

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

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

PRESENT

David Amburn, Chair
Shawn Evans
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

Sabra Smith, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Paul Pincus, Philadelphia Museum of Art
Nancy O'Donnell, Philadelphia Horticultural Society
Allen Spulecki, The Olin Studio
Viki Sand, Atwater Kent Museum
Daniel Klein, Ewing Cole
Walt Crimm, Ewing Cole
John Milner, John Milner Architects
Doris Fanelli, Independence National Historical Park
Amanda Jones, Independence National Historical Park
Charles Tonetti, Independence National Historical Park
Charles Murray, Undine Barge Club
Stan Free, Undine Barge Club
James Paulo, Undine Barge Club
Robert McAuliffe, PE, Undine Barge Club
Myles Pettengill, Archway Builders
Ed Fink, Fink & Stange Architects
Gibbs Connors
Kevin Rasmussen
Michael Loonstyn
Salvatore Farruggia

CALL TO ORDER

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

2201-09 BENJAMIN FRANKLIN PARKWAY, RODIN MUSEUM

Owner: Philadelphia Museum of Art

Applicant: Paul Pincus, Officer for Planning and Special Projects, Philadelphia Museum of Art

History: 1926-29, Paul P. Cret and Jacques Greber; individually designated, 6/21/1971

Project: Restore gardens, install ADA ramp to lower terrace

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the gardens of the Rodin Museum. This project is part of a much larger project to improve the landscape of this section of the Benjamin Franklin Parkway, which is bounded by 21st, 22nd, and Hamilton Streets, and the Parkway. The Commission has jurisdiction over the Rodin Museum garden restoration, but not the larger project. The work includes the restoration of the historic garden features, plantings, and the addition of an ADA ramp to the lower terrace. The lower terrace of the garden is currently only accessible by steps, as designed by Jacques Greber in 1929. The applicant proposes to install a ramp on the southeast corner of the garden that would not require handrails. The ramp would not be perceived from the Meudon Gate, but would be visible from other vantage points as visitors move through the garden. The application includes the creation of two new entry points along a non-historic fence. These entrances would connect the garden to the new circulation paths in the park that occupies the remainder of the block. The applicant also proposes general restoration and/or replacement of paving materials, spalled and broken stone elements, and lighting. Much of this work can be considered restoration and reviewed and approved at the staff level. The staff has recently approved restoration work to the Meudon Gate, which is the entry point to the garden and the museum. That work includes the restoration of the front steps as well as restoration of the stone gate and its wrought iron elements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 3, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Gutterman recused from the meeting owing to her consulting relationship with the Philadelphia Museum of Art.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Paul Pincus of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, Nancy O'Donnell of the Philadelphia Horticultural Society, and landscape architect Allen Spulecki attended the meeting.

Mr. Pincus described the proposal. The project will restore the original design of the museum's garden while making it accessible to all users. Large sections of the garden are currently not accessible. Many tourists, especially foreign tourists, visit the garden. Mr. Pincus also added that the museum's location makes it one of the most visited sites in Philadelphia. Bus tours traveling between New York and Washington D.C. often only stop at this site in the city. The museum would like to "reactivate the space." Several agencies and groups including the Fairmount Park Commission, Philadelphia Museum of Art, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia Horticultural Society, Pew Charitable Trust, and the Knight Foundation are collaborating on the project.

Mr. Spulecki provided an overview of the design. He stated that the site has aged and is suffering from deterioration. He discussed various other schemes for the ramp to demonstrate

that the proposed scheme is the least intrusive. He noted that the ramp would not require railings, owing to its pitch and length. Mr. Spulecki stated that all paving and other materials would conform to the Parkway guidelines. Mr. Pincus stated that the signage that will accompany this project has not yet been developed, but that it too would follow the guidelines. Mr. Spulecki noted that the vegetation would consist of the same plant species as specified by Jacques Greber in his original 1929 plan.

Mr. Cluver questioned the appropriateness of the curb at the ramp that extends beyond the end of the ramp. Mr. Cluver suggested removing the end section of the curb to avoid the tripping hazard. He suggested blending the end of the ramp into the garden walk to avoid the curb. Mr. Spulecki did not object to this suggestion. Mr. Amburn concurred to Mr. Cluver's suggestion, but acknowledged that the ramp's design and location are appropriate from an historic preservation perspective.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 3, 9, and 10.

