

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

**TUESDAY, 25 JANUARY 2011
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, chair
John Cluver
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz
Rudy D'Alessandro

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

ALSO PRESENT

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Martin Rosenblum
Adam Montalbano, Moto Design Shop
David Watt
Steven Perkiss, Patterson & Perkiss Construction
Michael Loonstyn
John Bushnell
Gary Martin, William Proud Masonry
Rodney Camarce, Mural Arts Program
Amy Johnston, Mural Arts Program
Lisa Murch, Mural Arts Program
Pat Brown, The Bourse
Jim Brown, The Bourse
Brian Chacker
Stephan Potts, Stanev Potts Architects
Frentia Preston
Aaron Preston
Gary Brent, Wells Fargo Bank
Theresa Shephard, Shephard Restoration Engineers, Inc.
Scott White, Holstein White, Inc.

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mes. Gutterman and Pentz and Messrs. Cluver, D'Alessandro and McCoubrey joined her.

2129-31 LOCUST STREET

Owner: 2131 Locust Street Associates

Applicant: Martin Rosenblum

History: 1909 for Alexander Biddle, Charles Barton Keen, architect; 4th floor added, 1930

Designation: 2/8/1995 contributing in the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District

Project: Alter basement window in front façade into a door

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter an original basement window on the front façade of this property facing Locust Street. The applicant claims in his cover letter that the existing entrance to the basement-level apartment must be rehabilitated and that the proposed entrance would serve two purposes: first, to allow continued use of the apartment while the rehabilitation of the existing entrance takes place, and, second, to create a direct entrance to the apartment from the street. The applicant does not specify the rehabilitation work that would be undertaken at the existing entrance. The existing basement window is a six-over-six window. The applicant proposes a door of unspecified design. The material or design has not been specified in the application, except for a description in the cover letter that alludes to some sort of “upper glazing.”

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to incompleteness and Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner and architect Martin Rosenblum represented the application.

Mr. Rosenblum submitted photographs of existing basement-level doors at the rear of the subject property. He noted that these doors, which are wood doors with nine lights and a solid panel below, are original to the building, which was a single-family residence. Mr. Rosenblum stated that he would use this original door design for the new front basement entrance doors. He clarified that the same door design would be installed at both of the front basement-level entrances, the existing entrance as well as the proposed entrance. Ms. Hawkins inquired whether the window adjacent to the proposed basement door would be modified. Mr. Rosenblum answered that that window would remain unaltered; the other window would be altered to accommodate the new entry door. He further stated that the design of the entrance well would mimic the existing well on the other side and that the window would retain its grate, just as it does at the existing basement-level entrance.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant to address the design of the proposed railing around the entrance well. Mr. Rosenblum distributed photographs of similar properties on the same block as well as nearby blocks. He noted that all examples are of buildings of similar style as the subject property, or built around the same time. He also noted that houses of this period had fully-developed cellars with exterior entrances, rather than basements, which are typical of earlier houses. He pointed out the scale and thickness of the metal features at those properties, specifically railings. He proposed to mimic the style and proportions of those wrought-iron elements. Mr. Rosenblum stated that the existing railing in the current basement well is not original, and that it is of thinner proportions than its neighbors. He proposed to replace that existing railing with a more period-appropriate substitute. He noted that he prefers that both railings at the existing and proposed basement entrances match for the sake of symmetry on the façade.

Ms. Hawkins inquired if the existing basement windows would be replaced. Mr. Rosenblum stated that they would be refurbished and reinstalled, not replaced.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the existing stair is very steep and may not be code-compliant. He contended that the Department of Licenses & Inspections may not allow a new stair with that steepness.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the height of the proposed railing and whether it was depicted accurately at 42 inches in height in the architectural drawing. Mr. Rosenblum answered that the current railing is not 42 inches in height. He stated that the final details had not been drawn yet. Ms. Hawkins expressed hesitation about the proposed railing as shown on the drawing. She stated that the code requires railings that are 42 inches in height; if the drawing does not depict such a railing, then its effect on the façade cannot be fully determined from the drawing. Mr. Rosenblum agreed and clarified that he was seeking feedback from the Commission regarding the possibility of creating a new basement-level entrance before he designed the final details of the railing. Mr. Hawkins stated that the railing and stair should be compatible with the building, but also must meet the building code.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the new basement well would have proper drainage. Mr. Rosenblum answered that the existing well drained properly and that he would design the new well in the same manner. He stated that he did not anticipate any drainage problems. Mr. Rosenblum also noted that the railings would be mounted on a small wall to prevent too much water from running into the well.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the basement door would have exterior security bars. Mr. Rosenblum answered that he personally disliked security bars; if bars were necessary, they would be installed in the interior.

