

**THE MINUTES OF THE 550TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**13 JUNE 2008
ROOM 18-022, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
David Amburn, AIA
Leslie Benoliel
Della Clark
Eileen Evans, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Rosalie Leonard, Office of Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Department of Commerce
David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property
Robert Thomas, AIA
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

Jon Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II
Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor

ALSO PRESENT

Robert Powers, Powers & Company
Jeffrey A. Cruse, Brandywine Workshop
Allan Edmunds, Brandywine Workshop
Glenn Werner, JKR Partners
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Robert Snow, ALA
Kevin Rasmussen, Rasmussen/SU
Sandy and Mark Cocatrella
Chris Kircher, Metcalfe Architects
Alan Metcalfe, Metcalfe Architects
Paul Stone, Emerald Windows
Beverly Penn, Malvern Hall Condo Association
Jeff Wyant, Wyant Architects
Lisa Ballard-Gamble
George Thomas, Civic Visions
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
Stephen Potts
Kathy Ragg, Korman

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Amburn, Benoliel, Clark, Evans, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, Thomas, and Wilds joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 549TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the minutes of the 549th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 9 May 2008. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 MAY 2008

David Amburn, Chair

136 N. 3RD STREET

Owner: Wesley Wei

Applicant: Christina Davis

History: c.1847; individually designated 12/31/1984, contributing to OCHD, 12/12/2003

Project: Construct storefront

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval provided a metal channel replaces the stucco band with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a storefront with a center display window flanked by single-leaf doors and transoms above. This proposal would replace a non-historic storefront of wood and concrete steps with stainless steel/aluminum channels, wood framed windows and doors, and diamond plate metal thresholds and steps. The historic storefront had a projecting display window over a basement access, flanked by double-leaf doors with transoms.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. Architect Wesley Wei represented the application.

Mr. Wilds inquired about the appearance and date of the original date of the storefront. Ms. Cote replied that the original storefront dated to 1847. She stated that it had a projecting central storefront window flanked by double-leaf doors. She noted a grainy photograph of the original storefront in the application materials. Mr. Wilds asked why the Committee was not requiring a true restoration since the original design is known. Ms. Cote replied that the Committee recommended approval of a new storefront because no historic material survives from the original storefront. Mr. Wilds noted that the Commission requires property owners to install the historically appropriate windows even when the extant windows are non-historic vinyl windows. He suggested that the Commission should be consistent and require a restoration in this case. Mr. Baron noted that the staff recommended a restoration.

Mr. Wei, the owner and architect, explained that no historic fabric has survived from the storefront above grade. The historic storefront piers survive below grade and can be seen in photographs. He claimed that his design for a contemporary storefront paid homage to the historic storefront; it would have the same openings and proportions, but contemporary materials and design. Mr. Wilds asked the applicant if he had considered restoring the storefront. Mr. Wei stated that he is a resident of the neighborhood and aware of and respectful

of its character. Mr. Wilds stated that it would not be appropriate for the Commission to approve this “exceptional” request. Mr. Thomas agreed with Mr. Wilds. He stated that there is nothing to prevent the applicant from fully restoring the storefront; he is completely removing the existing storefront and starting from scratch. He noted that the applicant has a variance for the steps already and could install a single-leaf door that replicates the appearance of the historic double-leaf door. Mr. Wei replied that it would be cost prohibitive to replicate the granite columns.

Mr. Sherman asked if the Commission would accept a substitute material that would replicate the appearance of the historic material. Mr. Wilds stated that he would support a substitute material and noted that the ordinance specifically refers to “appearance.” Mr. Baron observed that a developer recently recreated a granite storefront on Strawberry Street with real granite. He suggested that the Commission not approve an alternative without knowing the cost of replicating the original storefront. Mr. Wei stated that replicating the granite would cost \$40,000. Mr. Wilds noted that the Commission has an advisory committee and process for reviewing application based on financial hardship.