13-17 S. 7TH STREET, ATWATER KENT MUSEUM

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Walter L. Crimm, AIA

History: 1824-26, John Haviland; individually designated, 6/26/1956

Project: Install glass doors, signage, rear alterations, and HVAC equipment

OVERVIEW: This application proposes several alterations to the front, rear, and side façades. This very significant Greek Revival building was designed by John Haviland to house the original Franklin Institute and constructed in 1824-26. The front façade retains its original appearance.

A set of glass doors would be installed in front of the extant, historic, wood front doors. The existing wood doors would remain in place in an open position. The applicant proposes to install the glass doors to make the institution more welcoming and less forbidding from the street. The glass doors would also help maintain a climate controlled environment in the museum. The existing wood doors are more than 10' in height. The proposed glass doors would only be 8'-6" tall; the remaining area would be infilled with a transom. The glass doors can not be as tall as the historic wood doors owing to the structural limitations of an aluminum and glass door system. The doors would be installed within the wood jamb and there would be no penetrations to the stone door surround. Although the proposed alteration would help the institution present a more welcoming face to the street, it would adversely affect the historic integrity of this landmark building. The proportions and vertical thrust so clearly visible in the front doors would be adversely affected by the installation of a glass door with transom. The introduction of a horizontal transom bar in what is otherwise an unobstructed vertical paneled door would disrupt the proportions of the wood doors.

The application proposes the installation of two signs flanking the front steps along 7th Street. The application does not include any details for the signage and, therefore, this portion of the application should be considered incomplete.

The rear elevation would be altered by the removal of two non-historic four-over-four windows, and a paneled door. A glass door would replace the existing wood door. This change stems from the desire to make the rear access to the institution more inviting. Four new louvers would

be cut into the rear masonry wall for the climate control system. These cuts would be located above infilled historic openings. A louver would also be installed in the north elevation, which faces a small alley. Mechanical equipment would be located at grade behind a screen at the southeast corner of the site. Although, originally the back of the lecture hall and of little architectural significance this rear elevation is now treated as a main point of entry. The alterations proposed for this façade should relate better to the proportions established by the fenestration on the upper stories. The proposed entry glass door is out of scale with the rest of the façade.

The applicant proposes to install new windows in infilled openings as well as interior panels behind existing historic windows on the front façade. These windows would be vented through holes on the rails to prevent moisture accumulation.

The application also proposes to remove four decorative cast iron columns that stand in the main public space in the museum. The museum claims that the columns obstruct the space. Some claim that the columns are the oldest surviving cast-iron columns in the United States. The columns were installed by John Haviland, the architect of the building, about one year after the building was completed after the second-floor tenant, the court system, complained that the building was not sound. Because they are in the interior, the Commission has no authority to deny the proposal to remove them. However, because the museum is owned and operated by the City of Philadelphia, the Commission could offer a recommendation on the removal of the columns to the Mayor and City Council. The historic preservation ordinance authorizes the Commission to:

Make recommendations to the Mayor and City Council concerning the use of grants, gifts and budgetary appropriations to promote the preservation of buildings, structures, site, objects or districts of historic importance to the City.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. The Commission should also recommend to the Mayor and City Council that the museum retain the historic cast iron columns.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Museum director Viki Sand, architects Daniel Klein and Walter Crimm, and preservation consultant John Milnor represented the application.

Mr. Danta acknowledged that the Commission does not wield plenary jurisdiction over the interior, but suggested that the Commission should advocate for the preservation of the important cast iron columns. He stated that these columns may be the oldest surviving examples in the country. He reported that the Commission has the authority to advise the Mayor and City Council on important preservation issues. He asserted that the Commission does not exercise this authority frequently, but this situation may warrant its employment.

Mr. Crimm stated that the museum must develop a system to control the environment in the museum. The glass doors would be part of this climate control system. He noted that the design of the glass doors is a direct consequence of the limitations of glass-door technology. He stated that the door opening is too tall for glass door without a transom. He stated that the design resulted from a series of compromises. He noted that the transom bar provides a place for the door closer. Without the transom bar, they would need to locate the closer in the sill, requiring the removal of more material.

Mr. Baron suggested that the glass doors be relocated to the interior, behind the historic wood doors. He cited a museum on Chestnut Street for which the Commission approved glass doors with an air lock behind the front doors. Mr. Crimm replied that the preferred option would be to install the glass doors on the exterior of the building, allowing a vestibule space to be retained.