Mr. Cluver stated that the concept of the new basement entrance is compatible with the building and the district. Mr. Cluver stated that the railing design should not be an exact replication of an historic railing, but compatible in rhythm and scale to the building and based on similar examples found in the area. Mr. Cluver also stated that any changes to the railing height or any extensions to the landing to satisfy the building code would require additional reviews. He stated that he would be comfortable deferring to the staff's judgment for those minor revision reviews.

Mr. Danta requested a description of the proposed door for clarification. Mr. Rosenblum stated that the door would be a wood door with a nine-light glazed upper section and a solid panel below.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposed basement entrance, provided the wood, nine-light doors and appropriate railings are installed at both basement entrances and the refurbished window grates are reinstalled, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standard 9.

230-32 S. HUTCHINSON STREET

Owner: David Watt

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, architect

History: c. 1830; carriage house, c. 1885

Designation: individually designated, 1/1/1961

Project: Legalize inappropriate windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize inappropriate windows installed in three main facades of this property. This property includes a total of three buildings, two 1830s row houses and a late nineteenth-century carriage house. All three properties have been consolidated into a single residence and tax parcel. The properties are located on a corner lot making them highly visible from the public right-of-way. The property was purchased in December 2009 by the present owner, who undertook a complete rehabilitation of the property, both interior and exterior. The Historical Commission reviewed and approved the rehabilitation project in June 2010. The staff subsequently placed the approval stamp on the building permitting set of drawings reflecting the Commission's approval. Those drawings included the correct windows in all elevations. The staff also reviewed and approved shop drawings showing the correct windows. However, six-over-six windows instead of the approved and correct windows three-over-six windows were installed in the third-floor openings. The architect for the project has conceded that the wrong windows were ordered and installed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to the June 2010 Historical Commission approval and Standards 2, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner David Watt and architect Adam Montalbano represented the application.

Mr. Watt stated that he was unaware that a neighbor had alerted the Commission to non-compliant window condition. He stated that he had surveyed the houses in his neighborhood and had not discovered any three-over-six windows. He presented a fire-insurance survey for his property from 1858, which was updated in 1911. The survey described the windows at the third-floor as twelve-light windows, which are six-over-six windows. Mr. Montalbano noted that the survey described a property on Raspberry Street, which is the former name of Hutchinson Street. Mr. Danta stated that he had checked the historic maps and confirmed that Raspberry is indeed the former name of Hutchinson Street. Mr. Montalbano noted that the survey predates the historic photograph in the Commission's file, which was taken in the mid twentieth century. He stated that the assumption, based on the survey, is that the windows were replaced sometime between 1911 and the time the photograph in the Historical Commission file was taken. He asserted that the six-over-six windows that were installed would be more appropriate than the three-over-six windows that were approved. Mr. Danta disagreed with his assertion.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that, regardless of the correct pane configuration, the window design should not have been revised without the explicit approval of the Historical Commission. Mr. Watt explained that the initial window replacement work was done by a contractor who is no longer involved in the project. A miscommunication occurred during the change from one contractor to another that led to the ordering and installation of six-over-six instead of three-over-six windows. Mr. Watt stated that, after the windows arrived on site, the contractor decided to install them to seal the building even though they were not correct, to allow construction to continue in the interior. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the wrong windows were installed owing to an emergency. Mr. Watt stated that he would not categorize the installation as an emergency, but

noted that the installation allowed the interior work to continue on schedule. Mr. Watt stated that he had received two unsolicited comments from neighbors regarding the rehabilitation of the property, who specifically stated that the windows looked good.

Mr. Danta clarified that the current property is comprised of a garage as well as the two 1830s rowhouses in question: a corner property with four floors and a smaller house to the south with three floors. Mr. Danta stated that he had met with the architect, Adam Montalbano, during the planning phase of the rehabilitation project and they had determined that the three-over-six window configuration at the third floor was appropriate based on a historic photograph that showed the three-over-six windows in place at the third floor. He explained that such a configuration was in keeping with the architectural style and age of the house. Mr. Danta noted that the Historical Commission files contain a survey dated 1888 for 234 Hutchinson, which is identical to the three-story house that forms part of the subject property. He pointed out that the survey describes the third-floor windows as three-over-six windows. Mr. Watt restated that the survey for the 230 section of his property is dated 1858. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the dimensions of the masonry openings at the third floor are smaller than the openings at the rest of the floors. However, the survey from 1858 described the dimensions of the glass panes in the 12-pane or six-over-six window as 8 inches by 10 inches, the same as the panes on other floors. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the pane dimensions could not be the same at the third floor as at the other floors if the third floor windows were six-over-sixes. The 1858 survey is internally inconsistent and must be in error. Mr. D'Alessandro explained that, in order for the panes of glass to be the same dimensions at all floors, the third-floor windows must have had a three-over-six configuration, as the historic photograph shows. He concluded that the historic photograph provides the most compelling evidence.

