

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

**TUESDAY, 26 JULY 2011
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Nan Gutterman
Suzanne Pentz
Dan McCoubrey

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

ALSO PRESENT

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance
Frank Mallas, Friday Architects
Juliet Geldi, North Street Design
Betty Mon, Mon & Associates
Mark Trimbath, VLBJR Architects
Vic Barr, VLBJR Architects
Anthony Phelps, Delaware Valley Design
Rustin Ohler, Harmon Deutsch
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
William Steedle, Graboyes Windows
Heather Lutzker, Graboyes Windows
Joe Schiavo, Old City Civic Association
Jhanel Wilson, Nel Estates LLC

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 2107 SPRUCE STREET

Project: Replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadeline LP

Applicant: Frank Mallas, Friday Architects/Planners Inc

History: 1869; front façade altered in Moderne style, c. 1935

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

Preservation Easement: No

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to address an outstanding violation for the illegal installation of vinyl windows in the ground and second-floor window openings of this mid nineteenth-century townhouse. The property was significantly altered c. 1935 with the refacing of the ground-floor façade in a Moderne Style and the addition of a second-floor bay. The Moderne Style refacing created a façade that showcased steel casement windows at ground and second floors. The steel casement windows were illegally removed in April 2010 and a violation issued soon after.

This is the second application presented to the Commission that proposes to address the violation. The applicant submitted an application in June 2011, which proposed the installation of one-over-one windows in the Moderne portion of the façade. The Architectural Committee recommended denial of this proposal and the Commission denied it. The applicant missed the Commission meeting and did not participate in the discussion.

The current application incorporates some of the comments received by the applicant at the last Architectural Committee meeting. The current proposal, however, falls short of meeting several key rehabilitation Standards. The proposal includes the installation of wood awning windows in the second-floor bay and wood double-hung windows at ground floor. All new windows would replicate the original muntin pattern. The applicant has not submitted any details of the original dimensions and profiles of the Moderne-era windows, even though evidence survives; the steel entry door and transoms in the bay are extant. The staff cannot compare how closely the proposed muntin and jamb details replicate the Moderne windows. That key portion of the application is incomplete. It is safe to assume, however, that a wood window would not replicate the dimensions of steel windows. This difference would be quite evident at ground floor, where the triple window is in close proximity to the Moderne steel entry door and both are at eye level along the public-right-of-way. The current proposal recreates an overall pattern, but presumably fails to replicate the proportions, profiles, and dimensions of the c. 1935 steel windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, and 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Frank Mallas represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked for a clarification of the proposed windows. Mr. Mallas explained that the windows would be double hung at the first floor and casements in the outer openings and fixed glass in the inner openings in the second-floor bay. Mr. Mallas added that he is now proposing horizontal muntins in the windows. The earlier application had not included muntins. He stated that the proposed muntins would be 7/8 inches wide and simulated divided light. Ms. Hawkins asked if the double-hung windows would have screens. Mr. Mallas stated that they would not. Ms. Gutterman noted that the illegally removed windows were metal. The proposed are wood. She noted that the replacements have different size muntins and different proportions. Mr.

Mallas agreed and stated that the original steel windows had five divisions; he is now proposing four because he thinks that the proportions are better. He explained that the glass dimensions are larger in the windows he is proposing. Ms. Hawkins observed that the original windows were much narrower than what is now proposed. Mr. Mallas replied that he could better replicate the dimensions with new aluminum windows, but those windows would not be ideal. Ms. Gutterman asked why he was proposing double hungs for the first floor, when they had been casements. Mr. Mallas replied that his proposal was the simplest and easiest way to come close to the original windows. He reiterated that his is a straight-forward solution. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that Mr. Mallas should provide drawings of the historic and proposed windows side by side so that the Committee can determine whether the deviations from the historic configuration are acceptable. Mr. Mallas stated that that was not possible because the historic windows had been removed and disposed. Ms. Gutterman disagreed, stating that the windows have been been lost but the matching door survives. Mr. Mallas claimed that the new muntin profiles match the historic profiles. Ms. Gutterman stated that the proposed windows are much heavier than the historic. She disagreed that the proposed window is a good match for the historic window. She added that the proposed first-floor windows are nothing like the historic windows, but the proposed second-floor, bay windows are closer. Ms. Hawkins agreed. She stated that the proposed first-floor windows have "a totally different character than what was there." She stated that the proposal would not replicate the historic windows. Mr. Mallas responded, saying that he had not intended to replicate the historic windows, but only to propose something "compatible" with them. Ms. Hawkins stated that the proposal did not meet the Standards. Mr. McCoubrey agreed and suggested that the double-hungs were not acceptable. Mr. Mallas stated that there was no good solution. Casements would not work well. Messrs. D'Alessandro and McCoubrey stated that the only way to devise an appropriate replacement was to use steel windows. Mr. Mallas stated that steel windows were inefficient "dinosaurs." Ms. Gutterman stated that Mr. Mallas had not submitted any information to justify the decisions he has made regarding the choice of replacement windows. She stated that there was no way to know if other options were wrongly excluded. Mr. D'Alessandro advised that Mr. Mallas would benefit from a custom window unit, rather than trying to couple off-the-shelf units from a catalogue. Mr. Mallas stated that the cost would be too high to fabricate a custom window. He stated that he has been directed to find an affordable window.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, and 6.