Mr. Cluver asked the architects to explain the need for the glass doors. Mr. Klein answered that the museum currently opens the front doors whenever the museum is open. A glass vestibule, which would be retained, stands behind the wood doors to shield the interior from the weather. The new glass doors would increase the protection from the weather. He also stated that the existing vestibule has heaters, limiting its redesign. Mr. Amburn stated that he favored an interior solution, not the new, exterior, glass doors. Mr. Crimm opined that an interior solution would not only disrupt the vestibule space, but it would also create an awkward floor plan for ticketing and a confusing path for the public.

Messrs. Klein and Crimm presented a revised design for the glass door without the transom bar. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the installation details for the revised glass doors. Mr. Klein described the proposed installation. He stated that the door would be hung on pivoting hinges that would be doweled into the threshold of the entryway. He noted that the upper frame would be partially concealed within the wood jamb at the lintel. Ms. Gutterman noted that the proposed mounting of the doors would result in an alteration of historic fabric. Mr. Klein agreed, but claimed that it would be minimal. He stated that a butt-glazed system would be less intrusive, but would not be weather-tight. Mr. Cluver asked about the use of the door. Ms. Sand stated that the museum receives about 30,000 to 40,000 visitors per day. Mr. Cluver noted that that is only about 100 per day. Mr. Cluver expressed concern about the visual impact of the glass doors, especially their reflectivity. He again asserted that an interior solution in the vestibule area would be more appropriate. Mr. Crimm rejected that suggestion, stating that there is significant heat loss with the extant vestibule. He also noted that the design of the new HVAC system is dependent on the doors; changes to the calculated pressure and temperature may require a redesign of the climate control system. Mr. Crimm stated that the museum must be able to control its thermal environment and also present an open and welcoming face to the street.

Mr. Klein stated that two of the rear louvers would be located in infilled openings above the historic window openings. The other two louvers on the rear wall, the south louvers, would be installed in new openings. He asserted that they would have no space for restrooms if the moved the louvers to the existing infilled openings. Mr. Cluver asked if they were proposing to remove the two windows flanking the rear entrance to widen the entrance. The architects stated that they were, but claimed that the windows were not original and that the rear façade had been significantly altered. Mr. Cluver suggested that there must be better solutions than the one proposed. Ms. Sand contended that the opening must be widened to accommodate groups and disabled visitors. The Committee members asked if the width was mandated by code. The applicants replied that it was for convenience, not to satisfy the code.

Mr. Cluver asked if the louvers could be moved from the rear to a less visible façade. Mr. Crimm replied that they could not. Mr. Cluver asked about the proposed appearance of the louvers. Mr. Crimm stated that they were not meant to be decorative, but instead provide a necessary function. Ms. Gutterman objected to the four louvers surrounding the major entrance. Mr. Cluver asked where the mechanical equipment would be located. The architects pointed out the fenced area at the rear of the building. Mr. Cluver asked why they propose to replace some, but not all of the windows. Mr. Klein replied that they are proposing to replace the windows that will be operable; they are not proposing to replace windows that will be closed off in the interior. Mr.

Milner reported that all of the windows are replacement windows; none is original. The Committee members suggested that all deteriorated windows should be replaced to provide a consistent pane configuration; some of the extant replacement windows are four-over-four, but should be six-over-six. The architects confirmed that the replacement windows would be true-divided-light windows. They also noted that the historic front windows would be repaired and retained. Mr. Danta assured the Committee that the staff would review all of the window details.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested adding a transom over the rear door to make its proportions more appropriate to those of the rear façade. Mr. Crimm and Mr. Kline did not object to this suggestion.

Mr. Danta raised the question of the interior columns. Mr. Milner provided a detailed history of the architect's original plans for the building, which did not include the cast iron columns. He stated that the columns were added about 1829 to stabilize structure. Mr. Milner described the columns as a nuisance; they impede views. He explained that the space originally had an auditorium with a sloped floor, but that the space had been transformed into gallery. The change in the grade of the floor made two of the brick piers that support a set of columns protrude above the level of the new floor. He claimed that the columns were not significant noted that, with the addition of a new structural system to support the second floor, they will restore the interior to Haviland's original design. Ms. Gutterman asked if the columns play an important structural role. Ms. Milner stated that they do. Mr. D'Alessandro contended that the columns should be retained, if only as artifacts. Ms. Sand stated that the columns must be removed to allow the museum to fully use the gallery space. The columns now obstruct it, making it more difficult to use. She acknowledged the story of the columns is an interesting one. She offered to put them into storage to be used in a garden gazebo at some point in the future. She stated that the immediate desire is to remove them. Ms. Sand stated that the gallery cannot accommodate their largest teacher groups with the columns in place. She reported that the renovation will make the third floor accessible to visitors. She must install a climate control system and correct the fire and ADA violations. She concluded that the columns prevent the full use of the space. Mr. Cluver stated that he did not think that the museum would meet its goals with these interventions.