Mr. Watt asserted that the third-floor windows had been replaced prior to his purchase of the property. He noted that the construction of the third-floor windows was different from the other windows in the house. Ms. Hawkins reiterated Mr. D'Alessandro's conclusions. She stated that the panes in the third-floor windows could not be the same size as the panes at the other floors if the windows had had the six-over-six configuration. The 1858 insurance survey must be in error. Mr. Watt stated that he had failed to communicate earlier that the third-floor window openings had been reduced in size at some point in the past. He claimed that that may explain why a three-over-six window was in place at the time the photograph was taken. Mr. Danta asked Mr. Watt if he believed that the current, third-floor window openings are smaller than the original third-floor window openings. Mr. Watt answered that he believed that the openings that had the three-over-six windows as seen in the historic photograph were smaller than both the original and the current openings. Mr. Danta noted that the third-floor windows that were in place at the time Mr. Watt purchased the property were six-over-six windows, not three-over-six windows. Mr. Watt disagreed. Mr. Danta presented a photograph that had been submitted during the review of a deck application for the property in June 2010. The photograph showed that the windows in place at that time were six-over-six windows. Ms. Hawkins stated that she was having trouble understanding how the window opening had been altered, if the sill height matched the sill height of the identical neighboring property. Mr. Danta pointed out that the proportions of the panes of glass in the six-over-six windows in the June 2010 photograph were different than the proportions of the panes in the rest of the windows in the façade. Ms. Hawkins and Ms. Gutterman concluded that the masonry openings had not been altered.

Mr. Watt acknowledged that the third-floor window openings are smaller than the openings at the other floors. Mr. Danta explained that the reason for the three-over-six configuration is to maintain the same window pane proportions throughout the façade, even in the smaller

openings. He stated that the consistency was lost when the six-over-six windows were wrongly installed at the third floor. Mr. McCoubrey agreed and noted that, if six-over-six windows with pane sizes as described in the survey were manufactured, they would be too large for the openings. Mr. Watt reiterated that he took photographs of houses in the neighborhood and leafed through two books of historic photographs of Philadelphia and was unable to find any three-over-six window configurations. He asserted that the six-over-six windows in the third floor would have panes of smaller proportions owing to the size of the openings. Ms. Hawkins stated that books of historic photographs tend to showcase larger and more prominent buildings rather than buildings on smaller streets such as Hutchinson Street. Mr. Watt answered that the two books do include buildings on smaller streets. Mr. Gutterman agreed with the staff's recommendation. The rest of the Committee voiced their unanimous support of the staff's recommendation. They noted that the applicant had the Commission's approval for the correct three-over-six windows, but not the incorrect six-over-six windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to the June 2010 Historical Commission approval and Standards 2, 6, and 9.

655-59 N. 16TH STREET

Owner: Calvary Baptist Church

Applicant: Michael Loonstyn

History: c.1855 as Hedding Methodist Episcopal Church; c.1900, Union AME Church; alterations, 1902, Watson & Huckel; alterations, 1906, C. Davis; c. 1962 Calvary Baptist Church

Designation: Individually Designated May 4, 1972, Significant to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Proposal: Convert church to residential use

OVERVIEW: This application proposes converting a church building to residential use. Casement windows would be installed in place of the extant non-historic windows. Outdoor space would be provided for most units. On the south side of the roof, some of the roof structure would be cut away and two decks created. The decks would not be visible from any right of way. Decks and fenced patio areas would be created along the front and north or side facades. Two doors would be cut into the stuccoed north facade to provide access to patios. At the upper floors of the north façade, shallow balconies would be installed. Also at the north façade, a non-historic chimney would be demolished and the stucco would be painted.

Most, but not all of these changes satisfy the Standards. The installation of the casement windows in all facades and balconies in the north façade do not meet the Standards. The window openings on the north wall should not be enlarged beyond their historic sizes to install balconies. Also, the cornice along the pitched sections of the front gable should be reconstructed to complete the gable and to protect the exposed brick façade, which shows evidence of water infiltration.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the windows and balconies, but approval of all other aspects of the application, provided the gable cornice is reconstructed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Developer Michael Loonstyn and architect John Bushnell represented the application.

Mr. Baron displayed a historic photograph of the church showing the historic stained glass windows and complete pedimental cornice at the gable end of the roof line. Ms. Hawkins noted that the interior of the space contains a first-floor meeting space and an upper-floor sanctuary with balcony. Mr. Baron asked if the stained glass windows survive inside the modern aluminum storm windows. Mr. Loonstyn stated that he did not believe that the stained glass windows survived. He also stated that he would not remove any stained glass windows discovered during the rehabilitation without the Commission's approval.

