

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

**TUESDAY, 26 AUGUST 2008
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DAVID AMBURN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

David Amburn, Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Shawn Evans
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

Kiki Bolender, Schade & Bolender Architects
Sabra Smith, Preservation Alliance
Anthony Miksitz, Architect
Tim Kerner, Terra Studio
Gabriele Lesaur
Karen Loveland
Todd Joseph
Brooke Weese, Esq., Arsenal Associates
Donna DeStefano
John Orsini
Matt Finlay, Agoos Lovera Architects
Paul Stone, Emerald Windows
David Huffman
Mark Ueland, UUMN

CALL TO ORDER

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

5 BOATHOUSE ROW

Owner: The Sedgeley Club

Applicant: Kiki Bolender

History: 1903, designated January 1984.

Project: Install aluminum windows in subframes

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace non-original windows on the river facade of the Boathouse. The Commission's files do not include designation photographs of that facade. It is unknown whether the existing windows were in place at the time of designation. The windows in question are part of an extension of the original porch. The original porch columns remain in the interior. The applicant proposes to install double-hung, clad windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, provided the new windows fit within the existing openings and that the windows are appropriately located within the openings, with installation details to be included in the shop drawings, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Architect Kiki Bolender represented the application.

Mr. Amburn inquired whether the windows could be installed further back in the window opening to the original location to provide the suggested reveal. Ms. Bolender stated that it could be shifted slightly back, perhaps 3/8". She explained that the sill is the controlling factor. She stated that she hoped to use Azek, a poly-vinyl-chloride material, for the sills because it requires little maintenance. She stated that the proposed window is "greener" than other choices. Ms. Bolender displayed a sample of the window. She stated that she is proposing a clad window because they would face the river and be subjected to extreme weather. She also noted that wood windows would be difficult to paint in this location because they overhang the water. Mr. Baron asked if the proposed window would fit the opening. Ms. Bolender replied that the window would fit the opening even though it is not a custom window. Fortunately, it is manufactured in an appropriate size for the opening. She added that they will fix the bottom sash and only the top sash will operate; this will obviate the need for guards at the windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, provided the new windows fit within the existing openings and that the windows are appropriately located within the openings, with installation details to be included in the shop drawings, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

2010 SANSOM STREET

Owner: John Ciccone

Applicant: Gianluca Demontis

History: Altered c. 1920

Project: Install casements with transoms in storefront

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the plate glass in the storefront with two sets of café windows with transoms. The café windows will fit within the existing masonry openings. The proposed railing would be steel.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of bi-fold windows, provided the existing jambs and transoms are retained, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application. No one represented the application.

Mr. Danta noted that the window manufacturer had explained that he sought to replace the jambs and transoms because they are in poor condition. Mr. Baron added that he had been told that there was deflection in the transom bars, necessitating their replacement. Mr. Danta observed that some deflection is visible in a 1997 photograph; which he displayed for the Committee members. Mr. Evans stated that he saw no evidence of degradation in the photograph. Messrs. D'Alessandro and Amburn suggested that the transoms could be repaired. Ms. Pentz noted that the plans for the proposed windows incorrectly portrayed the transom over the door. Mr. McCoubrey opined that the Committee could not review the proposal without accurate drawings. Messrs. Amburn and Evans agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of bi-fold windows, provided the door configuration is retained and the existing jambs and transoms are retained or replaced in kind if their condition warrants, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

535-537 N. 22nd Street

Owner: Diane Eigner

Applicant: Anthony Miksitz

History: c. 1860

Project: Replace and construct roof decks.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct two decks that were removed for roofing work on this property. The decks were present at the time of designation. The proposed decks would be of the same dimensions and at the same location as the previous decks. The applicant proposes to install a hot tub with a trellis. The railing would be fabricated from steel cables. The railing would be taller around the hot tub.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Architect Anthony Miksitz represented the application.

Mr. Danta informed the Committee that Mr. Miksitz has requested that the Commission review this application for final approval rather than in-concept approval, as originally proposed.

Ms. Pentz asked if an engineer had verified that the deck would support a hot tub. Mr. Miksitz replied the hot tub's location was chosen to take advantage of the existing structure. He noted that the structure would rest on the parapet walls. Mr. Evans asked if an engineer had approved of the design. Mr. Miksitz stated that an engineer had approved the design.

Ms. Pentz asked about the trellis. Mr. Miksitz stated that the trellis would be both a screen and a safety feature. He added that the trellis would have vertical members only and nothing would be grown on it.