Mr. Amburn concluded that the rear has been compromised. He stated that the rear alterations were acceptable if all of the rear windows were replaced.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the signage owing to incompleteness; approval of the exterior alterations, provided that the front glass doors are frameless with minimal hardware and no transom bar, that all rear windows are replaced to match the historic windows, and that the rear doorway includes a better proportioned transom, with the staff to review details. The Committee suggests that the museum retain the interior columns as artifacts.

500-36 CHESTNUT STREET, INDEPENDENCE HALL

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: National Park Service

History: 1729-34, Edmund Wooley & Andrew Hamilton, architects; tower, 1753 and 1828 individually designated, 1956; World Heritage Site, 1979

Project: In concept: restore tower, repair masonry, replace metalwork and roofing

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application requests comment on several alternative methods of repair for the tower of Independence Hall. Famed architect William Strickland reconstructed the tower in 1828. The City of Philadelphia owns Independence Hall, but agreed to allow the federal government to maintain, curate, and interpret the building in 1950. The agreement dictates that "Any work of restoration or any major alterations or repairs to any of the buildings [including Independence Hall] shall not be undertaken until the plans for such work shall have been mutually agreed upon [by the Secretary of the Interior and the City of Philadelphia]." The Historical Commission has two tasks in this review. First, it must perform its regulatory responsibilities under §14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code. Second, it must advise the City on appropriate preservation methods for Independence Hall. Before the National Park Service may commence its work on the tower, it must have both the final approval of the Historical Commission and the agreement of the City of Philadelphia.

The wood-clad section of the tower, where the clock is located, was constructed using a novel technique. The section of the tower has a wood frame clad with very thick horizontal boards stacked on top of one other and fastened together with iron rods running vertically through them. In several cases, water has penetrated the boards and rusted the iron rods, causing them to expand and damage the boards. Possible treatments include:

1. Wholesale removal and replacement of the siding in kind.
2. Disassembly, replacement of the deteriorated boards, reassembly.
3. Repair of existing siding in place and treatment with borate to inhibit rot.
4. Protection of the existing siding with a covering or wood or metal sheeting.

The applicant has included sections of a Historic Structures Report that examines the advantages and disadvantages of the approaches. The applicant recognizes that the best approach may be a combination of several alternatives. The applicant requests that the development of a protocol to allow for Commission oversight during the process of disassembly.

The application also proposes replacing wood shingle roofs with metal roofs, replacing wood elements in a balustrade in fiberglass copies, and brick repointing. The building has been pointed in myriad ways and the applicant is seeking to identify the most appropriate pointing method and mortar mix. The applicant would also like to install "emplacements" or permanent brackets for hanging scaffolding that would allow for less expensive and more timely maintenance in the future. No details for the "emplacements" have been provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the wood-board cladding on the tower be repaired in place with the least invasive methods that allow for the greatest retention of historic fabric. The staff does not recommend any one of the proposed methods, but awaits additional information before opining. The staff recommends denial of the alternate materials for the roof and balustrade replacement; it recommends in-concept approval of replacement of portions of the wood shake roof and the wood balustrade in kind only where absolutely necessary. The staff recommends in-concept approval of pointing that is undertaken with an appropriate mortar mix that replicates the historic appearance and does not contrast greatly with the extant mortar.

The staff recommends denial of the “emplacements” owing to a lack of details. The staff makes these recommendations pursuant to Restoration Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Doris Fanelli, Amanda Jones, and Charles Tonetti of the National Park Service represented the application.

Mr. Tonetti displayed a Powerpoint presentation that provided an overview of the conditions at the tower. He noted in particular the water infiltration and deteriorating conditions. Water has run down from the 6th level to the 4th level, causing significant damage. He explained that the tower has very thick, horizontal, wood, shiplap siding. The horizontal siding is held together by original, vertical, metal rods, which have corroded greatly. As the rods have corroded, they have expanded to many times their original size, degrading the wood. Mr. Tonetti explained that the Park’s consultants had documented the damage to the wood cladding using radiography on the south and west elevations. Mr. Tonetti explained that they have not conclusively determined why architect William Strickland employed the unusual construction method with the shiplap siding and rods. He may have used it for ease of assembly or for structural reasons. He may have borrowed the technology from the barge construction industry. Mr. Tonetti stated that the rust from the rods is eating away at the wood. Displaying a diagram of the tower, he explained that the 4th level is in the best condition, the 5th level exhibits some deterioration, but the 6th level is in the worst condition. In some places, the wood is completely breaking down. He said that the condition is akin to “spike death” seen on the railroads. Water attacks the iron, which, in turn, attacks the wood, causing decomposition. At the 6th level, the siding retains early and mid nineteenth-century graffiti, which is historically significant and should be preserved.