The Committee and applicants discussed the proposed casement windows and balconies. The Committee objected to both elements as being foreign to the architecture of the building and creating a distinctly residential character at this religious building. The Committee also objected to changing the size of existing window openings. Mr. Loonstyn explained that they are not widening any openings, but they intend to restucco the façade. He stated that he was proposing to add balconies. He contended that these elements would beautify the façade. He wanted to provide a sense of outdoor space to the units that would lack access to a deck or patio. He suggested that residents could place flower pots on the small balconies. The Committee members commented that many apartments in Philadelphia have no outdoor space. They also noted that some units with balconies also have access to outdoor space. Mr. Loonstyn advocated for the casements on the less visible south façade, explaining that they would allow more light and air into the units. The Committee members countered that more appropriate windows would also allow light and air into the units. Mr. Bushnell said that they could install windows with operable awning sections, like those in the historic photograph. The Committee members agreed that that was acceptable. They opined that double-hung windows would be appropriate for the first floor. They also noted that non-historic spandrel panels should not be added between the windows; any panels should match those shown in the historic photograph.

Ms. Pentz asked about the apparent water damage to the brick at the pediment. Mr. Loonstyn explained that they would be restoring the façade with pointing and paint removal. They would also replace the flashing at the roof. Mr. Loonstyn stated that he could not commit to restoring the cornice at the pediment, but he agreed to investigate the cost of restoring it. He explained that the property itself is relatively expensive and he must therefore watch his rehabilitation costs closely.

Mr. Baron asked about the proposed locations of the HVAC units. Mr. Bushnell explained that they would place any HVAC units on a rear roof and on the south slope of the main roof where they would not be seen. Mr. Loonstyn said that he hopes to limit the size of any structural elements like dunnage on the roof. The Committee members suggested that the architect revise plans to include all proposed rooftop elements. The Committee members did not object to the demolition of a chimney at the north or a small addition at the rear.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization supports the staff recommendation, in particular the compromise of allowing the historic roof to be cut for decks in exchange for the restoration of the front cornice at the gable. He said that the Alliance is very concerned about the viability of preserving church buildings and considers the casement windows and balconies acceptable if they make the reuse of this building possible. He stated that a prominent example of the conversion of a church building to a new use like this would send a positive message regarding the preservation of church buildings.

Ms. Pentz questioned whether the Commission could require the reconstruction of the gable cornice if the applicants had not proposed to undertake any work to that area of the building. It was noted that the Commission is authorized by the historic preservation ordinance to condition an approval in any way that advances preservation. It was also noted that the scope of work for this complete rehabilitation project includes all aspects of the building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the windows and balconies, but approval of all other aspects of the application, provided the gable cornice is reconstructed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

1700 MT. VERNON STREET

Owner: Spring Garden CDC

Applicant: Michael Loonstyn

History: c. 1859

Designation: Contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Proposal: Rehabilitate rowhouse

OVERVIEW: This application proposes rehabilitating a corner rowhouse, which is currently a shell. Two-over-two windows would be installed, the bays would be restored with wood panels, and the storefronts would be reopened and restored. The cast-iron column at the corner would be re-exposed, the cinderblock infill would be removed, and the tin-shingle storefront pent roofs would be restored. A cinderblock wall in the rear yard would be removed and a fenced parking place installed. Decks would be constructed on the rear bay and on the roof of the rear ell. The roof deck and stair house would be significantly set back from the streets, making them inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Michael Loonstyn and architect John Bushnell represented the project.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the proposed storefront restoration was based on historic information. Mr. Loonstyn said that it was based on a nearby storefront. Mr. Baron explained that pieces of the side storefront survive and will be used to detail the front storefront. He explained that, when a storefront is being converted for residential use, often there is an attempt to make the windows look more residential. He said that, in this case, every effort was being made to restore the look of the historic storefronts. He assured the Committee that the staff would work with the applicant to define the correct details. Ms. Hawkins asked if the staff thought that the roof deck was inconspicuous. Mr. Baron said that it will have minimal visibility because it is set back significantly from the front and side facades. He also noted that it would be located on the rear ell, as is preferred. The Committee asked Mr. Bushnell, the architect, to correct the area of the drawing above the side bay to show the exposed brick. The Committee concluded that the project was appropriate, but asked the staff to work carefully with the applicants on the restoration details.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization supports the project.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architecture Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

1731 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: 1731 Spring Garden Association

Applicant: William Proud, mason

History: c. 1886

Designation: Contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Proposal: Paint brownstone façade

OVERVIEW: This brownstone faced mansion is currently painted grey. A mason will be repairing the façade. The owner wishes to paint the façade a light grey and the brownstone window surrounds a darker grey. The Commission has usually required applicants to either remove paint from painted masonry façades or, if the paint cannot be feasibly removed, paint those facades the color of the underlying masonry materials. In this case, the facade should be painted its natural underlying brown, not grey, colors.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Mason Gary Martin and owner's representative Brian Chacker represented the project.

