and the removal is being requested to protect and preserve the windows because prospective buyers do not want them retained in the church. She opined that any future buyer would remove the windows to sell them to fund the rehabilitation of the buildings. The Diocese is fearful that they will end up in the wrong hands. The Diocese wants to find the right buyer for these windows. She stated that the applicant is committed to putting the Bishop White window on display. Mr. Farnham reminded the applicants that a new owner of the church who wanted to remove the windows would need to seek an approval from the Historical Commission.

Ms. Kimmel stated that the church is currently vacant and that it would cost \$6 million to restore these windows. She claimed that that is equivalent to the cost to restore the historic buildings on the property. Mr. Farnham stated that it did not appear that the applicants were currently offering a financial hardship argument to justify the removal of the windows, but he reminded them that the Commission has a process to evaluate hardship claims, if the Diocese believes that it is suffering a hardship owing to the retention of the windows in situ.

Mr. Amburn asked if the Diocese intended to have the windows restored at the Beyer Studio. The Reverend Ritter replied they intend to store them at the studio and will probably sell them in as-is condition. The Committee members asserted that they could not support the removal of the windows from the church. Mr. Farnham reminded the applicants that the Committee is a technical advisory body that must base its recommendations on the Secretary of Interior's Standards. He suggested that they save reasoning unrelated to architecture and preservation for presentation to the Commission itself, which has broader authority.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee committed to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 2.

1935 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: Dan Kilpatrick

Applicant: Dan Kilpatrick

History: c. 1975; Contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, 2000

Project: Demolish rear addition, construct garage (In Concept)

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a non-historic one-story rear addition and construct a one-story two-car garage to the rear property line. The garage addition would be parge-coated in stucco. The drawings state that the garage door will be steel, but the garage door specifications indicate a wood fiber composite material. A Trex deck is proposed for the roof of the addition. Access to the deck would be provided from a door cut down from the middle window of the rear bay. No other work is proposed for the rear bay.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Final approval, provided the new door in the bay is divided to match the pane sizes of the adjacent windows, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Nancy Kilpatrick represented the application.

Ms. Cote stated that this proposal was submitted as an in-concept application, but the staff suggests that there is enough information to merit a review for final approval.

Ms. Kilpatrick clarified that they are proposing a steel garage door, not the wood fiber composite door that is shown in the submitted specification. The garage door would be paneled and without windows, as is correctly shown in the submitted specification.

Ms. Kilpatrick asked about the provision in the staff recommendation. Ms. Cote explained that the staff is recommending redesigning the door in the bay to include window panes that match the pane sizes of the adjacent windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend final approval, provided the fenestration in the door in the bay is divided to match the pane sizes of the adjacent windows, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

1201 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: Oddfellows c/o Equitable Owner Steven Savitz

Applicant: Ryan Lohbauer

History: 1906 by Watson & Huckel, architects

Project: Install roof deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of a roof deck and extension of a stair tower. The deck would be set back about nine feet from the rear north elevation and two to three feet from the east elevation. It would be constructed of wood planks and steel rail.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided a mock-up of the deck proves that the deck would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Noah Morganstein represented the application.

Mr. Morganstein noted that he was representing the application in place of architect Ryan Lohbauer, who was unable to attend. He asserted that the deck would be minimally visible from public rights-of-way. He stated that the deck would become visible when 490 feet north on 12th Street and slightly visible from two blocks north on Walnut Street, but not visible Spruce Street. He explained that there is a tall parapet that would block the majority of the views of the deck. However, there is a low portion of the parapet that would expose the deck from Manning Street, which is a service alley, he stated. Mr. Morganstein reported that the deck would have cable railings. He explained that the stair house extension would provide better and safer roof access than the current access.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a mock-up of the deck proves that the deck would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9.

3500 POWELTON AVENUE

Owner: Courts-UCAL LLC

Applicant: David Brawer, Brawer & Hauptman Architects

History: 1902, Willis Hale, architect

Designated: 3/2/1978

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the enclosure of an open gated carriageway in a large early-twentieth-century apartment complex. The metal gates at the front of the carriageway would be replaced with glass automatic sliding doors. A new free-standing awning would replace the one currently at the carriageway.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect David Brawer represented the application.

Mr. Baron asked Mr. Brawer if the canopy would be fabricated from a Sunbrella-type material. Mr. Brawer stated that it would. The Committee members considered the application and deemed the proposed alteration appropriate.

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

2500 SPRING GARDEN STREET, BOATHOUSE # 4

Owner: Pennsylvania Barge Club

Applicant: Paul Zebrowski, CYMA Builders & Construction Managers

History: NHL

Proposal: Addition of a ramp

OVERVIEW: The application proposes the construction of a ramp for handicap accessibility along the Kelly Drive façade of the boathouse. The applicant has stated that building the ramp along the side of the building would hinder movement of the boats which are stored there. The staff recommends looking at the possibility of building the ramp into the porch or adding a lift at the side of the porch as the proposed ramp would greatly alter the appearance of the main façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

The Committee suggested that the building could be made accessible without significantly detracting from its historic appearance. Mr. Baron suggested that a lift instead of a ramp may satisfy the accessibility requirements and not interfere with the movement of the boats alongside the building. He suggested that the applicant may also seek a variance from the accessibility requirements through the state's Department of Labor and Industry, which oversees the Pennsylvania Industrial Board and the Accessibility Advisory Board.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:00 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 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

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

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

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

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

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

PM-704.2.7 Design: Additions, alterations, and new construction shall be designed so as to be compatible in scale, building materials, and texture, with contributing buildings in the historic district.