Mr. Tonetti explained that they would like to modify the roof at the 6th level for better drainage. The roof cannot be seen from the ground. The roof currently allows moisture to penetrate and travel to the lower levels. A bucket test was undertaken to examine the flow. Historic photographs show that the roof was metal at one time.

Mr. Tonetti reported that the weather vane spindle is also deteriorating. The internal plate that supports the spindle is showing signs of rust, but the full extent of the damage is not yet known. Mr. Tonetti suggested replacing it with a maintenance-free stainless steel rod. Also, the brass ball on the weather vane has split, allowing water to infiltrate.

The discussion turned back to the metal rods that run through the siding. Mr. D’Alessandro suggested replacing the rods. Mr. Tonetti concurred, but stated the replacement is complicated by a lack of understanding of the construction system. They do not fully understand the siding system or how to dismantle it. He explained that he would like to construct a full-scale mock-up of the siding to better understand it. Mr. D’Alessandro again emphasized the need to replace the rods. He acknowledged that the siding would likely be damaged during the disassembly. He also wondered how a mock-up would duplicate the conditions of wood that has been in place in the weather for 200 years. Ms. Gutterman asked about the spacing of the rods. Mr. Tonetti replied that they are placed approximately 20” to 24” apart. He added that the rods sometimes overlap one another. Mr. Amburn agreed that new rods appeared to be the solution, but cautioned that the siding would be damaged during the replacement. He claimed that the complexities of the replacement could not be fully predicted, but suggested more study. He also suggested that the siding should be completely removed to allow for a full inspection of the underlying structure. Mr. Baron stated that Independence Hall has great significance. He stated that every effort should be made to preserve the existing historic fabric. He contended that dismantling the siding would destroy it. He suggested that the rusted rods could be treated with a rust-inhibiting chemical.

Mr. Tonetti explained that it would cost \$500,000 to scaffold the tower. Owing to the high cost, the Park would like to fix the problems in a way that would last well into the future. He also explained that the Park would like to install “outriggers” on the tower to make maintenance simpler and cheaper in the future. He stated that the best solution may be to disassemble the wood siding, replace the rods with stainless steel rods, and reuse the wood siding where possible. Any siding with graffiti that could not be reinstalled would be retained and displayed.

Mr. Danta asked about the rate of deterioration. He asked if the rusting of the rods is accelerating. He asked when the deterioration had occurred. Mr. Tonetti replied that he did not have good data on the rate of deterioration. He noted again that the rusting rods are attacking the wood fibers. In some places, the rusting rods have popped through the surface of the siding. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that all of the siding should be replaced owing to the cost of the scaffolding. Ms. Gutterman asked if the panels of siding on the tower could be disassembled as units. Mr. Tonetti stated that he could not answer this question, but hoped that the mock-up might provide some clarity. He stated that getting a crane to the site would be very expensive owing to the walls around the square. A smaller crane would be needed to lift the pieces of a larger crane onto the square.

Ms. Gutterman suggested sending a piece of the wood to a specialized laboratory for analysis to determine how the rods are reacting with the wood and whether those reactions can be neutralized.

Mr. D'Alessandro rejected the mock-up suggestion, claiming that it would be impossible to replicate the conditions at the tower.

Ms. Gutterman asked if any panels or pieces of siding had been replaced over the years. Mr. Tonetti stated there one or two small sections of siding had been replaced, but no rods had been removed. Mr. Tonetti suggested that the Architectural Committee visit the site and assess the conditions for itself. Ms. Gutterman suggested tabling the application until the Architectural Committee had an opportunity to visit the site.

Mr. Farnham informed the Committee that it does not have the authority to table an application, but it could recommend that the Commission table it. Also, the applicant could request a continuance, but, in either case, the application would not return to the Committee unless remanded by the Commission. He noted that the applicant could withdraw this application and submit a revised one after the Committee had visited the site.