Mr. Martin explained that the original brownstone is covered with a stucco plaster which has spalled off in several areas, revealing the brownstone underneath. He will be repairing these areas. The owner explained that he chose a grey color for the façade because the block features a variety of building types and colors. Since the building next door is painted a brownstone color, he said that painting his building brown would create an unattractive monolithic "UPS truck" appearance. The Committee members explained that because the building is stuccoed, they would not ask for the removal of paint. However, the building should be painted to appear as though it retains its original brownstone. The Committee members suggested that the true brownstone color would have been pinker than the house next door. Therefore, if it is painted its natural color, it will retain its individuality. In addition, they explained that the wood trim could be painted in such a way to give the building the individuality that the owner is seeking. The Committee members noted that, if the beltcourses are found to be a different material than the brownstone, then they could be painted to match the underlying color of that material.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposed color scheme, but approval of the painting the façade in colors that replicate the inherent colors of the original masonry façade materials, with the staff to review details including color samples, pursuant to Standard 6.

1801-27 GREEN STREET

Owner: Brianna Dunn, School District of Philadelphia

Applicant: Lisa Murch, Mural Arts Program

History: 1956-62

Designation: Non-contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize mural

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a mural installed around an entrance on the east elevation of the Laura Wheeler Waring Public School. The mural is composed of paint and mosaic tiles and is attached to the brick façade, which was ground down to create a smooth surface. The building is classified as non-contributing in the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Rodney Camarce, Amy Johnston, and Lisa Murch of the Mural Arts Program represented the application.

Ms. Johnston stated that this project has highlighted the need for better communication at the Mural Arts Program to ensure that the necessary approvals are obtained before a project is commenced. She assured the Committee that the Mural Arts staff is seeking to remedy this issue by improving its project management tool kit. She stated she was pleased with the staff recommendation. She presented the Committee with artworks in support of the mural created by some of the school's students.

Ms. Murch explained that the Mural Arts Program has a longstanding relationship with the school and runs an afterschool program for the students. Parents and students from the school attended the Architectural Committee meeting in support for the mural.

Ms. Pentz asked the applicant why the brick was ground down to create a smooth surface for the mural. Ms. Murch responded that mosaics are best adhered to flat surfaces. She explained that, with permission of the school, they ground down the area to properly install the mosaic tiles.

Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant why they did not seek Historical Commission approval prior to the installation. Ms. Johnston explained that the failure to obtain a building permit and approval of the Historical Commission was a misstep owing to a lack of communication and an organizational gap at Mural Arts. She stated that they are seeking to remedy this gap by changing the project management tool and providing more education and checks and balances to assure that this does not happen in the future. Ms. Murch added that they have included Historical Commission review as a step in the checklist for all Mural Arts projects.

Mr. Farnham explained to the Committee that the staff has the authority to approve all types of work to properties classified as non-contributing in historic districts, but elected not to approve this application to allow for a public discussion of it. He reported that a near neighbor had telephoned the Commission several times to express his opposition to the mural. The staff therefore elected to refer this application to the Architectural Committee and Commission to give the neighbor any opportunity to address the merits of the application. Ms. Gutterman asked for explanation of the neighbor's concerns. Ms. Murch responded that she spoke with the neighbor, who told her he thought the mural marred a pristine historic façade.

Ms. Pentz asked if the protruding bricks that were ground down were arranged in a specific pattern. Ms. Murch responded that they were interspersed throughout the elevation.

The Committee members noted that the school is classified as non-contributing in the historic district and opined that the mural does not have an adverse effect on the district.

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

1201 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: Odd Fellows of America

Applicant: Ryan Lohbauer

History: 1906, Watson & Huckel, architects

Designation: Individually designated, 12/12/2008

Project: Replace storefront windows and doors

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the replacement of storefront windows and doors. The existing windows are non-historic, four-light, metal, fixed windows and wood, four-light casements with transoms. The applicant proposes to replace the existing storefront windows with four single-light, aluminum casements. The existing doors are non-historic. They are a three-part, metal system with transoms and sidelights and a three-part, wood system with transoms and sidelights. The applicant proposes to replace the doors with aluminum doors to fit within existing openings.

The Architectural Committee reviewed a similar application in December 2010. That application proposed four single-light, wood casements with three-light transoms in line with the three-part windows on the upper levels. The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The applicant withdrew the application before the Commission meeting. The applicant has revised the proposal and responded to suggestions offered by the Committee in December.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the window frames and mullions are painted a color compatible with the terracotta façade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Stephan Potts represented the application.

