

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

**TUESDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 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
David Traub, Save Our Sites
John Dowlin, Save Our Sites
Justin Detwiler, Elfreth's Alley Association
James Timberlake, Christ Church
Andrew Halladay
Edward Fink, Fink und Stange
Richard and Polly Cress
Andrew Halladay, Power Windows and Siding
Ellen Lariviere
Jeff Wyant, Wyant Architecture
Michael Palermo, Starr Restaurants
Steve Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Ron Patterson, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Rachel Schade, Schade & Bolender
Martin Droz, Schade & Bolender
Rich Stange, Fink und Stange
Jim Curry
Tuval Shlomo, Star Contracting
Christine Kimmel, Esq., Pepper Hamilton
Reverend Christine Ritter, Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania
Frank Barletta, Colliers Lanard & Axilbund
David R. Knapton, Philadelphia City Planning Commission

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Amburn called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman and Pentz and Messrs. McCoubrey and Evans joined him.

205-07 CHURCH STREET

Owner: The Rector and Wardens of Christ Church

Applicant: Daniella Voith, AIA

History: Neighborhood House 1916, addition 1922; Ralph White, architect

Washburn House 1922; Ralph White, architect

Contributing to Old City Historic District, 2003

Project: Construct a link between two historic structures

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing a link building between two historic structures associated with Christ Church. The Community Building and the Washburn House, both on the west side of American Street, would be linked with a glass structure that would be constructed across what is now an open court. A gate and flanking brick piers at the entrance to the court would be demolished.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the gate and flanking brick piers are retained, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz recused owing her firm's involvement. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Daniela Voith and James Timberlake of Christ Church represented the application.

Ms. Voith provided a brief overview of the proposal. She stated that the Neighborhood House was built in 1916 and a story was added in the 1920s and that the Washburn House, which is adjacent, was built in the 1920s as well. She stated that the intent of the project is to allow the buildings to accommodate the needs of the church and community. The uses include church gatherings, community meetings, festivals, and performances. Ms. Voith stated that the Church wants to provide an accessible entrance and to help manage the volume of visitors and members as they move between the church and the buildings. She pointed out that, although the ADA walk, ramp and stair will be proposed as part of a separate application, they are viewed as conjoined projects. She stated that the piers along the sidewalk where the addition would be constructed will need to be disassembled for the new construction. She added that the church would like to reuse them in the garden across the street from the new entrance. Ms. Voith stated it is important to make this very small space as visible as possible. She noted that it must be able to accommodate wheelchairs.

Mr. Timberlake stated that this is the final phase of a three phase project. The most recently completed phase included life safety upgrades to the main sanctuary. This project is focused on life safety and accessibility for the Neighborhood and Washburn Houses. He added that, at the present time, the space is only 50% utilized. Their hopes are to make the space 100% utilized. He stated that it was his opinion that the gate and piers should be relocated as a single unit. Mr. Amburn commended the scheme, but questioned the moving of the gate and piers. Ms. Gutterman stated that the gate and piers should not disappear, but should be reused in a way that is visible to the public. Mr. McCoubrey questioned the date of the wall. Mr. Timberlake was unsure of the date. Mr. Amburn stated that he approved of the application, provided that the gates and piers were relocated, not put in storage.

Ms. Voith assured the Committee that she would provide detailed documentation. She praised the contractor, who is committed to the restoration.

Mr. Baron asked the applicant of her plans for the placement of the gate if the Streets Department requires that the crosswalk be located at the corner and not in the middle of the block in line with the entrance to the new structure. Ms. Voith replied that she had not discussed the options for that case. Mr. Timberlake stated that he was confident that this scheme would meet the Streets Department's safety standards.

Mr. Baron asked the Committee members if they wanted to condition a recommendation of approval on the rebuilding of the gates on the site. Ms. Gutterman asserted that the gates and piers should be rebuilt on the site and that the gate and the piers should remain together, not be separated. Mr. Timberlake agreed to this stipulation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the gate and piers being rebuilt together on the site, with the staff to review details.