ADDRESS: 209-25 N 18TH ST

Project: Install windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Cathedral Basilica of Sts. Peter and Paul

Applicant: Robert Koochagian, O'Donnell & Naccarato, Inc.

History: 1846; Cathedral of Sts. Peter and Paul; John Notman and Napoleon LeBrun, architects

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: No

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace all clear glass windows throughout the Rectory of the Cathedral Basilica of Sts Peter and Paul; windows that currently have stained-glass in them would remain in place. The Roman Catholic Archdiocese proposed the exact same replacement in May 2010. The application was presented to the Architectural Committee. The

Committee recommended denial and the application was subsequently withdrawn prior to the Commission meeting.

The rectory postdates the Basilica and is a fine example of Renaissance Revival architecture. The existing windows are double hung one-over-one wood windows. Several of them contain stained glass. The building sits on a prominent location at the intersection of Race Street and the Benjamin Franklin Parkway. The rectory along with the Basilica is part of the Parkway's architectural ensemble of grand public, civic, and religious buildings. Three of the rectory's facades are clearly visible from the public right-of-way; two of the facades are visible from the Parkway. The north façade is not visible from any public right-of-way.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards recommend the retention of historic fabric or its replacement in kind, if the material has reached its useful life. These windows could be successfully replaced in kind. The applicant notes in his cover letter that the extruded metal windows are proposed because they are the cheaper option and would require less maintenance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Gutterman recused owing to her firm's involvement in the project.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Mr. Danta explained that he spoken by telephone with the applicant before the meeting started. The applicant explained that he had just arrived home from vacation and could not attend, owing to a scheduling conflict. Mr. Danta asked the applicant if he wished to postpone the review of the project until the August Committee meeting; the applicant requested that the Committee move ahead with the review without him.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the condition of the extant windows. Mr. Danta stated that the applicant has claimed that the windows are beyond repair and must be replaced.

Ms. Pentz noted that the Committee had already reviewed and recommended denial for an identical application. Mr. Danta explained that the earlier application had been withdrawn before the Commission had an opportunity to review it. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Committee had deemed the proposed windows inappropriate the first time and should come to the same conclusion again. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed and also noted that the windows could be repaired. Mr. Danta contended that the argument for the new windows is based solely on cost and should be made to the Commission, not the Committee, which bases its recommendations on the Standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9.

ADDRESS: 2330 PINE ST

Project: Restore exterior

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Owen Carton

Applicant: Andrew Curtis

History: 1855; major alterations, 1962

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

Preservation Easement: No

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate a rowhouse at the southeast corner of Pine and S. 24th Streets. The rowhouse dates to about 1855, but was radically altered in a Modernist style in 1962.

This is the second application submitted by the owner of this property. The first application was submitted on April 2011. That application proposed a hybrid design, which retained some of the Modernist features of the building while restoring some elements of the original mid-nineteenth century building. The hybrid approach was rejected both by the staff and the Architectural Committee. Instead, the Committee guided the applicant to choose between the retention of the Modernist alterations or a restoration of the mid-nineteenth century appearance of the building. The owner strongly wishes to restore his property to its mid-nineteenth century appearance. The owner has followed the Committee's guidance from the first review and now proposes a revised application that restores the building to its mid-nineteenth century appearance as close as possible.