Several members of the Architectural Committee suggested that Ms. Pentz should be involved in the discussion and site visit because of her extensive knowledge of the tower. Mr. Farnham stated that the Board of Ethics had disallowed her participation in the Committee's deliberations because she is a consultant for the applicant. He noted, however, that the status of this application review is open to question. The building is owned by the City but managed by the federal government. The federal government is not subject to the Commission's oversight, but is bound by a 1950 memorandum of understanding to receive the City's concurrence before proceeding with any major restoration projects. He stated that the Commission may be working in an advisory capacity, not a regulatory capacity and, therefore, perhaps Ms. Pentz's participation is possible.

The applicants agreed that the application should be deferred until additional information can be gathered.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend tabling the application for a period not to exceed six months to allow for additional investigation.

4414 RIDGE AVENUE, CASTLE RINGSTETTEN OF UNDINE BARGE CLUB

Owner: Undine Barge Club

Applicant: Myles Pettengill, Archway Builders

History: 1875, Furness & Hewitt

Project: Reroof in copper and rolled roofing

OVERVIEW: The applicant proposes to reroof Castle Ringstetten of the Undine Barge Club. It is currently roofed with a standing seam tin roof. The club would like to use copper in place of the tin because it would not necessitate painting. A copper roof would present a very different appearance than a tin roof painted red. Historically, red is the most common color for tin roofs; green is also common. Copper was historically used for roofing for very high style buildings constructed later than this 1875 building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, and 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Club members Robert McAuliffe, Stan Free, Butch Perillo, and Charles Murray and contractor Myles Pettengill represented the application.

Mr. Murray questioned the designation of the property, claiming that the boat club, but not the barge club was designated. He asked for documentation. Mr. Baron provided documentation showing that the barge club was designated.

Mr. Free, the treasurer of the club, noted the difficulties in raising sufficient funds to accommodate the upkeep of the property. He stated that maintaining and restoring the interior had consumed most of their funding, which comes from donations and volunteers. The club is proposing this type of roof because it will be low-maintenance and long-lasting. He asserted that copper, which has recently declined in price, meets their needs. Mr. Murray stated he has maintained and repaired the existing roof on his own since 1974. He claimed that the repairs are becoming time consuming and cost prohibitive. The roof needs constant patching.

After reviewing photographs of the roof, the Committee members concluded that the red colored roof is a character-defining feature and should be replicated. They explained that a painted tin roof lasts a very long time. Mr. Baron offered a several suggestions including repairing the existing roof with a thick red rubber paint that fills in holes. He also suggested a red rubber roof with ridges that replicates a metal, standing-seam roof. Mr. Pettengill noted a copper roof will dull down, but will take a long time to develop the green patina. He commented that a dark copper would look like a red roof from a distance. Once a roof is painted, the edges hold more debris from the surrounding trees, accelerating deterioration. A copper roof will shed water more quickly. Mr. Cluver asserted that the red color is a character-defining feature and that should be replicated.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of an unpainted copper roof, but approval of a red roof in any material,

provided it replicated the appearance of the original roof, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, and 6.

1831 DIAMOND STREET

Owner: Brian Shaffer

Applicant: Edward Fink

History: c. 1890, Angus Wade, contributing to Diamond Street Historic District 1995
declared Dangerous by L&I and demolished, 1999

Project: Reconstruct demolished historic building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconstruct the historic building that stood on this site. The historic building was declared Dangerous by the Department of Licenses & Inspections and then demolished in 1999. The Commission reviewed and approved an in-concept application for this project at its March 2009 meeting.

Since the approval in concept, the design has been revised. It includes two alternatives. Alternative A3a proposes reconstructing the front facade with brown cast stone. Alternative A3b proposes reconstructing the front façade using a scribed elastomeric finish. The design has also been revised to include windows in the party wall.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of either alternative, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Reconstruction Standards 1, 4, and 5. The cast-stone option is the preferred but more expensive alternative. Requiring the more expensive cast stone may render the project infeasible.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Architect Edward Fink represented the application.

Mr. Fink assured the Architectural Committee that the revised proposal stipulates a front façade that will be built in the plane of and to height of the original building and its adjoining neighbor.

Mr. Fink introduced samples of the stucco coloring to be used in this modular construction, saying that the company is capable of matching any color. This stucco finish will simulate the brownstone.

Ms. Pentz opined that both options meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. She noted that the stone better replicates the original brownstone. Mr. Fink described the wall with the elastomeric coating as studs and plywood with a vapor barrier and a three coat stucco system. He also noted that the windows will be recessed approximately 2" to 2½". The building base will be real brownstone in either case.