Mr. Potts introduced the proposed design and explained that he is now proposing a painted aluminum system with four equal panels. He stated that this is the best solution for operability and compatibility with the various geometries of the three-panel base below and differently proportioned three-panel windows above. He presented other window configuration options and demonstrated how they do not line up with the base panels and upper story windows. He concluded that these characteristics may have influenced the original architect's decision to install one large pane of glass. After working through several options, he concluded that a four-panel window configuration is more compatible than a three-panel system. He showed the Committee members a few earlier working designs including one labeled SK-3 with a large fixed center panel and smaller flanking casements. He stated that the owner has as strong

preference for the four-paneled configuration. Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant if it were possible to have a four-part division with a transom. Mr. Potts stated that it is possible and his previous application was similar to that configuration. He stated that a full-height window would disappear better into the opening than a window with several divisions.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the storefront bases are original. Mr. Potts stated that he thinks that they are original. Ms. Gutterman asked if the windows would be installed within the existing frames. Mr. Potts explained that he intends to retain the existing frames and would use a monolithic painting approach to tone down the different geometries.

Ms. Gutterman recalled the discussion of a transom and use as a restaurant from the previous Committee meeting. She asked the applicant if there were plans for signage or awnings and asserted that nothing should be mounted directly into the terracotta. Mr. Potts responded that, although there are merits to having a transom, if the owner wants full-height windows, it will be his responsibility to mount any signage and awnings appropriately.

Ms. Hawkins stated that it is her preference for some variant of drawing SK-3 because it gives the building flexibility for a commercial or restaurant use as well as awnings and signage options. Mr. Potts stated that he would like the Committee's support for both the revised design depicted on drawing SK-3 and the original submission, the design depicted on drawing A-401. Ms. Hawkins stated that the design documented on drawing A-401 is not appropriate, that a transom is necessary to break up the window height, and that a tripartite division is more appropriate.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the design depicted on the drawing labeled A-401, but approval of the design depicted on the drawing labeled SK-3 and dated 25 January 2011, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

111 S. INDEPENDENCE MALL EAST

Owner: Bourse Tower Associates, LP

Applicant: Maggie Persofsky

History: 1893-95, Hewitt Brothers, architects

Designation: individually designated, 1/26/1971

significant in the Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Install signage

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a roof-top sign made of galvanized steel and LED lighting that will read "THE BOURSE." The sign would be situated in the center of the building facing 5th Street and Independence Mall. The application drawings show the structure for the sign in elevation and cross-section. No information has been provided regarding the appearance or details of the sign itself.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Robert Gilberg, sign installer Patrick Gaffney, and sign fabricator Jim Malin represented the application.

Mr. Malin distributed color renderings and drawings to Committee members and displayed a cardboard cutout letter, to demonstrate the size and shape of the proposed letters. The sign would consist of an internally-illuminated red box letters against a mesh background. Ms. Hawkins summarized that the application proposes a roof-top sign with letters the size of the one shown, internally illuminated, and mounted on a mesh background like the sample. She asked if the mesh will be framed. Mr. Malin stated that it will not be framed. Ms. Hawkins asked if the proposed color will be red. Mr. Malin confirmed that it will be same color red as the sample and will be painted with acrylic and an aluminum finish. He explained that the previous sign had white-faced letters on a black background with lighting fixtures mounted to the cornice line casting light up to the sign. He added that the proposed sign will be the same size and Times Roman font as the previous sign, but will instead be populated with LEDs.

Ms. Pentz asked how the proposed sign compares in size to the existing brownstone letters over the portico that read "The Philadelphia Bourse." Mr. Malin responded that he did not know. Ms. Pentz asked if the rooftop sign that was removed was present at the time of designation. Ms. Sell responded that it was not present in the designation photograph taken in 1970. Ms. Pentz asked the applicant to explain why this sign is necessary. Mr. Gilberg responded that there was a sign that was installed between 1979 and 1980 in conjunction with similar signs along 4th Street. Ms. Pentz asked if there is information about whether they were installed legally. Ms. Sell responded that she did not have information showing that the sign was installed legally with permits and approvals. Mr. Gaffney stated that the previous sign was destroyed by inclement weather and was subsequently removed. Ms. Sell explained that the removal of the sign required a building permit and the approval of the Historical Commission and asked when the sign was removed. Mr. Gaffney responded that it was removed one year ago after a snow storm. Mr. Gilberg explained that a maintenance person took it down because it posed a life safety hazard.

Mr. Malin explained that the proposed sign will be installed 18 inches from the edge of the roof. He distributed photographs of other internally illuminated signs in the area. Ms. Pentz explained that the building currently has a very large, built-in brownstone sign that is very visible from anywhere in Independence Mall. She stated that she does not find a compelling argument for installing a sign on the roof. Mr. Malin explained that they want to restore the sign that had stood on the roof. Ms. Pentz stated that it remains unclear whether the previous sign was legally installed. Mr. Gilberg explained that he has found the permits for the 4th Street signs, but not the 5th Street signs.