110 ELFRETH'S ALLEY

Owner: Richard and Polly Cress

Applicant: Richard Cress

History: c. 1760; individually designated 6/26/1956; significant to OCHD, 12/12/2003

Project: Install vinyl windows at rear

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install vinyl windows at the rear of this significant property. The rear is not visible from any public right-of-way. It appears that the existing sashes are not historic. The application does not indicate if the historic frames will be retained.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the existing historic frames are retained.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owners Richard and Polly Cress and Andrew Halladay of Power Windows and Siding represented the application.

Ms. Cress stated that the existing windows at the rear of the house are in poor condition. Pointing to a photograph, she indicated that the existing frames would remain. Ms. Cress stated that they propose to replace all the windows at rear ell, the rear dormer windows, and the second-floor rear window on the main block of the house. Mr. Cress stated that they want to replace the windows for energy efficiency. They are planning a second phase of work for the front of the house, which will be undertaken using historically appropriate replacement elements and materials. Mr. Amburn asked if the Commission had approved vinyl windows for designated properties of this importance, whether visible or not. Ms. Cote replied that the Commission has not approved vinyl windows for a house of this type. She added that the staff had lengthy debate over this application. The primary question is whether the Commission should protect historic fabric when the public has no access to it.

Ms. Gutterman asked if they had looked into Marvin wood windows. Ms. Cress stated that they were cost prohibitive. Mr. Halladay explained that the muntins in the proposed windows would be internal and sandwiched between the layers of glass. Mr. Evans asked if there was enough information on the windows. Ms. Cote replied that no shop drawings were provided, but added

that the staff typically approves catalogue cuts for vinyl windows on a non-visible rear, provided the windows are installed in existing openings or frames. Mr. Amburn suggested that the Committee could recommend approval of vinyl windows in the rear ell only, and not in the main block. Ms. Gutterman asked if the retained frames would be capped with vinyl. Mr. Halladay responded that they would be capped. Ms. Gutterman opined that the capping would not be good for the wood of the frames because it would trap moisture. She added that she was not comfortable with the level of information provided and suggested that the Committee needed more information such as shop drawings. Ms. Pentz also stated her reluctance to recommend approval. Ms. Cress stated that the frames would not be capped. Ms. Cress stated that she spoke with the installer, which is not Mr. Halladay, and the frames would not be capped.

Mr. Evans asked why some of his fellow Committee members wanted to review additional details. He contended that this task could be entrusted to the staff. Mr. Amburn replied that this application would set a precedent for this important street. Ms. Cote informed the Committee that she reviewed every file for the street and found approvals of vinyl windows for any of the buildings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the vinyl window in the main block, but approval of the vinyl windows in the rear ell only, provided the existing frames are retained and not capped, with the staff to review details including shop drawings.

1831 DIAMOND STREET

Owner: Brian Shaffer

Applicant: Edward Fink, Fink & Stange Architects

History: c. 1890, Angus Wade, architect; declared imminently dangerous and demolished, 1999
Contributing to the Diamond Street Historic District, 1985

Project: Reconstruct historic building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the reconstruction of a demolished historic rowhouse. The historic house was demolished in 1999 after the Department of Licenses & Inspections declared it imminently dangerous.

The application proposes to rebuild the house with two alternate façade materials. Plan A2 calls for rebuilding the façade in brick with brown cast-stone details. Plan A-3 calls for rebuilding the façade in brown cast-stone cladding. Details such as the door and basement windows are not depicted correctly. The staff should work with the applicant to finalize all details.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Final approval of plan A-3, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Reconstruction Standard 4.

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

Mr. Baron explained that the building had been declared Imminently Dangerous by the Department of Licenses & Inspections (L&I). The building and its twin were demolished to alleviate the dangerous condition. The in-concept application proposes reconstructing the building. It proposes two alternate schemes, one in brick and a second in brown cast stone. Mr. Baron observed that the historic door and basement window were not depicted accurately on the plans, but that staff could work with the applicant to correct the details.