Mr. Evans stated that the structural details should have been included in the application. Mr. Miksitz replied that a structural engineer had not yet been retained; the property owner does not want to pay for the structural design until the project is approved. Mr. McCoubrey stated that

the staff could confirm that the structural details were compatible with the approved design after the engineering is complete. Mr. Danta agreed that the staff could verify that the final design complied with any approval.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the engineering design should not propose any new penetrations to the parapets walls; the deck should sit on them. Mr. Miskitz agreed and stated that he would not propose any penetrations to the walls. He added that the addition where the deck would sit is constructed of CMU, not brick.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the engineered design does not require any new penetrations in the parapet walls, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

251 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: Philadelphia Art Alliance

Applicant: Janice Woodcock

History: 1906, Day & Klauder; significant in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District

Project: Replace front doors

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace non-historic entry doors with new doors that would not replicate the original doors. The original doors were not present at the time of designation, but their design is known from the original design documents. The applicant proposes two-leaf, metal doors with horizontal push bars. This building is classified as Significant in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. It is one of the best examples of Renaissance Revival architecture in the city.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as submitted, pursuant to Standard 6.

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

Ms. Pentz contended that the original doors were a spectacular aspect of this very significant building and should be restored. Mr. Amburn noted that the surviving documentation of the original door is sufficient to allow for a true restoration. Mr. Danta noted that the proposed door is not a restoration. He opined that a building of such significance deserves a true restoration. Mr. Evans noted that the original doors used to swing in; the proposed doors would swing out over the steps. He suggested that this condition may not satisfy the building code. He stated that the doors may not be wide enough to satisfy the ADA requirements and may also require push-button hardware for access. He contended that details such as the location of the hardware should be included for review. Mr. Evans also suggested that applicant consider safety glass. The Committee members unanimously supported a full restoration of the doors.

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

309 S. 25TH STREET

Owner: Timothy Kerner

Applicant: Timothy Kerner

History: c. 1960; non-contributing to the RFRHD, 2/8/1995

Project: Alter façade

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the façade of this non-contributing house in a development row of three. The alterations include infilling the garage opening, squaring off the arched doorway, replacing the steps and balcony railing, and adding a bay window at the third floor. The garage infill would consist of horizontal windows with hardwood siding on a brick base. The doorway would be squared off and cast stone panels added. The steps would be reconstructed in a wider form in cast stone. The new balcony railing would be steel with a wood cap. The proposed third-floor bay would be clad in wood channel lap siding with aluminum clad windows and topped by a cornice.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the bay, but approval of all other proposed alterations pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Property owners Gabrielle Cesarino and Tim Kerner, who is also the architect, represented the application.

Mr. Evans asked how the staff arrived at its recommendation of denial. Ms. Cote explained that some of the staff considered the third-floor bay to be inconsistent with the vocabulary of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. Mr. Farnham stated the he did not agree with the majority of the staff on the recommendation. He explained to the Committee that the review process for non-contributing buildings is not like the standard review process. He stated that the staff may approve proposals for non-contributing buildings without referral to the Architectural Committee or Commission. If the staff refuses to approve an application for a non-contributing building, it refers the application to the Committee, which can approve it without referral to the Commission. If the Committee refuses to approve an application for a non-contributing building, it refers the application to the Commission, which reviews it for approval. Mr. Farnham stated that, unlike the majority of the staff, he had advocated for approval of this application, but agreed to refer it to the Committee to allow for a public debate. He stated that he considered the staff recommendation to be flawed. He explained that the Commission can only deny an application for a non-contributing building if the proposal would have an adverse effect on the district as a whole. He asserted that this application would not have an adverse effect on the district. He concluded that any recommendation based on an adverse effect on this building was logically inconsistent. He advocated for approval of the project.

Mr. Kerner stated that he was attempting open the building to the park across the street with the addition of the bay. He also explained that the bay would be very shallow, allowing for a window seat only. Mr. Kerner noted that he would need a zoning variance to convert the garage into living space. Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the bay should be reduced in height to allow the original roof line to remain exposed. All other Committee members disagreed, stating that the Commission was charged with protecting the district only, not this building. They asserted that this proposal would have no adverse impact on the district. They concluded that they should approve it. Mr. D'Alessandro disagreed with his colleagues, but acknowledged that he was outvoted.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee approved the application.

618 S. FRONT STREET

Owner: Felix Panzarella

Applicant: Felix Panzarella

History: c. 1835; individually designated, 6/24/1958

Project: Construct three-story building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story brick building on Howard Street at the rear of this property. The building would have a garage on the first floor and studio space on the second and third floors. The building would not be visible from Front, South, Bainbridge, or S. Hancock Streets. The photomontages provided with the application differ in details from the architectural drawings. The staff prefers the design details in the drawings, not the photomontages.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. No one represented the application.