Mr. Schaaf asked if the Commission would require the replication of the projecting display, which he considered anomalous. Mr. Wilds responded that a restoration would include replicating the window, but its projection could be reduced if necessary. Mr. Wei stated that the historic photograph also shows casement windows; he asked if his proposed double-hung windows would be acceptable. Ms. Cote replied the windows in the historic photograph were not casements, but double-hung windows meant to imitate casements. Mr. Thomas remarked that unique architectural features are important and should be retained or reconstructed. He observed that the historic photograph does not provide every detail of the historic storefront, but does provide enough for a faithful restoration. He stated that not every historic detail could or would need to be replicated. Mr. Wei observed that he is proposing an expensive, well-detailed contemporary storefront that relates to the historic storefront, but the Commission is instead requesting a cheap, poorly-detailed copy of the historic storefront. He questioned the sense of the Commission’s position. Mr. Wilds instructed that the Commission should not redesign the applicant’s storefront during the meeting, but should guide the applicant. He suggested denying this storefront and looking forward to a new and better design.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to deny the application. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Commissioners Mattioni and Schaaf dissented.

2200 PINE STREET

Owner: Robin L. Perry

Applicant: Joe Federman

History: 1895; contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District

Project: Legalize cornice alteration

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the alteration of the cornice. At the time of designation, the original cornice on the north façade had been removed; however a small piece of the cornice on the east facade remained intact. In September 2007, a staff member observed the removal of the cornice and the installation of siding over the area on the north façade; this work was undertaken without a permit or the approval of the Commission. A violation was issued. Subsequently, in January 2008, a staff member observed that the siding was removed, but the cornice had been constructed into a box-like configuration and the remnant piece of

cornice on the east façade had been altered. These alterations were also done without a permit or the approval of the Commission.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. No one represented the application.

The Commissioners agreed that the illegal alterations were inappropriate.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

730-732 S. BROAD STREET

Owner: Allan Edmunds

Applicant: Alan Metcalfe, AIA

History: 1868; designated 5/26/1964 and 4/27/1971

Project: Restore front façade and cut entrance and window

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the façade restoration owing to incompleteness, but approval of the installation of an entranceway and window in the north elevation, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to clean, repair, and restore the stone façade of this firehouse, which is now the home of the Brandywine Workshop. This application also proposes to cut a modern entrance in the first story of the north façade. The entrance would consist of a glazed garage door, double doors, and windows surrounded by a metal “shadow box” projection. A large circular window is proposed to be cut into the second story of the north façade. Historically, this elevation was a party wall and not exposed. The neighboring three-story building was demolished between 1977 and 1979.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Architect Alan Metcalfe and Jeffrey A. Cruse and Allan Edmunds of Brandywine Workshop represented the application.

Ms. Sell reported that the applicant has provided additional details for his proposal since the Architectural Committee meeting. Mr. Metcalf explained that most of the work will take place in the vacant lot adjacent to historic firehouse. Historically, rowhouses stood on the lot, but they were demolished years ago. He displayed renderings and explained that this project will be undertaken in phases as financial resources become available. The north façade of the historic building, which is a party wall, will be developed with an entrance to give the building a presence on S. Broad Street. The lot will be developed as a park and green space. The new entrance in the party wall will be a shadow-box opening wrapped in metal. He described the proposed circular window opening on the second floor, which would provide a view of City Hall. He noted the sculptural stair tower, which will be sheathed in glass. The stair tower is not part of the current project and is not proposed as part of this application; it is part of a later phase of work. Ms. Merriman asked if the entrance currently proposed is temporary. Mr. Metcalfe stated that it is not; it will be retained after the stair tower is constructed. Mr. Thomas clarified that the stair tower is not proposed as part of this application and its review would require a subsequent application to the Commission. He also noted that the staff should work with the applicant on the restoration details for the front façade of the historic building.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the application as presented at the Historical Commission meeting on 13 June 2008, with the staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

611 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: German Society

Applicant: Glenn Werner, AIA

History: 1888; William Gette, architect; individually designated 10/11/2000

Project: Construct elevator tower

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story elevator tower on the west façade of the German Society of Pennsylvania for ADA accessibility. The west façade is a brick elevation with stone quoins, but without fenestration.