Mr. Fink stated that his client would prefer to rebuild using brick because it would be less expensive. Ms. Pentz opined that either option was acceptable. The remainder of the Committee members contended that the brown cast stone option was the only acceptable option because the original building had been brownstone. The Committee members noted that they might consider other brownstone like materials, but objected to Dryvit.

The Committee members discussed the fenestration of the side of the building. They asked the applicant to determine with L&I whether it would be possible to include side windows to restore the former character of that facade.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of plan A-3.

700 S. 2ND STREET

Owner/Applicant: Ellen Lariviere

History: west and east section c 1790, central section c. 1940
individually designated 1966

Project: Demolish and reconstruct front wall of central section.

OVERVIEW: The property at 700 S. 2nd is comprised of a four-story eighteenth-century structure at the corner of 2nd and Bainbridge Streets, a single-story fragment of an eighteenth-century house at the corner of Bainbridge and Phillip Streets, and a single-story twentieth-century commercial structure connecting them. The middle structure is in very poor condition.

In September 2007, the Commission approved a proposal in concept to add to and reface the middle and rear structures to create a four-story structure. That project did not receive the requisite zoning approvals and was abandoned. The applicant now proposes to remove the damaged brick face of the central section and reconstruct it in red brick. The design would look very similar to that approved in concept in 2007; however, it would remain a single story. Several details are not specified. The staff suggests that the new wall be constructed of red brick and sit in the plane of the existing wall. Clad, simulated-divided-light windows would be appropriate for this non-historic section of the building.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Ellen Lariviere represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the existing wall of the middle section is badly bowed. The lintels are rusted and are pushing the wall apart. The Committee members deemed the proposal appropriate.

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

210 W. WASHINGTON SQUARE

Owner: Zukin Realty/210 W. Washington Square Associates

Applicant: Jeffrey Wyant, AIA

History: 1928, Ralph Benker, architect, designated as significant within the Society Hill Historic District 3/10/1999

Project: Install door in window, alter side openings, replace non-historic fence, add signage

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert one section of a very large, original window into a door, alter already-altered side openings, replace a non-historic fence, and add signage.

This very important Art Deco building has monumental windows at the first floor in the northern and southern bays flanking the entrance. This application proposes a door for the window in the southern bay. The Commission approved an identical window-to-door conversion for the northern bay in August 2005. Both the current and approved applications proposed to remove a section of the stone sill, salvage an existing metal panel and window section, and convert the panel and window section into a single-leaf door. The doors provide direct access to retail spaces flanking the lobby. The current applicant proposed the same window-to-door conversion to the Commission in June 2008. The Commission denied that application because the applicant did not provide information about the interior layout of the retail space, which will be used as a restaurant. The Commission refused to approve the conversion without adequate justification. Since that denial, the applicant has developed an interior scheme, which is documented in the application.

The application also proposes to alter already-altered side openings connecting the restaurant to an exterior seating area. No historic fabric will be lost with the alteration, which will be minimally visible from the street. The application proposes to replace a non-historic glass wall with a metal picket fence. The proposed fence is more compatible with the historic building than the existing fence. The application also proposes signage for the large window and the fence. No details are provided. Signage would be appropriate on the fence, but not on the large window, which is a character-defining feature. The staff could approve appropriate signage at the staff level.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the signage, owing to incompleteness and Standard 9. Approval of the remainder of work, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Commission's August 2005 approval.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Ronald Patterson, Michael Palermo of Starr Restaurants, and architect Jeffery Wyant represented the application.

Mr. Patterson addressed the signage proposal and stated that it has not been fully developed. Mr. Patterson explained that the former restaurant has been closed for approximately six months, a new tenant has been secured, and there are plans to reconfigure the interior layout and open by June 2009.