Mr. Evans asked if the new building would attach to the historic building. Ms. Cote stated that it would not. Ms. Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the bricks used in patterning proposed for the exterior of the building should not contrast as much as they appear to in the design documentation. The Committee members agreed that the design details proffered in the drawings were preferable to those in the photomontages.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application as documented in the architectural drawings, not the photomontages, provided the brick patterning is more subtle, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

1401 ARCH STREET

Owner: AFIAA U.S. Investments

Applicant: Karen Loveland

History: 1897-99, added to 1926; storefronts altered from arches to square-head by 1917
Individually designated, 6/24/1987

Project: Install entrance

OVERVIEW: The Committee and the Commission reviewed a similar in-concept application last month. The Commission approved, in-concept, a street-level entrance at the northern outermost bay of the Broad Street façade. This application for final approval proposes to remove the stone base and the glass below the top horizontal mullion of the northern outermost bay and install a new storefront system with double glass doors to match the existing main entrance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the new storefront system matches in material and color, pursuant to the Commission's in-concept approval of 8 August 2008.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Karen Loveland and Michelle Taraschi represented the application.

Ms. Loveland informed the Committee they had contacted a professional storefront restorer, one who had previously done work at Liberty Place, who will be able to match the existing storefront system. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the date and metal of the existing storefront. Ms. Loveland replied that it is not original and it is made of aluminum, not bronze.

Mr. Amburn explained that the Commission had reviewed this project in concept and preferred that the new entrance be located in the outermost bay.

Mr. Evans suggested that the newly exposed sides of the stone resulting from the cuts should be treated and finished to match existing stone surfaces. He also suggested that the shape of the nosing of the edges should match the existing shape at the main entrance. Mr. Amburn observed that it would be a flush cut. Mr. Evans also suggested that the staff should review the details of the cut and installation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Commission's in-concept approval of 8 August 2008.

1903 DIAMOND STREET

Owner/Applicant: Todd Joseph

History: c. 1889, Diamond Street Historic District, 1/29/1986, contributing

Project: Legalize exterior alterations

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of windows, a metal door, glass block in basement windows, and mailboxes on the front facade, application of cement and paint over the brownstone base and stair on the front façade, demolition and reconstruction of the rear bay, and installation of stucco, a door, and vinyl windows at the rear.

The 1986 designation photograph shows one-over-one, wood windows with original brick molds, built-down door, transom, louvered basement windows, and damaged brownstone base. A 2003 aerial photograph shows the rear ell and two-story bay intact. Photographs from March 2008 also show the rear ell and two-story bay intact, although in poor condition.

The appropriate historic features are as follows: windows on the first, second, and third stories should be one-over-one, wood, double-hung, sash; the basement windows should be six-light, wood, true-divided-light sash; the front door should be a wood, double-leaf paneled door with transom and historic moldings as shown in the designation photograph of 1909 Diamond Street; the first story window sills and base should be unpainted brownstone maintaining the historic block design; and the stair should be unpainted brownstone.

Although the current windows were approved by the Historical Commission in June 2008, they were installed incorrectly and protrude dramatically from the window openings. The frames should be recessed within the openings.

As depicted in the March 2008 photographs, the rear ell should be brick with a two-story wood bay with four one-over-one, wood, double-hung windows and wood cornices at the second and third stories. The first story should have a one-over-one, wood, double-hung window and paneled wood door.

In April 2008, the applicant was informed that the Historical Commission staff would not approve the installation of stucco on the rear elevation or bay windows and an approval from the Historical Commission and permits from the Department of Licenses and Inspections must be obtained prior to any alterations on historically designated buildings. A staff member also met in the office and on-site with the applicant on several occasions and informed him of Historical Commission requirements and application process. In July 2008, a staff member observed the rear bay demolished and reconstructed with stucco and vinyl windows as well as several illegal alterations to the front facade.

In July 2008, violations were issued for the illegal alterations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: The Architectural Committee agreed to review the applications for 1903, 1909, 1915, and 1917 Diamond Street simultaneously. The review is summarized below.

1909 DIAMOND STREET

Owner/Applicant: Todd Joseph

History: c. 1889, Diamond Street Historic District, 1/29/1986, contributing

Project: Project: Legalize exterior alterations

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the removal of door and door surround, installation of windows, a metal door, glass block in basement windows, and mailboxes on the front facade, application of cement and paint over the brownstone base and stair on the front façade, demolition and reconstruction of the rear bay, and installation of stucco, a door, and vinyl windows at the rear.

The 1986 designation photograph shows one-over-one, wood windows with original brick molds, historic door, door surround, and transom, six-light wood basement windows, brownstone stairs, and damaged brownstone base. A 2003 aerial photograph shows the rear ell intact and not stuccoed.