The first story of the addition would be set back two feet from the façade and house an entrance vestibule. The second story, encasing the elevator, would be set back about ten feet from the façade. The tower would be constructed with a brick veneer, modest cornices on both levels, and vertical wood windows with brick sills. The staff suggests that the entry vestibule be set back from the front façade of the historic building to reveal the quoins.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Architect Glenn Werner represented the application.

Mr. Schaaf questioned the cornice on the elevator tower, which he deemed “historicist.” Mr. Werner replied that the cornice was intended to give the elevator shaft an appropriate scale; without the cornice, the shaft looks like a chimney. He stated that the design was intended to complement but not copy the historic building.

Mr. Schaaf asked if the sills could be fabricated from cast stone instead of brick. He stated that brick row lock gives a residential appearance and is not consistent with the elegant building. Mr. Werner replied that the budget does not allow for cast stone sills. Mr. Sherman asked if the west façade of the elevator tower would be brick. Mr. Werner stated that it would.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1701-1709 ARCH STREET

Owner / Applicant: 1701 Partners, LP

History: c. 1915, Ballinger & Perrot, architect/engineers

Project: Repair terracotta, alter storefronts, replace revolving door, cut windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application with the following revisions: the lower roof mechanical screen and railing are painted a neutral color; and the terracotta sill lips are repaired up to the 6th-floor break. The Committee voted to recommend denial of upper roof penthouses, owing to incompleteness, and the storefront details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a combination of restoration and alterations to the Robert Morris Building. The applicant proposes repairs to the terracotta cladding of this Gothic Revival building. The material has experienced typical weathering and deterioration, such as cracking, fire-skin failure, and deterioration of previous repairs. The applicant proposes to use Conproco terracotta restoration products. The applicant proposes to eliminate all failed terracotta lips at horizontal elements from the fifth floor upwards, and repair them with a flush patch. These elements are mostly found on window sills, cornices and other horizontal bands of the façade. The applicant proposes to restore the lips on the lower four floors. The applicant also proposes to remove obsolete ventilation louvers and replace them with solid caps of the same color as the adjacent terracotta.

The application also proposes some façade alterations at ground level; these include the replacement of all storefronts with new aluminum display storefronts to match the original configurations. The ornate stained-glass transoms would remain undisturbed. Two individual storefronts along Arch Street would be altered to eliminate their entry doors. The main entrance to the building along 17th Street has a non-historic revolving door. The applicant proposes to replace the revolving door with a double-leaf aluminum door in a custom color. In that same elevation, a new gate is proposed for a side alley.

Along the west party wall, the applicant proposes to cut new windows. On that same elevation, the applicant proposes to install a roof deck with metal railing. The roof deck would be accessed by modifying existing windows. The plans also show the installation of mechanical equipment on the roof of the annex. The equipment would be shielded by a metal mechanical screen of an unspecified design. The open Philadelphia fire stair would be enclosed with single-light windows. Lastly, an elevator is proposed for an existing light well.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Robert Snow, preservation consultant Bob Powers, and developer Leo Addomando represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked the applicants if they accepted the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Snow stated that the plans for the alterations at the roof are incomplete and he would therefore not contest the recommendation of denial. Mr. Powers stated that his team accepted the recommendation on the terracotta restoration. Mr. Snow stated that they would only contest the storefront recommendation. He reported that the storefront that Mr. Baron was suggesting that they use as a model is not original, but dates to the 1920s or 1930s. He asserted that these non-original storefronts cannot be replicated in an environmentally sensitive manner. He noted that they are seeking LEED certification for the building. He explained that the storefront frames he is proposing are wider and flatter than the 1930s frames Mr. Baron is advocating. He explained that his proposed storefront framing would allow for a thermal break and insulated glass. If they replicated the other frame, they would need to add air conditioning and heating to