Ms. Hawkins stated that an internally illuminated sign on a historic building that faces Independence Mall is inappropriate. She stated that neon works on PSFS because it fits stylistically. She stated, however, that she cannot think of other appropriate historic examples. She clarified that the examples of internally illuminated signage in the photographs presented by the applicants are of wall-mounted signs on newer buildings, not rooftop signs on historically significant buildings. Ms. Gutterman agreed and stated that this type of signage sets a bad precedent.

Mr. Malin asked the Committee members what they objected to beyond the internal illumination. Ms. Hawkins stated that the internal illumination was one of several issues that relate to color and context. Ms. Gutterman explained that the previous sign included white letters on a black background, which is different from the proposed red letters. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he is opposed to the application because the sign would be inappropriate on this building.

Mr. Gilberg asked the Committee members if there was a signage option that they could support. Ms. Hawkins recommended that the applicants explore options at ground level. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the building is already unique and signage of this scale is not necessary for way-finding. Mr. Malin explained that it is also for branding. Mr. Gilberg added that it is for identification because the address has changed from 5th Street to Independence Mall East and visitors have been confused. Ms. Hawkins added that they are more fortunate than other landlords because there are 100 park rangers in the area who can provide directions.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the building is already identified by a masonry sign. Ms. Pentz agreed and explained that the historic sign is quite visible.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance concurred with the Committee opposition to the sign and stated that, unless the applicants propose to reconstruct a turn-of-the-century rooftop sign, the removed sign as well as the proposed sign are inappropriate in color, type face, illumination, and material.

Ms. Hawkins stated that, if the applicants can prove that the removed sign was installed legally with the necessary approvals and permits, then the Committee can discuss the merits of recreating it. The sign currently proposed is inappropriate.

Maggie Persofsky, the permit expeditor, stated that she researched the Historical Commission files and found some indication of a stamp on an application for signage. She stated that the previous sign identified the building and that a lower sign would not be visible. She opined that the sign would not have to be internally illuminated, but perhaps external illumination could be an option. She stated she researched Zoning, Historical Commission, and Art Commission files and could not find a permit. She concluded that a sign would be a significant addition for visitors.

Ms. Hawkins contended that there are many masonry retail buildings that do not have rooftop signage; for example, the Wannamaker building, which sits at a major intersection, does not have a rooftop sign.

Mr. Malin noted that the removed sign hid some rooftop elements like HVAC equipment.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the application materials did not provide enough information for the Committee to conduct a thorough review. Ms. Gutterman added that, even as submitted, the application is inappropriate.

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

340-50 S. 2ND STREET

Owner: Wells Fargo Bank, NA

Applicant: Gary Brent

History: c. 1868, upper three stories later removed

Designation: contributing to the Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Install new signs

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install new signs on this bank building. The bank building is located at the corner of 2nd and Pine Streets, directly across from the 2nd Street Market Head House. The application proposes to replace all existing Wachovia Bank signs with signs for Wells Fargo Bank, which acquired Wachovia. It also proposes to add new signs.

Two signs would be installed on the front façade of the building; only one would be a replacement of an existing sign. Currently, there is a Wachovia Bank sign over the main entrance; it is metal and non-illuminated. The proposed replacement would have a plastic face and be internally illuminated. A second sign would be located on the parapet over the main entrance of the front façade. This sign would be made out of individual metal letters. It would not be illuminated.

A sign with individual metal letters would be located on the north façade parapet; it would resemble the sign proposed for the front parapet. A second, internally-illuminated sign would be located on the rear façade of the property over a rear entrance from the parking lot. This sign would not be visible from the public-right-of-way.

The application proposes various small signs that pose no adverse effect to the historic character of the property or the district.

Two banners sign would be installed in the interior of the banking room and would be visible through the windows facing Pine Street. The Commission does not have jurisdiction over signs installed in an interior, unless that interior has been designated as historic.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the internally illuminated sign over the main entrance on the front façade; approval of all other signs; pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Gary Brent represented the application.

Mr. Brent stated that the parapet signs with metal letters are subtle. He stated that they have no plans for internal or external illumination of the parapet signs. The sign over the door would be replacing an existing Wachovia panel sign. Ms. Gutterman asked if the current entrance sign is internally illuminated. Mr. Brent replied that it is and that they would merely be replacing a "Wachovia" panel with a "Wells Fargo" panel and using the existing power cabinet.

Ms. Gutterman stated that the square is not that large and the building has always been a bank. She asked why, in light of these facts, the signs were proposed for the parapets. Mr. Brent replied that it was most likely for branding purposes and added that the entrance sign is low to the ground and not extremely visible. Ms. Hawkins observed that this is a pedestrian zone and, with the banners and the ATM, people will know it is a bank.

Ms. Gutterman opined that the lower entrance sign is appropriate, but the parapet signs are not, as they would alter the architectural character of the building. Ms. Hawkins concurred, especially since the entrance sign is already internally illuminated.