Mr. Patterson reported that the main entrance to the restaurant space used to be through the lobby of the building. However, with the renovation of the building for condominiums, that entrance is no longer available. The residents of the building do not want restaurant patrons using the lobby. The courtyard entrance opens into a dining room. In cold weather, the entrance is not suitable for use. Mr. Patterson described the plan to create a new entrance in the front

façade at the large window, as has been done in the north bay. He explained that a small lounge and coat room would function as an airlock.

Mr. Palermo explained that the previous entrance detracted from the front dining room. Customers waiting to be seated and coats being collected the disrupted seated diners.

Mr. Wyant described the proposal to cut the new door. It would match precisely the door that that was installed in the north bay with the Commission's approval. He explained that they intended to maintain the symmetrical appearance and salvage existing metal panels to integrate into the new door.

Steve Weixler of the Society Hill Civic Association opined that the alteration of the north bay with a new shop door was not accomplished according to the approved plans. He asserted that the quality of workmanship, design, and materials was poor. He opined that there is no resemblance to the original, finely detailed, Art Deco window system. He acknowledged the value of the restaurant to the neighborhood, but contended that buildings with this significance should be treated with deference; the interior layout should not drive decisions about the exterior. Mr. Weixler stated that the Society Hill Civic Association is advocating for the denial of this proposal based on the inappropriate north-bay alteration, the significance of the Art Deco architecture, and the building is a backdrop for tourists at Independence National Park and the Monument of the Unknown Soldier. He stated that he did not object to the south façade alterations or the glass removal. However, he opined that signage is inappropriate for this building.

Mr. Patterson assured the Committee that his client would reuse and adapt as much of the existing material as possible for the new door. Mr. Wyant argued that the north bay door was executed according to the approved plans.

Mr. Evans inquired whether other options were considered before the applicant arrived at this proposal. Mr. Wyant asserted that they had looked into many options. However, without creating a new opening they were limited to the main lobby of the building and exterior courtyard as entrances. He explained that an airlock is needed to make the front dining room usable. Mr. Evans asserted that the designers should be able to create a usable space with the constraints. He contended that this is an interior planning problem.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated his opposition to the proposal. He recalled major main entrance alterations to a cafe at 1900 Spruce Street. The cafe went out of business six months after the façade was modified to serve the business. He observed that the building is now left with the inappropriate alterations.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the insertion of the door in the window; and approval of south façade alterations and fence replacement; pursuant to Standard 9.

3615 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: Ralston House

Applicant: Rachel Schade

History: c. 1890, individually designated 2/23/1971

Project: Replace ADA ramp on side façade, replace front entrance canopy.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace an ADA ramp and two canopies. An earlier version of this application was presented to the Architectural Committee in January 2009, but then withdrawn before the Commission meeting. The Committee had several suggestions, which have been incorporated into the current application.

The building currently has an ADA ramp on the west side of the property. This ramp discharges onto a parking lot. The applicant proposes to replace the existing wood ramp with a steel ramp. The landing of the ramp would be covered by a steel and glass canopy. The location of the entrance door directly adjacent to an octagonal bay makes it a very difficult location for the installation of a canopy. The applicant proposed to utilize the arch of the window in the bay as a guiding element and presents a curved canopy that follows the radius of the arched window. The canopy would be anchored to the wall and supported by a cable.

The main entrance to the building along Chestnut Street currently has an unsympathetic cloth canopy. The applicant proposed to install a more compatible canopy of steel and glass. The canopy would fit the width of the opening and it would be supported by two slender columns.

The current application responds to the Architectural Committee's suggestions. The proposed canopies have been designed to shed water away from the building rather than toward the building; the west canopy will be attached at two points on the brick wall by a bracket and flashing; the south canopy will be supported by two brackets on either side of the main entrance; and the recommended metal mesh skirt is proposed beneath the sloped ramp.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Rachel Schade and Martin Droz represented the application.

Ms. Schade explained that she responded to the Architectural Committee's previous recommendations. She stated that she met with the canopy installation engineer and developed the concept of a basic glass canopy with minimal coverage of historic fabric. She clarified that the existing canopy on the west entrance is also not appropriate.