the storefront window areas. Mr. Baron disagreed and claimed that the 1930s system could be replicated with insulated glass. He claimed that the 1930s system has “delicacy”; the proposed system is “chunky.” Mr. Snow again noted that the system Mr. Baron prefers is not historic, but is a replacement system that is only found in one of the many storefronts. It is not the original storefront system. He claimed that his preferred storefront better replicates the original wood storefront. Mr. Addimondo, the developer, stated that, at the request of Mr. Baron, his architect has developed a system to replicate the 1930s look, but he does not like it. It is a curtain wall system. Mr. Addimondo reminded the Commission that there is evidence of the 1930s system in only one of the many storefront bays. He asked the Commission to consider their original proposal for the storefront. Mr. Snow stated that the historic photographs show heavy wood storefronts, not light metal storefronts. Mr. Addimondo reported that the Preservation Alliance holds a façade easement on the building.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he believes that the original storefronts were heavy wood, not light metal. He asserted that the storefront system advocated by Mr. Baron is not original, but a later feature. He remarked that he has not had an opportunity to review the revised drawings for the storefront that were presented at today’s meeting. He concluded that he cannot offer an opinion and asked the Commission to table the storefront portion of the application. Ms. Merriman and Mr. Wilds stated that the easement owner has an interest in the alterations to the façade, but has not had an opportunity to review the proposal. They suggested deferring a final decision until the easement owner has consented to the application. Mr. Addimondo objected, stating that the two storefront plans preferred by the developer were presented to the Architectural Committee. He stated that the third option was presented today only to demonstrate why the scheme suggested by the Architectural Committee was infeasible. He stated that he is not asking the Commission to approve the third scheme; it was included for comparison purposes only. He should not be penalized for providing additional information. He claimed that Mr. Gallery has already had an opportunity to review the two options he is proposing. Mr. Mattioni asked Mr. Gallery if he had agreed to either of the two original options. Mr. Gallery replied that he was unable to answer; he observed that he may have commented informally, but not formally. Mr. Mattioni asked Mr. Gallery to answer his question about any prior approval by the Alliance. Mr. Gallery responded that the Alliance supports all but the storefronts. Mr. Addimondo stated that he would submit a revised storefront design.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the upper roof penthouses, owing to incompleteness, and the storefront details; and to approve the remainder of the application with the following revisions: the lower roof mechanical screen and railing are painted a neutral color; and the terracotta sill lips are repaired up to the 6th-floor break. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1924 BRANDYWINE STREET

Owner/Applicant: Sandra & Mark Colatrella

History: c. 1870; contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, 10/13/2000

Project: Roof-top addition, rear façade alterations

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of addition at the top of the mansard in concept; denial of the bay and the garage opening along Monterey Street, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes additions to the rear façade and rooftop of this carriage house. The house extends from Brandywine through to Monterey Street. The Monterey Street

elevation has suffered some alterations to masonry openings, but retains its original materials, massing, and scale. The applicant proposes to construct a bay window on this façade that would extend through the cornice level into the mansard. On the ground floor, the applicant proposes to create a garage door. The applicant proposes to eliminate the existing roof deck, and construct a one-story addition in its place. The addition would open onto a roof deck on the rear portion of the roof that would extend over the proposed bay window. The addition would be visible; however, no sight line studies were submitted to assess the visibility.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Kevin Rasmussen and property owners Sandra and Mark Colatrella represented the application.