The current proposal complies with the Committee's guidance and satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The revised design eliminates the Modernist double chimney on the Pine Street elevation. It retains one chimney, which is pushed back away from the cornice. The location of the relocated chimney restores an unbroken cornice line along Pine Street. Window openings on Pine Street would be reopened based on the evidence found in the historic masonry. The first-floor front façade on Pine had a storefront at one time, but traces of it were completely destroyed during the 1962 rehabilitation. The Pine Street elevation would be restored to a typical residential appearance. The 24th Street elevation would also be restored. Window openings would be reopened based on the evidence found in the masonry walls. The rear portion of the building dates entirely from 1962; the original rear ell was probably demolished at that time. The applicant proposes to create window openings along 24th Street that have the same proportions and pattern of the mid-nineteenth century windows in the rest of the building, thus unifying the entire elevation along 24th Street. The entrance to the building would remain on 24th Street. This configuration is supported by countless historic corner buildings, whose main entrances are located on the side elevations. The entire building would be restuccoed in a smooth stucco finish.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Andrew Curtis represented the application.

Mr. Danta reminded everyone that they had concluded during the earlier review that, based on comparisons with other Modern-styled contributing and non-contributing buildings in the historic district, the contributing classification of this building was most likely not predicated on its Modernist features, but instead on its ability to be restored to its mid nineteenth-century

appearance. They had concluded that the classification of this property was not intended to protect the 1962 alterations, which could be retained or removed based on the owner's wishes.

Mr. Curtis explained that his client, the owner, is in Ireland and could not attend the review. He stated that he and his client took to heart the advice provided in the earlier review and sought to restore the building as much as possible, not create a hybrid of the mid nineteenth century and the mid twentieth century. Mr. Curtis explained that he will confirm the locations of historic window openings when they undertake the interior demolition. Ms. Hawkins stated that the architect had followed the Committee's recommendation.

Ms. Pentz asked if the deck on the rear ell will have a railing. Mr. Curtis explained that the rear ell was constructed in 1962 in place of an earlier ell. He noted that the 1962 ell was built taller than the original ell would have been, disrupting the rear roof line and giving the rear strange proportions. He stated that the proposed design would restore the rear ell height to its original height below the rear eave by reducing the height of the rear parapet. The existing rear deck does not have a railing, but will need one when the height of the parapet is reduced. He is proposing a simple railing. He added that the rear parapet wall has a strange coping that will be removed. The Committee members agreed that the railing proposal was appropriate.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the two small bathroom windows proposed for the 24th Street façade. Mr. Curtis stated that the windows do not currently exist, but must be added to meet the code for windows in bathrooms. He stated that the window locations and sizes were based on privacy needs. He added that similar nearby historic buildings have such windows. Several Committee members suggested using a more vertically-oriented window. Ms. Hawkins suggested double-hung windows. She said that casements would be appropriate as well. The Committee stated that the staff could review minor revisions to the bathroom window designs. Ms. Gutterman concluded that the overall design was very successful. Mr. McCoubrey agreed and stated that the staff should review many details including the cornice and bathroom window details.

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

ADDRESS: 2003 DELANCEY PLACE

Project: Alter exterior

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Francine & Roberto Sella

Applicant: Juliet Geldi, North Street Design LLC

History: 1865

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

OVERVIEW: This application proposes work to the front and rear façades of this townhouse. The house was built in 1865 as part of a row. The prominent firm of Stewardson & Page altered in 1912 the house for then-owner George L. Harrison Jr. The alterations transformed the exterior of the building from its mid-nineteenth century Italianate appearance to an elegant Colonial Revival appearance.

The application proposes work to both front and rear facades. The front façade would retain its 1912 alterations and all window replacements would replicate the six-over-six pane

configurations installed at that time. The fine Adamesque fanlight over the front door would be retained and restored.

The application proposes two designs for the rear alterations; an owner preferred design on page H3 and an alternative on page H7. The preferred design (H3) proposes to replace an existing and unsightly roll up gate with a garage. The garage would occupy the ground-floor of the property and have garage doors and a person door. The entire garage would be finished in red brick. The roof over the garage would be treated as an open-air deck with a small greenhouse addition to the east. The alternative option (H7) proposes a garage of the similar design, with the exception that the railing on the deck would be metal rather than solid masonry and the garage would be finished in stucco rather than red brick. The greenhouse remains the same in the alternative option. The garage faces Cypress Street, which is lined with garages and rear yards of myriad styles and designs.