Ms. Gutterman asked if a free-standing canopy would work. Ms. Schade acknowledged that a free-standing canopy could work, but she would have to design it to be closer to the building for watershed protection. Mr. Evans stated he would prefer a shallower pitch to the canopy for decreased visibility. Ms. Schade stated that she could redesign it with a shallower pitch.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the canopy has a shallower pitch, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

1727 PINE STREET

Owner: Beryl and Jeffrey Rosenstock

Applicant: Rachel Schade, AIA

History: c. 1850, contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Legalize front façade repair

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the removal of a small section of the marble cladding on the first-story façade and its replacement with concrete block and stucco formed to match the shape of the lost marble. The window sills were also repaired and the entire first-floor façade repainted. Pieces of the marble facade between the two first-story windows collapsed into the street. The applicant performed the repair without the Historical Commission's approval or the requisite building permit.

Standard 6 of the Secretary of the Interior Standards requires that "Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of distinctive features, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials." In this case the marble collapsed onto the street. Therefore, the severity of deterioration requires replacement. The question then is how to restore the façade. There are two equally-valid preservation options. One would seek to restore the material; the other the appearance.

The materials-centric option would require the installation of a new piece of marble between the windows to replace the lost marble. However, the new marble would not match the surrounding marble, which is painted and was painted at the time of designation. The material would be restored, but the first floor would have a discordant, not monolithic, appearance. The pre-collapse appearance would not be replicated unless the Commission required the painting of the new marble, an absurd option. Likewise, the historic appearance would not be replicated unless the Commission required the removal of all of the paint, a requirement which may extend beyond the applicant-defined scope of work.

The second option, which was undertaken illegally, replicates the shape and appearance of the historic marble when painted, but not the marble itself. In this case, the marble was reconstructed in concrete block and stucco and then painted to match the surrounding cladding. This option restores the uniform appearance of the first-floor cladding, but does not replicate the historic material or pre-painted appearance. Also, it does not allow for the removal of all of the paint and restoration of the cladding in the future.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff notes that both options have preservation merits, but neither is perfect. The first option would allow for a true restoration at some undefined point in the future, but would not recreate the pre-collapse appearance. The second option would recreate the pre-collapse appearance, but not allow for a full restoration in the future. The staff does not present a recommendation.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Rachel Schade and Martin Droz represented the application.

Ms. Schade stated that she did not know that reason for the collapse, but noted that the building inspectors had witnessed the aftermath. Mr. Evans asked if there were anchors that held the marble in place. Ms. Schade stated that it appeared that there were no anchors in the pieces of marble that fell. Ms. Gutterman asked if the brick backing was removed during the repair. Ms. Schade stated that she was called in after the repairs were underway and did not know the

answer to the question. However, she assumed that the brick was not removed and block was placed over it.

Ms. Schade stated that this house is a group of four with marble watertables. She asserted that 1729 and 1731 Pine Street still have exposed marble bases, but this building and its neighbor have been painted for a long time.

Ms. Gutterman observed that unless one removed all of the paint and matched the marble perfectly, the marble replacement would not match. She stated that, in this case, she would recommend the legalization of the repair and stucco replacement because the existing marble is painted. Mr. Evans stated that legalization would not preclude future restoration. However, he stated that, if this had come to the Architectural Committee prior to the repair, he would have requested multiple bids on new marble and information about the marble failure.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the legalization, provided a structural engineer determines the cause of the marble failure and current condition of the remaining marble.

250 S. 20TH STREET

Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Applicant: Richard Stange

History: 1911, architects Lafarge & Morris; significant to RFRHD, 2/8/1995

Project: Install gates on front steps and chapel

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install three double-leaf gates, constructed of metal bars, on the entrance landing, and one double-leaf gate at the side entrance of the church. Also, a fixed panel of fence is proposed to stand between the columns and the landing on the stairs. The fixed panels would alter the spaces and spatial relationships that characterize the grand entrance of the church.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the gates without the fixed panels, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Richard Stange and Jim Curry represented the application.