Mr. Brent added that the signage package was approved as submitted by the zoning reviewers. Mr. Brent pointed out that the rear parapet sign faces a parking lot and is minimally visible from the street. Ms. Gutterman opined that it did not matter to her that the sign was minimally visible from the street; she was still opposed to it. Ms. Hawkins stated that, given that this is a corner lot, the proposed signage is most likely visible from 2nd Street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the parapet signs, labeled NE01 and NE02 on the drawings, approval of the entrance sign, labeled E01 on the drawings, provided the existing sign is internally illuminated, and approval of all other proposed signs, pursuant to Standard 9.

604-36 S. WASHINGTON SQUARE, HOPKINSON HOUSE

Owner: Hopkinson House Owner's Association

Applicant: Theresa Pearce Shepherd, P.E.

History: 1961, Oscar Stonorov, architect

Designation: Contributing to the Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Proposal: Install HVAC equipment

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the replacement of the building's central hot water heating system with individually controlled electric heating and cooling systems in every condominium unit. The building was constructed with black-colored vent panels under some windows and plain black panels under others. The new electric units, which will be black in color, would be inserted into some, but not all of the panels. They would project out 7 to 8 inches beyond the faces of the panels. The units could be moved farther into the interior, thereby projecting less, but they would potentially disrupt interior spaces.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Consultants Theresa Shephard and Scott White represented the application.

Ms. Shephard stated that currently all of the panels below the windows are solid and have no louvers. She stated that the building was constructed in the 1960s. She stated that the windows were replaced in 2004. She added that all of the panels were replaced with insulated panels as part of that 2004 window replacement project.

Mr. White stated that the current heating and cooling system is located in the penthouse and pipes running through the structure carry the heating and cooling to the units. A recent study of the HVAC system concluded that it would suffer catastrophic leaks in the near future. He stated that the pipes in the walls will not last much longer and will require replacement. Mr. White explained that each riser serves 80 units. To replace a single riser would displace the residents in 80 units for six months. The replacement would raise serious hazardous materials abatement issues as well. Therefore, they are proposing replacing the current centralized system with separate heating and cooling systems in every residential unit.

Ms. Shephard stated that they are proposing through-panel HVAC units. She stated that the individual residential dwellings are very small. If the HVAC units are mounted entirely within the interiors, they will take up considerable interior space in the small dwellings. Ms. Shephard pointed out that the proposed HVAC units would be black in color and mounted in black panels. Therefore, they would have a minimal visual effect on the exterior of the building. She added that no masonry would be disturbed. Ms. Gutterman asked if the units could be made wider so as not to protrude so far off the faces of the panels. Ms. Shephard replied that the units are already 42 inches wide and cannot be made wider.

Ms. Hawkins stated that at the HVAC units at balconies will not be highly visible and should be acceptable from historic preservation standards. However, the HVAC units at the other locations will be highly visible. She stated that she understands that the interiors are small, but asserted that the Commission is charged with protecting the exterior appearance, not the interior space. Ms. Shephard stated that shifting the HVAC units farther into the interior would negatively impact 80% of the 573 condominium units in the building.

Ms. Gutterman asked if they could work with the existing piping. Mr. White stated that the sizes and conditions of the existing piping in the 52 risers in the building make their reuse infeasible. Mr. D'Alessandro, the contractor of the Committee, agreed that it would be difficult to reuse the risers.

Ms. Pentz stated that the flat panels are character-defining features of the building. The new HVAC units punched through the panels would not be compatible with the building. Ms. Gutterman stated that a punched opening that was flush would be more appropriate because there would be no shadow line.

Ms. Shephard stated that she had discussed the project with Randy Baron of the Commission's staff and that he had suggested that the HVAC units would be acceptable at places on the façade where there are double windows. She stated that she could develop a design that complied with that suggestion. She also stated that Mr. Baron approved of the HVAC units at the balconies and the single panels. Ms. Hawkins observed that many of the HVAC units would be highly visible because of the location on Washington Square. Ms. Shephard proposed constructing a mock-up for the Committee to review. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee could not base its recommendation today on a mock-up because the results of the mock-up were not before it.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia contended that the HVAC units would be highly visible. He objected to projecting HVAC units and also to installing them in a piecemeal pattern, which would disrupt the rhythm of the architecture of the building.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the applicants find the smallest unit available and prepare a mock-up of it for review by the Committee at a later meeting. Ms. Shephard agreed to prepare the mock-up. Ms. Gutterman asked if shapes of the HVAC units could be altered. Mr. White replied that they could not; they must work with standard units. Ms. Gutterman suggested looking into larger units that would protrude less.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked how the condensate would be handled. It would damage the building if it was allowed to flow onto the structure. Mr. White informed him that the condensate would be handled internally.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:15 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 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.