The appropriate historic features are as follows: windows on the first, second, and third stories should be one-over-one, wood, double-hung sash; the basement windows should be six-light, wood, true-divided-light sash; the front door should be a wood, double-leaf paneled door with transom and historic moldings as shown in the designation photograph; the first story window sills and base should be unpainted brownstone maintaining the historic block design; and the stair should be unpainted brownstone.

Although the current windows were approved by the Historical Commission in June 2008, they were installed incorrectly and protrude dramatically from the window openings. The frames should be recessed within the openings.

The rear ell should be brick with a two-story wood bay with four one-over-one, wood, double-hung windows and wood cornices at the second and third stories. The first story should have a one-over-one, wood, double-hung window and paneled wood door.

In April 2008, the applicant was informed that the Historical Commission staff would not approve the installation of stucco on the rear elevation or bay windows and that an approval from the Historical Commission and permits from the Department of Licenses and Inspections must be

obtained prior to any alterations on historically designated buildings. A staff member also met in the office and on-site with the applicant on several occasions and informed him of Historical Commission requirements and application process. In July 2008, a staff member observed the rear bay demolished and reconstructed with stucco and vinyl windows as well as several illegal alterations to the front facade.

In July 2008, violations were issued for the illegal alterations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: The Architectural Committee agreed to review the applications for 1903, 1909, 1915, and 1917 Diamond Street simultaneously. The review is summarized below.

1915 DIAMOND STREET

Owner/Applicant: Todd Joseph

History: c. 1889, Diamond Street Historic District, 1/29/1986, contributing

Project: Legalize exterior alterations

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of windows, a metal door, glass block in basement windows, and mailboxes on the front facade, application of cement and paint over the brownstone base and stair on the front façade, painting of the façade, and installation of stucco, a door, and vinyl windows at the rear.

The 1986 designation photograph shows one-over-one, wood windows with original brick molds, built-down door, transom, closed basement windows, and damaged brownstone base. A 2003 aerial photograph shows the rear ell intact and not stuccoed.

The appropriate historic features are as follows: windows on the first, second, and third stories should be one-over-one, wood, double-hung sash; the basement windows should be six-light, wood, true-divided-light sash; the front door should be a wood, double-leaf paneled door with transom and historic moldings as shown in the designation photograph of 1909 Diamond Street; the first story window sills and base should be unpainted brownstone maintaining the historic block design; and the stair should be unpainted brownstone.

Although the current windows were approved by the Historical Commission in June 2008, they were installed incorrectly and protrude dramatically from the window openings. The frames should be recessed within the openings.

The rear ell should be brick with a two-story wood bay with four one-over-one, wood, double-hung windows and wood cornices at the second and third stories. The first story should have a one-over-one, wood, double-hung window and paneled wood door.

In April 2008, the applicant was informed that the Historical Commission staff would not approve the installation of stucco on the rear elevation or bay windows and that an approval from the Historical Commission and permits from the Department of Licenses & Inspections must be obtained prior to any alterations on historically designated buildings. A staff member also met in the office and on-site with the applicant on several occasions and informed him of Historical Commission requirements and application process. In July 2008, a staff member observed the rear bay demolished and reconstructed with stucco and vinyl windows as well as several illegal alterations to the front facade.

In July 2008, violations were issued for the illegal alterations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: The Architectural Committee agreed to review the applications for 1903, 1909, 1915, and 1917 Diamond Street simultaneously. The review is summarized below.

1917 DIAMOND STREET

Owner/Applicant: Todd Joseph

History: c. 1889, Diamond Street Historic District, 1/29/1986, contributing

Project: Legalize exterior alterations

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of windows, a metal door, glass block in basement windows, and mailboxes on the front facade, application of cement and paint over the brownstone base and stair on the front façade, and installation of stucco, a door, and vinyl windows at the rear.

The 1986 designation photograph shows one-over-one, wood windows with original brick molds, the historic door stripped of its pediment moldings, transom, grated basement windows, and a damaged brownstone base. A 2003 aerial photograph shows the rear ell intact and not stuccoed.

The appropriate historic features are as follows: windows on the first, second, and third stories should be one-over-one, wood, double-hung sash; the basement windows should be six-light, wood, true-divided-light sash; the front door should be a wood, double-leaf paneled door with transom and historic moldings as shown in the designation photograph of 1909 Diamond Street; the first story window sills and base should be unpainted brownstone maintaining the historic block design; and the stair should be unpainted brownstone.

Although the current windows were approved by the Historical Commission in June 2008, they were installed incorrectly and protrude dramatically from the window openings. The frames should be recessed within the openings.