Mr. Danta explained that the staff had learned since the Architectural Committee meeting that the Monterey Street façade is not the front façade of a separate building as initially thought, but the rear façade of the Brandywine Street building.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that his clients plan to convert this building to a single-family dwelling with the living spaces concentrated on the second floor. They plan to move the garage, which is now on Brandywine, to Monterey. Mr. Wilds asked about the Brandywine Street garage door. Mr. Rasmussen replied that he would retain the garage opening, but would introduce some glazing into the door.

Mr. Baron expressed concern about the visibility of the addition. Mr. Rasmussen stated that a sight-line diagram shows that it would not be visible from Brandywine. Messrs. Sherman and Thomas agreed that the addition would not be visible from Brandywine. Regarding the rear, Mr. Sherman stated that Monterey is an alley, not a street. Mr. Thomas agreed that it Monterey cannot be considered a street. It is a service alley with backs of buildings facing it.

Mr. Wilds observed that the introduction of the bay and garage door on Monterey Street would result in the loss of historic fabric. Mr. Rasmussen stated that the bay is necessary to achieve the program inside. He stated that his clients need additional space and headroom. He noted that the Monterey façade has been significantly altered. Mr. Colatrella agreed.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the application, with the staff to review the details of the Brandywine Street door. Ms. Clark seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

135 S. 18th STREET

Applicant: Stephan Potts, architect

Owner: 135 S. 18th Street L.P.

History: 1913, architects, McIlvaine & Roberts, contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District
Project: Remove historic windows from doorway, new doors, signage

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, 9, and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes several alterations including the replacement of doors and windows, and the installation of signage. In September 2006, the applicants requested approval to remove the doors, historic transom, and windows above the door and their replacement with a two-story glass doorway wall. The Commission denied that application and asked the applicant to retain their transom and windows. The staff approved a set of wood and glass doors, which were installed recently. The applicants now propose alterations to the entranceway

that are very similar to those denied by the Commission. They now propose to remove the wood and glass doors and the historic windows. They seek to replace them with all glass units. Without seeking a permit, they covered the framed classical transom, which was revealed in their work, with a sign. They propose to legalize that work. They propose to install banners in the rusticated building base flanking the doors and a large fabric sign on the east façade of the building to be visible from Walnut Street. The building already has plaque signs approved and installed at the corners of the structure.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Stephen Potts, preservation consultant George Thomas, attorney Carl Primavera, and developer Kathy Ragg represented the application.

Mr. Primavera described the proposal and stated that the architect had incorporated the Commission's earlier suggestions. Mr. Potts described the restoration as long and expensive. The windows, plumbing, and mechanical equipment were replaced. He endeavored to create a comprehensive solution for the entranceway. He claimed that the spandrel panel in the entranceway is not original. He stated that the mezzanine windows in the entranceway may not be original. He reported that the Architectural Committee suggested the modification of the entranceway. Mr. Primavera stated that the mezzanine windows are not original and his client wants to remove the spandrel panel. George Thomas stated that the owner has made a good-faith effort to return the building to its original condition. He stated that the building is very important because it houses transients, who come to the city for one or two months. He reported that it had been a premier building, but it declined from the 1930s to the 1960s. He pointed out the many bad alterations at the storefronts. He contended that the main entranceway had been altered. He claimed that mounting holes showed that the entranceway details had been much larger in scale originally. He claimed that the decorative metal on the building's storefronts is bronze, but the entranceway metal is not. Several people pointed out that the bronze storefronts are not original. Mr. Thomas claimed that the spandrel panel was added latter to allow for an additional apartment. He claimed that the mezzanine windows have fewer layers of paint than the rest of the windows. He asserted that the original entranceway would have filled the tall opening.