Both options propose to alter rear façade masonry openings and the replace windows. These alterations are the proposed in the same way in both options. The alterations involve the replacement of six-over-six windows, which date to the 1912 Colonial Revival redesign, with two-over-two windows. The rear façade has triple double-hung windows at ground floor and triple French doors with a balcony at the second floor. The second-floor balcony and French doors are visible from 20th Street. The applicant proposes to infill the middle portion of these triple windows to create two independent windows. The muntin pattern on the French doors would be simplified and the existing balcony would be retained.

The 1912 alterations by Stewardson & Page are significant. The alterations were carried out holistically and incorporate both front and rear facades in a unified composition. If the 1912 Colonial Revival alteration is maintained at the front façade, it should also be maintained at the rear, especially, given that the rear façade is highly visible from 20th Street. The two-over-two pattern proposed for the rear façade windows is problematic because the rear façade probably dates to the 1912 alteration. Maps dating to 1910 and 1921 show that the building was lengthened between those dates. The proposed pattern would create a false sense of history and style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of both garage and greenhouse options (H3) and (H7), but denial of the infill of the rear openings and the installation of two-over-two windows and simplified French doors, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Francine Sella and architect Juliet Geldi represented the application.

Ms. Geldi suggested that the rear windows would have originally been two-over-two windows, as she is now proposing. Mr. Danta replied that the front windows would have been two-over-two before the house was remodeled in 1912, but the rear would not. Italianate houses usually had six-over-six windows at the rear, even if the front windows were two-over-two or four-over-four. Mr. Danta added that the Stewardson & Page alterations at the front and rear are a unified whole. Restoring one section to an earlier appearance would not satisfy the Standards. Ms. Hawkins noted that the period of significance for the historic district includes the early twentieth century; therefore, the alterations to this building are considered significant and merit preservation. Mr. Danta noted that the property was also individually designated in 1972.

Ms. Geldi asked if the first-floor rear window alterations would be acceptable. Mr. Danta observed that the first-floor rear windows are not visible from the public right-of-way; the second-floor rear windows are. Ms. Gutterman stated that matching the brick will be difficult. Ms. Pentz asked the applicants why they want to infill the large rear openings; today, most owners want larger, not smaller openings. Ms. Geldi explained that her client feels that the interior flow would work better with fewer openings. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the middle door could be retained and fixed in place. Ms. Sella stated that the large opening makes the interior feel exposed, and it is cold in the winter. The interior would be more “cozy and livable” for her family with fewer windows. She also claimed that the middle section of the opening was added later because the lintel over it is different. Ms. Geldi asked if French doors with the middle leaf fixed would be acceptable. The Committee members stated that it would be acceptable. Fixing the door in place is not problematic, but adding brick is, the Committee members contended. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the rear façade as redesigned in 1912 is very wonderful.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants if they were willing to replace the historic six-over-six windows at the rear with six-over-six, instead of the proposed two-over-two. Ms. Sella stated that she would prefer the two-over-two. She noted that she walks her dog in the alley and has seen that most buildings on the block have two-over-two at the rear. She stated that the proportions of the six-over-six windows look “wrong.” She contended that the window openings were designed for two-over-two windows. She stated that she was compromising, meeting the Commission’s requirements on the front in exchange for doing what she wants at the rear. Ms. Hawkins disagreed that the proportions of the six-over-sixes would be wrong.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of both garage and greenhouse option H3, but denial of the infill of the rear openings and the installation of two-over-two windows and simplified French doors, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 1710 WALNUT ST

Project: Install blade sign

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joan Keiser & Barbara Wasberg

Applicant: Betty Mon, Mon & Associates Consulting, Inc.

History: 1840; H.W. Catherwood House; alts, Furness & Hewitt, 1874; storefront, 1930

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a blade sign on the façade of this building on Walnut Street. The sign would be made of wood and mounted to an existing pole. However, the pole was not approved by the Historical Commission and is an illegal condition.

Projecting blade signs are not compatible along this Walnut Street commercial corridor. Additionally, the Art Commission prohibits all projecting signage along Walnut Street from river to river.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Expediter Betty Mon represented the application.