The rear ell should be brick with a two-story wood bay with four one-over-one, wood, double-hung windows and wood cornices at the second and third stories. The first story should have a one-over-one, wood, double-hung window and paneled wood door.

In April 2008, the applicant was informed that the Historical Commission staff would not approve the installation of stucco on the rear elevation or bay windows and that an approval from the Historical Commission and permits from the Department of Licenses & Inspections must be obtained prior to any alterations on the historically designated building. A staff member also met in the office and on-site with the applicant on several occasions and informed him of Historical Commission requirements and application process. In July 2008, a staff member observed the rear bay demolished and reconstructed with stucco and vinyl windows as well as several illegal alterations to the front facade.

In July 2008, violations were issued for the illegal alterations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the applications for 1903, 1909, 1915, and 1917 Diamond Street to the Committee. Developer Todd Joseph represented the applications.

The Committee began the reviews with a discussion of the incorrectly installed windows. Ms. Sell informed the Committee that the staff had approved applications for wood, one-over-one windows. However, the windows were installed incorrectly. The windows are not recessed in the window openings, but are installed at the plane of the facades. Subsequently, the brick molds protrude from the window openings. She stated that the applicant had discussed the window installation problems in the field with several staff members. Mr. Baron added that the staff had also discussed the basement windows with Mr. Joseph in the field at that same time. Mr. Joseph installed glass block instead of the appropriate basement windows.

Messrs. Amburn and Evans directed the Committee's attention to the many other non-compliant aspects of the rehabilitation including the front doors and rear stucco. Mr. Joseph claimed that 1915 had already been stuccoed at the time of purchase. He added that he applied a smooth coat of cement over the brownstone bases at 1903, 1909, and 1917. Mr. Evans asserted the cement treatment was inappropriate, would cause the brownstone to retain moisture, and thereby cause additional damage in the future.

Mr. Amburn noted that the rear bays were reconstructed and now have vinyl windows. He cited staff emails sent in April 2008 to Mr. Joseph in which the staff explained that it could not approve stucco for the rears of the buildings at the staff-level. The staff had advised Mr. Joseph that any proposals for stucco would require reviews before the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission. Mr. Joseph ignored that advice and stuccoed the rears without any approvals or permits.

Mr. Evans opined that he would have been liberal with his recommendations for the rears if the applicant had followed the correct process. However, the process was not followed. Committee members asked Mr. Joseph if he had demolished and rebuilt the bays. Mr. Joseph responded that he had not; he merely covered them with stucco. He stated that he assumed that stuccoing the rears would be acceptable because the buildings are in the middle of the block. Mr. Danta stated he had met several times with Mr. Joseph and his contractors and explained that the proposed work exceeded the staff's authority to review. He advised them of the application procedures. Mr. Joseph claimed that an inspector with the Department of Licenses & Inspections told him to do whatever he needed to do to make the buildings secure. Mr. Joseph stated that Mr. Baron had told him that the rears should be repointed and the rear bays should be reconstructed in wood. He stated that those were not realistic solutions for these development projects. Mr. Joseph claimed that he undertook the work without approvals because he needed to complete the projects by 15 August 2008. Mr. Evans replied that there is an official application process; if he had complied with it, the Committee would have been able to help him develop appropriate compromises. Mr. Evans added that the staff does not have the authority to review many types of work. Mr. D'Alessandro stated the Architectural Committee could not recommend legalization of this work. Mr. Joseph stated he also owns 1905 and 1911 Diamond Street; he stated that he would rather allow those properties to sit than comply with the Historical Commission. Mr. Evans responded that the Commission would have helped him achieve his goals if he had respected the process. Mr. Joseph stated he notified the staff consistently about copper stolen from his projects. The staff suggested that he install metal grates during the construction. Mr. Joseph claimed the grates had been stolen as well. He claimed he had no choice but to undertake the illegal work because the Commission would not compromise with him. Mr. Amburn noted that glass block is not impenetrable. Mr. Baron stated

the staff is currently reviewing projects at neighboring properties; those property owners are complying with process. For example, developers at 1901 Diamond have been working with the staff and doing appropriate work at a fraction of the cost estimates proffered by Mr. Joseph for compliant alterations. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission must treat all property owners consistently. The staff cannot excuse Mr. Joseph from compliance. Mr. Amburn noted that Mr. Joseph entered into the process, but then ignored it. Mr. Baron stated that the staff had approved permit applications for interior work and front windows only. All of the exterior work was either non-compliant or illegal. Mr. Amburn noted there had been regular communication between Mr. Joseph and staff, yet he had failed to comply.