Mr. Baron stated that the applicant will be using neighboring homes as a guideline for the details. He explained that the cornice, which was originally sheet metal, will be rebuilt in Fypon.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of either alternative, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Reconstruction Standards 1, 4, and 5.

1112 LOCUST STREET

Owner: Gibbs Connors

Applicant: Gibbs Connors

History: c. 1815

Project: Construct three-story addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story addition to the west elevation of 1112 Locust Street. The building at 1112 Locust Street is the only survivor of a row of four houses constructed circa 1815. The building at 1110 Locust Street was demolished between 1917 and 1936. The buildings at 1114 and 1116 Locust Street were demolished in the 1970s by the Redevelopment Authority. Their designations were subsequently rescinded in April 2005.

The proposed addition would stand on the lot at 1114 Locust Street, but would connect to the historic building at 1112 Locust Street. It would be modern in design and would employ a glass and steel storefront system with metal infill panels at the façade and rear elevations. The west elevation would be comprised primarily of brick with intersecting bands of glass and metal panels above the first story. The historic fenestration pattern of the existing building is carried over to the proposed addition in its storefront fenestration and panel configuration, creating a compatible rhythm.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Kevin Rasmussen and property owner Gibbs Connor represented the application.

Mr. Amburn asked if the property line had been relocated since the proposed addition is ten feet wide and the original lot was fifteen feet. Mr. Rasmussen confirmed that the property line was indeed relocated.

Mr. Cluver asked whether the Architectural Committee's review is limited to review and comment because the historic designation of the two lots at 1114 and 1116 Locust Street have been rescinded. Ms. Sell explained that 1112 Locust Street is designated and this project is being reviewed as an addition to that designated property. The Commission has full jurisdiction.

Mr. Gallery addressed the Committee and recommended denial of the application. He insisted that the design of the addition is not compatible with the historic building. He cited Standard 9 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He contended that the architectural features and fenestration are not consistent with the historic building or other historic properties in the area. He referenced the historic storefront design and materials, stating that the design and materials of the proposed addition are not compatible. He asserted that the proposed addition is differentiated from the historic building, but that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that new additions should be "compatible with" the historic building. He opined that it is possible to design a contemporary building to be compatible with a historic district. Mr. Amburn clarified that 1112 Locust Street is not within a historic district. Mr. Gallery distributed photographs of other contemporary buildings in the area with brick facades and punched window openings. Mr. Gallery explained that the Washington West Civic Association owns the lot at 1114 Locust and had transferred a 10-foot-wide section of it to the owner of 1112 for egress from his coffee shop. The space was meant to be used as a means of egress, not for construction. Committee members asked if the deed restricted the use. Mr. Gallery conceded that the deed does not include any restrictions.

Mr. Rasmussen rejected Mr. Gallery's claim that the building is not compatible with the historic building. He asserted that Mr. Gallery's criteria for compatibility were entirely subjective. Mr. Gallery is seeking to impose his aesthetic preferences on the project. He stated that he attempted to design a building that is compatible yet different; the building is neutral and modern. He stated that he was not trying to recreate the historic building or produce a radically different addition, but instead an addition that was contemporary yet compatible. He explained that the 10-foot width produced several unique design restrictions. He noted that he brought the lines from the other building across onto the addition. He explained that the color scheme will help to knit the two structures together. He recalled that the original buildings all had storefronts and explained that the proposed design has more fenestration and glass to imply that the first story will be a commercial space. Mr. Rasmussen asserted that the shape of the roof is low and is stepped back to make it appear as minimal as possible. He stated that he paid great attention to the three-quarter view from the northwest because of the vacant lot to the west.

Mr. Connors, the property owner, stated that he had met with the Washington West Civic Association in February for a preliminary review. He stated that he initially planned to build a one-story "jewel box" enclosure for the commercial space, but the Association encouraged him to build a three-story contemporary building. He added that he lives on S. Quince Street, near the buildings Mr. Gallery held up as compatible contemporary architecture. He opined that aesthetic taste is subjective and stated that he did not prefer the buildings presented by Mr. Gallery.