Mr. Stange stated that they took the advice of the Committee last month and moved the gates to to the landing, reduced the height, and added the perpendicular element. Mr. Evans asked if the church pursued other means of security such as guards or lighting. Mr. Curry stated that the church had looked into lighting and guards. Lighting would present a fire hazard and guards would be too costly. He explained that the gates fold in on themselves. Mr. Evans opined that the proposal is a good solution.

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

316 S. 21ST STREET

Owner: Will Hozack & Vesna Hess

Applicant: Tuval Shlomo

History: c. 1860, main block refaced in 1949

Project: In-Concept: rebuild portions of the side façade, alter fenestration, construct rear addition

OVERVIEW: The Commission has reviewed many iterations of this project. This is the fifth application for significant alterations and additions submitted by the current owners since 2006. All applications have proposed major alterations to the rear ell of this corner house, which runs along Cypress Street and is highly visible to the public. The ell is original to the building. The main block of the building was altered and refaced in the mid twentieth-century. The Commission also recently reviewed the designation of the property. The applicant has submitted a cover letter that does not accurately portray the Commission's designation review.

The property owners submitted the first application for this project in March 2006. The Commission reviewed that application in April 2006 and tabled it for a period not to exceed six months to allow for a review of the inventory regarding the classification of this property. One version of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District inventory listed this property as an "intrusion," which is not a classification used by the Commission. In June 2006, the Commission reviewed the inventory classification and confirmed the classification of the property as Contributing to the district. The applicant withdrew the permit application tabled by the Commission in April 2006 and submitted a new application in July 2006, which was also subsequently withdrawn and not reviewed by the Commission. The applicant filed a subsequent application and, in November 2006, received an approval for a two-story rear addition with garage and two new widow openings in the side façade with small balconies. In July 2007, the applicant requested approval for changes to the design approved in November 2006. These changes included French doors that opened on to a deck over a ground-floor loggia, a separate balcony at the second floor, a new brick parapet and the painting of the rear ell masonry walls. Along the entire process most of the discussion centered on the retention of the nineteenth-century fabric, as well as the retention of the spatial relationship between the front block and the rear ell.

The current in-concept application once again has many of the same characteristics as the previous applications, and continues to ignore the Committees and Commission's comments regarding spatial relationships and the retention of historic fabric. The application proposes Variants 1 and 2, both of which would require the demolition and complete reconstruction of the rear ell. The applicant submitted an engineer's letter, which does not address any specific structural concerns. Both variants also propose a rear addition of identical design. Variant 1 proposes to reconstruct the side façade to align with the front block at the second and third floors, thus eliminating the traditional rear ell side yard. The ground floor would have two entrances with columns. Variant 2 proposes to reconstruct the side wall on its historic plane and to extend it towards the rear to align with the front block and rear addition. This approach would only maintain four windows in their historic plane.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Vesna Hess and contractors Ruval and Tuval Shlomo represented the application.

Mr. Tuval Shlomo explained that the proposal is driven by the desire to create more usable interior space. He asserted that, although demolishing the wall was not their preferred option,

the structural integrity of the wall may lead to a demolition. Mr. Amburn noted that the previous application, which was approved, proposed retaining the rear ell wall as well as most of the original window openings. Ms. Hess noted that the previous approval was unlike her original plans for the house. She acknowledged that the previous design was driven by her architect and not by her personal taste. She stated that she did not want such an elaborate exterior elevation; instead, she is most interested in creating more usable interior space.

Mr. Evans suggested that the building is already quite large. He did not deem the proposed alterations as necessary. Mr. Amburn opposed the loss of fabric and asserted that the proposed alterations would be highly visible. He also noted that the drawings are very schematic and lack details. Mr. Danta reminded the committee members that the application was in concept and, as such, the drawings were of an acceptable level of detail. Mr. Tuval Shlomo noted that they would work with an architect on the details as they move forward with the project.