Mr. Joseph submitted a quote of \$14,000 for a compliant front door. Mr. Baron provided a quote of \$7,500 for the same correct door, door frame, and transom from the developer at 1901 Diamond Street.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that it was impossible for the Committee to recommend legalization of any of this illegal work. Mr. Joseph had knowingly chosen to ignore the process at his own peril. Ms. Pentz concurred, explaining that none of the work proposed in the application was appropriate. Mr. Joseph rhetorically asked if he should demolish the building. He stated that he would appeal any denial to the Board of License & Inspection Review.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that, as a first step toward resolution, Mr. Joseph retain a design professional to produce annotated, measured drawings. Mr. Joseph responded that that would be too expensive. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the applicant is making the process as difficult as possible. Mr. Joseph stated the time constraints did not allow for him to go through the process. He added that, in hindsight, he should have just let the buildings sit.

Mr. Joseph asserted that he would not consider removing the stucco. He stated every house on the opposite block has stucco at the rear.

Mr. Baron suggested that Mr. Joseph submit a compromise application to the Commission, which would propose legalizing some aspects of the illegal work in exchange for some restoration at the front facade. Mr. Amburn agreed, but suggested that the best time for a compromise was before any illegal work was undertaken.

Mr. Baron acknowledged that the stucco was applied to remediate poor conditions. He noted, however, that stucco never solves structural problems. He explained that the Department of Licenses & Inspections requires building permits for all stucco regardless of historic status so that the inspectors can verify that the walls stuccoed are structurally sound before the stucco is applied.

Ms. Pentz stated that the Committee could consider genuine applications for compromise, but could never consider the proposed blanket legalizations. Mr. Amburn asked if they could make a list of recommendations. Ms. Pentz stated that the burden is on the applicant to present a proposal; the Committee cannot design a compromise for him. Mr. Baron suggested that the Committee recommend denial of the current applications, but provide some guidance to Mr. Joseph. Mr. Evans asked if it would be possible to craft a compromise today. Ms. Sell replied any compromise proposal must be documented and made available to the public for its consideration.

Mr. Evans stated that although he does not like the stucco or the covering of the cornices, he would be willing to recommend approval of some of the changes at the rears. Mr. Amburn

stated he would be willing to recommend approval of the rear vinyl windows, provided the front windows are reinstalled correctly. Ms. Pentz stated she would be willing to recommend approval of a steel door in the rear, but not at the front. Mr. Baron reminded the Commission that the developer at 1901 Diamond had complied fully with the Commission and is currently having the appropriate windows and doors manufactured. He also reconstructed the bay appropriately. Mr. Evans noted that 1901 is a corner property. Ms. Sell noted that the corner properties have more visible facades and are more expensive to rehabilitate. Mr. Baron reiterated that the corner property at 1901 was in the process of being appropriately restored. Mr. Joseph said that the owner of 1901 will not make a profit on the development.

Ms. Pentz turned the discussion to the cement applied to the brownstone front facade. Mr. Amburn stated the brownstone was already damaged. Mr. Baron suggested removing the loose cement and filling in the damaged areas with an appropriate brownstone repair material such as Jahn. Mr. Joseph stated the cementing was done uniformly and the shapes had not been changed. Ms. Sell noted that the designation photographs show the shapes of the brownstone had, in fact, been changed.

Mr. Joseph stated he spoken with Sam Sherman, the chair of the Commission and his neighbor. He stated that Mr. Sherman told him to purchase salvaged doors for the properties. Mr. Baron reminded the applicant that the regulations prohibit the use of salvaged material if inappropriate. Mr. Joseph replied that Mr. Sherman had informed him that he installed salvaged doors on his own home. Mr. Evans explained that salvaged doors may be stylistically inappropriate, even if they are from a building of the same age. Mr. Baron stated that, owing to the influence of Temple University, the Diamond Street area is becoming more attractive. He suggested that the area would support appropriate rehabilitation.

Mr. D'Alessandro reported that he would vote to recommend denial of the applications. Ms. Pentz agreed with a recommendation of denial, stating that the Committee and staff have provided sufficient guidance to the applicant. Mr. Amburn stated that he would vote to recommend denial owing to incompleteness. He contended that the proposal was too vague for presentation to the Commission. Mr. Baron suggested that the applicant has the right to formalize his informal claim of economic hardship. Mr. Joseph stated that he would refuse to spend \$40,000 to \$60,000 for doors for four buildings. He stated that it is difficult to work in the neighborhood and that materials have been stolen from his job sites. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that the Architectural Committee is not authorized to base its recommendations on anything but the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Amburn suggested that the applicant develop a compromise and submit new applications. Mr. Joseph reiterated that he was operating on advice from Sam Sherman. Mr. Amburn suggested that Mr. Joseph confer with the developer at 1901 Diamond, who is renovating that property in compliance with the Commission. Mr. Baron suggested that Mr. Joseph improve his security. The developer at 1901 Diamond had not suffered similar setbacks. Mr. Joseph stated that the developer had asked him about a missing generator. He demanded that Mr. Baron cease comparing his projects to that at 1901 Diamond. Mr. Baron claimed that the comparison was valid; he stated that 1901 is the same building type within the same development row as Mr. Joseph's properties. The developer at 1901 is rehabilitating the building in compliance with the Commission, which Mr. Joseph claims is infeasible.