Mr. Amburn stated he was in favor of the proportions of the proposed addition. Ms. Pentz stated that she approved of the roof design. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that Mr. Gallery's point about material compatibility has merit. Ms. Gutterman stated that the lines of the historic building carry through to the proposed addition until the third story. She suggested that the top story be redesigned. She stated that she would prefer punched fenestration rather than spans of glass. She also noted that color choice will be important. Ms. Gutterman noted that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards state the building should be differentiated, but sympathetic. She observed that she is not suggesting a neutral structure, but rather something more compatible with the historic building.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated he prefers punched windows. Mr. Rasmussen reiterated that the building is not a normal size, but rather ten feet wide. Punched windows are not appropriate for the structural system. He stated that he is proposing windows that are compatible with the structural system. The addition will not have masonry, load-bearing walls. Mr. Amburn agreed with the applicant. Mr. Rasmussen commented that it might be helpful to see the three-quarter view for a better understanding of the perspective. He added that the structure will always be viewed as a three-dimensional addition and that the side elevation is meant to work with the facade. Ms. Gutterman opined that the side elevation works better than the façade. Ms. Pentz added that perhaps something could be adjusted on the façade to tie it in with the side elevation. Mr. Rasmussen replied that he has studied the design very carefully. He asserted that the design is appropriate and compatible. Mr. Amburn stated that a ten-foot addition with punched openings would look out of proportion. Mr. Gallery stated that the punched openings could be wider in the addition than in the historic building. Mr. Rasmussen asserted that he would not design punched openings and reemphasized that punched openings are not appropriate for this structural system. Ms. Pentz suggested addressing the third-floor window and cornice lines. Ms. Gutterman stated that the windows do not need to be small, but could perhaps look more like the historic windows. She added that a three-quarter view would help to visualize the relationship between the front and side elevations.

Mr. Gallery stated that there is an agreement with the Washington West Civic Association that the garden would remain in perpetuity. Therefore, the applicant could add more windows on side wall.

Ms. Pentz and Mr. Amburn stated that they would recommend approval of the proposal. Ms. Gutterman and Messrs D'Alessandro and Cluver stated that they would recommend denial of the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 3 to 2 to recommend denial of the application.

605 AND 609 N. 18TH STREET

Owner: Michael Loonstyn

Applicant: Michael Loonstyn

History: Vacant lot within SGHD

Project: Review and Comment: Construct building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct two three-story, three-bay, brick buildings on vacant lots in the Spring Garden Historic District. This block of N. 18th Street was comprised of three-story, two-bay-wide twins. The drawings indicate that the door, windows, and cornice of the front façade would replicate those found on the historic buildings on the block.

STAFF COMMENT: The staff comments that the building should be only two bays wide, not three, and should stand on the historic footprint, like the other twins on the block. In addition, the staff suggests that the historic features not be replicated precisely. The new building should be compatible with the historic twins in rhythm, scale, proportion, size, massing, and materials, but should not create a false sense of historical development, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application. Developer Michael Loonstyn represented the applications.

Ms. Cote informed the Committee members that revised drawings proposing two-bay wide buildings had been submitted since the overview was written. She provided the drawings to the Committee. Mr. Amburn asked if the new buildings will be constructed in the original footprints. Ms. Cote replied that they will be the same width, 20', but without rear ells. The new buildings will have rectangle footprints.

Salvatore Farruggia, a neighbor, introduced himself and asked Mr. Loonstyn about the proposed occupancy. Mr. Loonstyn replied it will be a three-family triplex, but he had not determined whether the properties would be rented or sold as condominiums. If he sells them as condominiums, he would sell at market rate. Mr. Loonstyn stated that he was under contract with the Spring Garden Community Development Corporation, the current owners, and that a condition of sale is that the new construction replicates the historic molding, doors, windows, and cornices found on the other twins on the block. He added that new brick, not salvaged brick, will be used for the construction of the buildings and the water table and lintels will be limestone, not the marble used on the historic twins.

Ms. Cote explained the staff's comment regarding a false sense of historic development. Mr. Cluver stated that the cornice should not exactly replicate the historic cornices on the block, but he thought it preferable if the cornice had a similar bracket pattern, perhaps without the same

profile. He also noted that the second- and third-floor windows as shown in the drawings were misaligned. Mr. Loonstyn stated that the drawings would be corrected to show the windows aligned correctly and assured that they would be the same size and proportion as the historic windows on the block.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that the windows and cornices of the new construction should align with their twins.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:30 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 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 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.

Restoration Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use which reflects the property's restoration period.

Restoration Standard 2: Materials and features from the restoration period will be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the period will not be undertaken.

Restoration Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate and conserve materials and features from the restoration period will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research.

Restoration Standard 4: Materials, features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods will be documented prior to their alteration or removal.

Restoration Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the restoration period will be preserved.

Restoration Standard 6: Deteriorated features from the restoration period 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.

Restoration Standard 8: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.