Ms. Hess asserted that the staff had not opposed the removal of the wall during meetings with her. She stated that, in her opinion, the important element was the footprint, not the actual bricks. Mr. Danta stated that both were equally important.

Mr. Evans suggested that there may also be zoning issues regarding open space. He also advised the applicant that the previous approval was for an entire design. They could not merely implement parts of that design piecemeal, but would need to submit a new application for the individual piece. A piece might be appropriate as part of a larger ensemble, but inappropriate alone.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance opined that the proposed changes are inappropriate and out of character. The demolition of the wall should not be viewed as an alteration, but instead as a demolition. The Commission can only approve demolitions in cases of hardship or public necessity. If the applicant is claiming financial hardship, she should demonstrate it. Ms. Hess objected to Mr. Gallery's comment.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

6008 WAYNE AVENUE

Owner: Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Christine Ritter

History: c. 1873, Furness & Hewitt; individually designated 11/30/1965

Project: Legalize the replacement of stained-glass windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the removal of four stained-glass windows from a vacant church building in Germantown. The Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania is exploring reuses for the building. The four windows are very important works of art. Violet Oakley designed one pair, titled *Wise and Foolish Virgins*. Tiffany Studios designed the other pair, titled *Saint Cornelius and the Angel*. A professional stained glass studio removed the windows and is currently storing them at its facility. Clear glass was inserted in place of the stained glass windows within the wood frames left in the masonry openings. The windows were removed to be transferred to the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts (PAFA). In a letter included as part of this application, PAFA expresses its commitment to the preservation, safe-keeping, and display of these important works of art. PAFA owns the color cartoons for the Oakley windows.

The proposal does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. It most directly contradicts Preservation Standard 5, which mandates that "Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved." However, the Standards and related Guidelines do not anticipate a situation like this, in which very significant features may be at risk if retained in the building.

The historic preservation ordinance defines "Demolition or demolish" to include "the removal of a building, structure or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface" [§14-2007(2)(f)]. The removal of the windows may qualify as a "demolition" under the ordinance. The Commission should consider the question. If the Commission concludes that the removal does constitute a demolition, it should invoke §14-2207(7)(j) and require the applicant to demonstrate that it is not reasonable or feasible to retain the windows in place, or that it is necessary in the public interest to relocate them to PAFA. The current claims of infeasibility are unsubstantiated by hard evidence.

Beyond the Standards and demolition questions, this application raises complex questions for the Commission regarding safeguarding the windows and ensuring public access to them. There are preservation advantages and disadvantages to both retaining in place and relocating the windows.

Advantages to retaining in place:

- The historic significance of the building and windows is preserved.
- The public maintains its current level of access to the windows.
- The retention of the windows in place complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
- The retention of the windows in place would not set a precedent and encourage other property owners to remove works of art from their buildings.
- If the removal is legalized without conditions, the Commission would relinquish all control over the windows; they could subsequently be removed from public display or transferred to third party, perhaps outside the city.

Advantages to relocating:

- The windows, which are great works of art, may be at risk in a vacant or redeveloped building. The windows would be safeguarded at PAFA.
- The windows would be interpreted by PAFA, offsetting the loss of historic value resulting from the relocation. The Oakley windows would be reunited with the cartoons.
- The public may have better access to the windows at PAFA, albeit in a different context and after paying an admission fee.

Even if removed from the church, the Commission could retain some control over the windows by designating them as objects. The Commission could condition an approval with a requirement that the applicant submit nominations for designations of the windows as objects.

Finally, the Commission must process this application with care, ensuring that it does not infringe upon the church's right to practice its religion. The fact that the applicant is proposing to transfer the windows to a secular institution indicates that the disposition of the windows is not predicated on any religious tenet. Nonetheless, the Commission should proceed with care.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the applicant demonstrates that the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts is contractually obligated to retain the windows in

perpetuity and provided that the applicant submits nominations of the windows for designation as objects within six months of the Commission's action.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. The Reverend Christine Ritter, attorney Christine Kimmel, and real estate agent Frank Barletta attended the meeting.