Mr. Joseph informed the Committee that he no longer owns 1915 and 1917 Diamond. Mr. Baron asked Mr. Joseph if the current owners have authorized him to submit these applications. Mr. Joseph replied that they have.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend:

- denial of the application for 1903 Diamond Street, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9;
- denial of the application for 1909 Diamond Street, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9;
- denial of the application for 1915 Diamond Street, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9; and,
- denial of the application for 1917 Diamond Street, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9.

2275 BRIDGE STREET, FRANKFORD ARSENAL, BUILDING 11

Owner: PAID/Arsenal Associates, Mark Hankin

Applicant: Mark Hankin

History: 1820, added to in 1850; individually designated, 11/29/1960

Project: Legalize doors

OVERVIEW: This building at the Frankford Arsenal is now used as a school. The applicant has exceeded a permit for interior renovations and installed fire safety doors without the Commission's approval. Wood and glass mid twentieth-century double-doors were removed and aluminum-and-glass-single doors were installed in their place. A photograph shows a paneled and glazed double-door on the south façade of the building. We do not have an equivalent picture for the north façade; however the applicant has provided 1957 renovation drawings showing a wider doorway with wood and glass panels matching the sidelights.

The application includes three alternate designs. Alternative One, the applicants preferred design, proposes the legalization of the new aluminum doors. Alternative Two proposes the installation of doors based on the 1957 renovation design. Alternative Three proposes a design based on the historic photograph of the building; however, it has been inaccurately rendered.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Brooke Weese, a representative of the property owner, represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the applicants have submitted a revised Alternate Three, labeled S1d, which accurately depicts the original doors. He explained that the applicants have stated that they installed the aluminum doors in response at the request of an inspector from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The changes were made without a building permit or the Commission's approval. Mr. Baron explained that he has worked with the applicants on a revised single-leaf door design that would replicate the exterior appearance of the original double-leaf doors. The applicants would prefer to retain the recently-installed doors for fire safety reasons and because the weighty door might be difficult for children to open.

Ms. Weese stated that her client would like to keep the aluminum and glass doors. She stated that the school would like to have glass doors to provide visibility during an emergency. She also noted the doors that were replaced did not meet the building code. Ms. Weese acknowledged her client did act quickly without the Commission's approval when he doors were replaced, but stated that the client endeavored to follow historic guidelines and create doors that were compatible with the building, but did not replicate the original doors. Ms. Weese added that the original sidelights and transom remain at the north door.

Mr. Evans suggested that it is possible to fabricate the historically appropriate doors with the operability and visibility desired by the client. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the weight of a door is irrelevant; with the correct hardware, a very heavy door can be opened with the force of a single finger. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Amburn advocated for a recommendation of approval of revised Alternate Three as shown on drawing S1d.

Ms. Weese told the Committee that she was asked to relay the owner's concerns for the health, safety, and welfare of the children who attend the school. She reported that the school would be forced to install signage stating that extra care must be taken when using these doors and that they were installed in accordance with Historical Commission guidelines and requirements if the Commission requires the installation of replicas of the historic doors. Mr. Amburn noted the importance in hiring of the qualified design professionals to ensure that the doors meet all safety and building code requirements.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the existing illegal doors, but approval of the doors shown as revised Alternate Three on drawing S1d, pursuant to Standard 6.

1330 LOMBARD STREET

Owners: John & Donna DeStefano

Applicant: John Orsini

History: c.1840, altered 1905, 1990

Project: rehabilitate building for office and apartments.

OVERVIEW: This mid nineteenth-century century rowhouse was altered into a commercial space about 1905 with bays and a storefront. After 1985, it was stuccoed and had its front bay removed and storefront altered as well as receiving a coat of rough stucco, all without the Commission's approval. The current applicants have just purchased the property and are seeking to restore the building to its 1905 appearance on Lombard Street and put a smooth coat of stucco on the Juniper Street facade. They also propose to reopen the large gable fanlight on Juniper Street and restore the Federal style parapet wall in salvaged brick. The stucco should be removed on Juniper Street down to the base of the gable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Owners John Orsini and Donna DiStefano and architect Matt Finlay represented the application.