Ms. Ragg stated that, although maintaining the historic appearance of the building is important, the entranceway is critical to the design concept for the building. She advocated for their non-historic design. Mr. Amburn suggested that a new paint color for the entranceway might give the applicants the appearance that they desire. Mr. Wilds opined that an extended-stay hotel does not need to attract foot traffic. Mr. Primavera responded, noting that the establishment needs signage. Mr. Schaaf stated that the projecting banners would require a variance and the banner on the east would need the approval of the Art Commission.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the applicants have provided no definitive evidence that the mezzanine windows and spandrel are not original. Mr. Gallery observed that the Architectural Committee recommended the retention of the historic fabric. He also suggested changing the color of the mezzanine windows to achieve a more harmonious appearance. Mr. Gallery then pointed out that the lobby is not a double-height space and does not merit the proposed fenestration in the entranceway. He reminded the Commission of its discussion of 1701 Arch. In that case, there is no historic fabric remaining, yet the Commission denied a non-historic storefront window system. In this case, the original features survive and should not be removed. He advised the Commission to deny the proposal.

Mr. Potts objected to Mr. Gallery's categorization of the lobby design. He stated that the mezzanine windows can no longer be opened now that the lobby configuration has been changed. He claimed that double-hung windows in a double-height space are an anomaly. Mr. Baron countered the claims of Mr. Potts. He explained that the Commission had already reviewed and denied a request from this developer to remove the double-hung mezzanine windows. Mr. Baron stated that the developer knew he could not remove the windows when he designed the new double-height lobby. Mr. Baron added that the panels on the mezzanine window system match those on the 3rd-floor windows; they are original. Mr. Baron stated that the proposed entranceway design is incongruous with the historic building. He added that the Architectural Committee and Commission have been consistent; they have denied the removal of the windows at every opportunity. Ms. Schlotterbeck concurred with Messrs. Baron and Gallery.

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, 9, and 10. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

6655 McCALLUM STREET

Owner: Malvern Hall Condominium Association

Applicant: Paul Stone, Emerald Windows

History: 1925, architect, Ballinger & Company; individually designated

Project: Replace wood true-divided-light windows with simulated-divided-light windows

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the replacement of windows within this large condominium building on a piecemeal basis. The existing frames belong to the condominium association and would be retained. Unit owners are responsible for their sash. The building board president has applied on behalf of the unit owners for approval of simulated-divided-light sash, which would be replaced on an as needed basis. The building is facing substantial expenses associated with the deteriorating front walkway and steps and other site work. They would like the cost savings they believe they will accrue from the simulated-divided-light windows. In the past, the Commission has held piecemeal replacement to a very high standard because the new windows will be seen next to the old. The proposed windows are reasonably close in many dimensions; however, the muntin depth differs. The building does sit very far back from the street on a plinth, which will minimize the windows' visibility. It should also be noted that many of the windows are covered by storm windows.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Window salesman Paul Stone and condominium association representative Beverly Penn represented the application.

Mr. Reuter disclosed that he works with Ms. Penn.

The Commission members agreed that the proposed windows were appropriate in this context.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

5279-5281 AND 5283 GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Owner/Applicant: Paul Jablonski

History: 5281 and 5283 are houses c. 1810; 5279 is a shop c. 1850

Project: Legalize window alterations owing to financial hardship application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and to refer the application to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Financial Hardship voted to recommend that the Commission find that the required replacement of the vinyl and storefront windows would constitute a financial hardship.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of the installation of vinyl window sash and capping in the existing window frames in three adjacent historic buildings on Germantown Avenue. It also proposes legalizing the wood muntins added to the storefront window at 5279 Germantown Avenue. The three buildings are consolidated into two properties, 5279-5281 and 5283 Germantown Avenue. The owner resides in and rents apartments and storefront in the buildings.

The owner has provided several documents substantiating his claim of hardship including a letter from his realty management company showing that he has been in arrears for a number of years. He has provided detailed statements for the last three years showing that expenses have exceeded income by several thousand dollars annually. Owing to their location on Germantown Avenue, the buildings have proven difficult to rent.

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

Mr. Baron reported to the Commission that he verified that the applicant would be eligible for storefront rehabilitation grants for his two storefronts. He would be eligible for a \$10,000 grant, but would have to provide the rehabilitation funds before being reimbursed at a 75% rate.