Reverend Ritter read a prepared statement explaining the removal of the stained glass windows. She stated that the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts proposes to use the windows for both public viewing and for teaching purposes. Reverend Ritter also stated there approximately 30 windows in the church and approximately 12 to 15 in the chapel. She noted that those windows are not part of the current application, but that the diocese will decide in the future what to do with them. David Knapton, a member of the congregation, stated that an inventory had been conducted in about 1993 or 1994 that catalogued all the windows, but he was unsure of the paperwork's location.

Reverend Ritter stated that the church had been de-consecrated, and the diocese was marketing the property either for another congregation or a developer. She asserted that another congregation was their preferred buyer. Mr. Barletta stated that the asking price and low interest of possible buyers are a reflection of the property's condition and expense to maintain.

Mr. Knapton stated that the congregation had received a grant from Partners for Sacred Places to restore some of the windows back in the 1990s. He noted that the Oakley windows had been fully restored then. Ms. Gutterman noted that such grants usually have an easement that prohibits the removal of the piece and she inquired whether this specific grant had anything like it. Reverend Ritter answered that she was unaware of any easements, but that they would have to investigate to find a definite answer to the question. Ms. Pentz asked if the removal of the stained glass windows would affect the price of the property. Mr. Barletta replied that he could not know either way, because it was subject to the buyer's program for the property.

Mr. Danta explained to the Committee the staff's recommendation. He noted that the best way for the Commission to maintain jurisdiction over these important works of art would be through their designation as objects. However, he acknowledged that even such a designation would be imperfect. It might be legally difficult to prevent the museum from transferring the windows outside the city. He asserted that this was the reasoning behind the clause "in perpetuity" in the recommendation. He noted several examples of designated historic objects in the city, such as the Wanamaker Eagle and Tiffany's Dream Garden.

Mr. Evans suggested that a comprehensive study should be undertaken on the existing windows. The removal of the four windows should be reviewed within the larger context of the building and the plans for the church. He felt that there were too many unknowns to fully understand the effects of the proposal.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the windows should stay with the church. He understood the desire to safeguard these objects, but noted that the property had been vacant for several years with no reports of vandalism. However, he noted that the Committee can only work within strict parameters, mainly the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and, in his opinion, the proposal does not meet those Standards. He asserted that only the Commission has the authority to approve such a proposal using its discretionary powers.

Mr. Evans noted that the Secretary of Interior Standards can not interfere with the freedom of religion granted by the constitution. Mr. Barletta stated that some congregations would find these windows inappropriate for their religious services. Therefore, even if the building was used for religious purposes in the future, the windows might not be retained.

Mr. Evans opined that this situation may become more common as congregations throughout the city diminish. He noted that the Committee and Commission must be carefully review this application because it will set a precedent for future reviews.

The Committee encouraged the applicant to provide a comprehensive study that includes all the windows in the church and more details on the future plans for these resources.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

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.

New Additions Guidelines: Recommended: Designing a new addition in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new. Not Recommended: Imitating a historic style or period of architecture in a new addition.

Entrances and Porches Guideline: Recommended: Designing and constructing a new entrance or porch when the historic entrance or porch is completely missing. It may be a restoration based on historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building.

Entrances and Porches Guideline: Recommended: Designing and installing additional entrances or porches on secondary elevations when required for the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the building, i.e. limiting such alteration to such non-character-defining elevations.

Setting Guidelines: Not Recommended: Introducing a new building or landscape feature that is out of character or otherwise inappropriate to the setting's historic character.

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

Building Site Guidelines: Recommended: Designing new onsite parking, loading docks, or ramps when required by the new use so that they are as unobtrusive as possible and assure the preservation of the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.

Site Guidelines: Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving buildings and their features as well as features of the site that are important in defining its overall historic character.

Windows Guideline: Not Recommended: Changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which noticeably change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of glazing; or the appearance of the frame.