Mr. Baron noted that the address of this corner property has been known as 1330 Lombard as well as 504 S Juniper Street. He reported that this property has likely been altered in the past without the Commission's review because of the confusion about the address.

The applicants propose to restore the Lombard Street façade of the property to its original appearance. They will remove all of the stucco and reconstruct the projecting bays. On the Juniper Street façade, the applicants plan to rebuild a missing faux chimney and reopen the historic fanlight in the gable end. Mr. Baron explained that some new windows will be cut into the side wall where a bay was removed and replaced with cinder block. He noted that no existing historic fabric would be removed.

Ms. Pentz asked about the support of the new faux chimney, which would replace one that had collapsed. Several Committee members recommended that an engineer review the support system for the new faux chimney. Mr. Evans suggested bringing the line of exposed brick down several courses. Mr. McCoubrey cautioned that only exterior bricks should be used to rebuild the chimney parapet.

Several Committee members commented that the window shop drawings submitted with the application do not correspond to the bay shown in the architectural drawings. They directed the applicants to submit revised shop drawings for review by the staff. Mr. Finlay stated that they will hire a millwork designer.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the stucco height on the side wall is revised and the details for the chimney parapet wall are provided, with the staff to review details.

412 S. CAMAC STREET

Owner: David Hoffman

Applicant: Paul Stone, Emerald Windows

History: 1830, dormer added late twentieth-century; individually designated

Project: Installation of simulated-divided-light windows

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for the installation of simulated-divided-light windows on the front façade of the building. The proposed pane configuration will match the historic configuration. The existing window frames will be retained. The proposed muntins will be a composite material, not real wood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the windows for the non-historic dormer, but denial of the windows for the front façade, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Property owner Dave Hoffman and window salesman Paul Stone represented the application.

Mr. Baron noted that the dormer was new construction approved by the Commission. He explained that the staff differed in their assessments of the appropriateness of the proposed windows. All staff members agreed that the simulated-divided-light windows were acceptable for the new dormer. The staff differed on the proposed windows for the historic portion of the front façade. Mr. Baron stated that he did not consider simulated-divided-light windows to be appropriate for the front façade of an individually designated building that dates to the 1830s. He claimed that this type of window had never been approved for this area. He noted that the streets are narrow and the buildings small in this neighborhood. Pedestrians can inspect the windows closely. Other staff members considered the simulated-divided-light windows appropriate for the building because they closely replicate the appearance of the historic windows.

Mr. Stone displayed a sample of the window. He stated that the drawing incorrectly labels the muntins as metal; they are cellular PVC instead. He noted that the muntins are paintable. Mr. Baron observed that the overall width of the muntin is appropriate, 7/8", but the shape of the muntin does not accurately replicate the shape of the historic muntin. Mr. Amburn reminded the Committee that the Commission has approved some simulated-divided-light sash that replicate the appearance of the historic sash. Ms. Pentz advocated for consistency. Mr. Danta stated that

he initially opposed the application when he thought that the muntin was made of metal. Now that he knows that the muntin is a composite material that can be painted, he supports the application. He added that the Commission has approved several applications for simulated-divided-light windows when the proposed window replicates the style and dimensions of the original window. He remarked that he believes that the Commission has approved this exact window in recent months.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the sizes of the panes would change. Mr. Stone replied that the differences would be negligible. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that it would be beneficial to have drawings of the original and proposed windows to compare. Mr. McCoubrey asked to see examples of both side by side. Mr. Danta told the Committee that neither a simulated nor a true-divided-light replacement window would precisely replicate the historic window. The Committee members decided that they could not recommend approval of the windows without additional information about the historic and proposed windows. They suggested that the applicant provide detailed drawings and samples of the two for side-by-side comparisons.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the windows for the non-historic dormer, but denial of the windows for the front façade, pursuant to Standard 6.

1520 RACE STREET

Owner: Friends Center Corporation

Applicant: Mark Ueland, AIA

History: c. 1850, addition c.1985

Project: construct entry vestibule

OVERVIEW: This application proposes construction of an entry vestibule. At the August 2008 meeting, the Committee asked the applicant to simplify the design with a shed roofline and glass walls. The applicant has complied with the Committee's recommendation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro recused owing to their firms' involvements with the project. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Architect Mark Ueland represented the application.

Mr. Ueland stated that his revised design responded to the suggestions offered during the earlier review. He remarked that the proposed design is now lighter, more transparent, and less historicist. He added that this is a green project that includes rain water storage. The design derives from the overriding green philosophy. Mr. Baron asked about the color of the roofing material. Mr. Ueland replied that the roof would be silver-colored, standing-seam, metal roof that would qualify for LEED certification.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

Standard 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.

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

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.