Mr. Sherman, the chair of the Committee on Financial Hardship, informed the Commission that the Committee had found that replacing the vinyl and storefront windows would constitute a hardship. He also commended the applicant for maintaining the property with limited resources. Mr. Wilds agreed that the applicant met the financial hardship requirements, but hesitated to advocate for a complete legalization. He suggested that a new owner should be required to replace the windows. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asked about the ramifications of refusing to legalize the windows. Mr. Reuter responded that the Department of Licenses & Inspections could enforce the violation if it is not cleared. He also noted that, if the Commission failed to act within 60 days, then the application would be approved automatically. Mr. Gallery clarified his question. He stated that, if the Commission did not legalize the windows, then a new buyer would be notified of the violation through the certification process and could factor the replacement of the windows into the purchase price. Messrs. Reuter and Baron stated that the outstanding violation would be automatically enforced unless the Commission requested otherwise.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved that the Commission find that the replacement of the vinyl and storefront windows would constitute a financial hardship and approve the application to legalize the alterations. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

210 W. WASHINGTON SQUARE

Owner: Zukin Realty/210 W. Washington Square Associates

Applicant: Jeff Wyant

History: 1928, Ralph Benker, architect; Significant to SHHD 3/10/1999

Project: Install door in window wall

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a single-leaf door in the center of the window wall of the southern bay. The Commission approved a similar proposal for the northern bay in August 2005. This application proposes to remove the stone sill and salvage the existing metal panel for reuse in the new door.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Jeffrey Wyant represented the application.

Mr. Wyant explained that he represents Starr Restaurants. The company is developing a new concept for the space. He explained that the current layout does not work well for a restaurant. He stated that the primary entrance is now in the courtyard and does not draw customers into the space. He asserted that the restaurant needs easy street access and visibility on the square. Mr. Wilds disagreed and asserted that the restaurant did not fail because of the space. It failed because it was a poor restaurant. Mr. Wyant countered that the restaurant worked well during warm weather, but not in cold weather. He asserted that, to succeed, the space must have an entrance from the street directly into the lounge area. Mr. Sherman asked if the restaurant can be entered through the main lobby. Several Commissioners noted that the restaurant space can be entered from the lobby. Mr. Wyant stated that a door to the street will have a significant impact of the design of a new restaurant. Mr. Wyant asked how the door in the north window had been approved by the Commission. Ms. Leonard asked the same question. Mr. Danta replied that it was approved as an aspect of the much larger condominium conversion project. It was approved because it required a limited alteration of the window and was needed to make the northern lobby space usable as a commercial space. He stated that the staff had recommended approval of the current application because it would restore the symmetry to the ground floor. Mr. Schaaf asked Mr. Wyant if the new door would require a vestibule. Mr. Wyant stated that it would not.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated he is not convinced that the applicant had provided a sufficient justification for the entrance door. He had presented no details about the interior plan for the new restaurant. The Alliance holds an easement on the Saunders Building across the courtyard to the south. He stated that the Alliance allowed for alterations to the Saunders Building to make the courtyard and courtyard entrance usable. Mr. Gallery suggested that alterations to the courtyard entrance should be considered before a new door is allowed in the window. He added that the staff's claim regarding the restoration of symmetry was not compelling.

Mr. Wyant reported that the Starr Restaurants Company is considering different restaurant concepts for the space. He explained that the general arrangement of the restaurant would be maintained. He stated that the courtyard area would be retained as well. He remarked that much of the redesign of the restaurant would be accomplished with new paint and furniture.

Ms. Merriman stated that she could not consider the application without knowing more about the proposed interior plan. She announced that she would vote to deny this application, but would

be willing to reconsider the matter again if additional information about the interior were provided.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion proffered by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Mr. Merriman, the Commission unanimously voted to adjourn to executive session at 12:10 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.