Ms. Mon stated that there are two alternatives to the blade sign; one, a fabric banner sign, and two, a flat wall-mounted sign over the door. Ms. Mon opined that large fabric signs are prevalent on this corridor. Ms. Hawkins asked where the fabric sign would be attached. Ms. Mon stated that it would be hung from the same pole as the proposed sign. Ms. Hawkins noted that the pole is an illegal condition. Ms. Hawkins clarified that the Committee should not recommend approval of the blade sign, as it is prohibited by the Art Commission. Ms. Gutterman asked if the Committee could make a recommendation for one of the alternatives. Ms. Sell stated that the Committee could offer the applicant suggestions, but that the recommendation must be based on the current proposal as submitted. Ms. Hawkins recalled that the former tenant was “Design Within Reach” and it used the pole for a red banner sign. Mr. McCoubrey asked if real estate company signs were legal. Ms. Sell explained that temporary “for sale” realtor signs are exempted from some sign regulations. Ms. Hawkins stated that she is not in favor of banner signs and acknowledged that, although there was once a sign on the pole, the condition is illegal. Ms. Hawkins and Gutterman suggested that the applicant explore alternatives. Ms. Gutterman suggested a vinyl sign behind the glass may be an option. Ms. Hawkins suggested an awning that fits within the door opening may also be an option. Ms. Gutterman advised that the Art Commission must review any such sign application.

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

ADDRESS: 2136-42 E DAUPHIN ST

Project: Renovate building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2136 Dauphin Street Ventures, LLC

Applicant: Victor Barr Jr., VLBJR Architects, Inc.

History: 1896; 26th District Police Station; John T. Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: 7/5/1984

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate the 26th District Police Station at the southwest corner of Dauphin and Trenton Streets in the Fishtown neighborhood. The building has been vacant since the 1970s. Though the building is sealed, the openings are missing windows and doors and the masonry has severely deteriorated at several places. This application proposes to create a first-story commercial space, nine residential condominium units on the second and third stories, and accessory spaces in the basement level.

The renovation proposes installation of wood windows, doors, and gates. The proposed windows would match the historic materials and configurations. On the front elevation, a photograph from 1900 shows some evidence of a wood double door with glazing and grates. The applicant proposes to install a glazed wood door with panels and sidelights. On the side elevation, the pedestrian entry doors were originally recessed into a vestibule with a gate at the masonry opening. The applicant proposes to install recessed full light aluminum doors at the top of the vestibule stairs and a picket gate at the opening to maintain the historic entry configuration. The proposed gate is compatible with the building. The side elevation vehicular

entrance was historically open. The applicant proposes to enclose it with glass and butt-glazed doors. There is little evidence of the historic door design.

The northern rear elevation historically shared a party wall with a three-story house. The house was demolished sometime after 1984. The outline on the party wall would be stuccoed. A stair tower would be constructed in the courtyard at the southern rear elevation. An entry door with stairs would also be cut into the rear elevation within the courtyard. Two windows on the rear elevation would be infilled.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the door in the vestibule is wood, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Victor Barr Jr. and Mark Trimbath represented the application.

Mr. Barr agreed with the staff recommendation to make the vestibule door at the pedestrian entrance on the side elevation out of wood instead of the aluminum as originally proposed.

Ms. Sell noted the discovery of some historic evidence of the front door in a photograph from 1900. Though obscured, a double door with a wood diamond panel base and glazed windows with grills can be deciphered. Ms. Sell suggested the front door design be reworked to invoke the historic door design. Mr. Barr stated that they could incorporate that into their design. He explained that a door with some glazing would be necessary for security purposes.

Ms. Pentz asked about the steel columns in the buildings. Mr. Barr stated that they are not removing any columns, but are adding additional columns in the basement to reinforce the structure. Mr. Trimbath stated that one column rises to the third story.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicants considered ADA accessibility requirements. Mr. Barr stated the only ADA requirement was entry to the first floor. He added that they proposed a lift within the large glazed vehicular side entrance.

Ms. Gutterman asked for the width of the front entrance. Mr. Trimbath stated that the width is about five feet. Ms. Gutterman stated that they may need to design a single-leaf door to simulate a double door.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the door in the vestibule is wood and the front door is designed to reflect the original door seen in the 1900 photograph, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 421 S CARLISLE ST

Project: Legalize windows, shutters, and door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kirsten Hontz

Applicant: Anthony Phelps, Delaware Valley Design

History: 1850

Individual Designation: 9/28/1965

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of wood windows within a subframe and wood six-over-six muntins attached to face of the glass. The muntins are deeper than the stiles and rails and there are no interior muntins or spacer bars. The subframe decreases the pane proportions. The application also proposes to legalize the installation of a non-historic two-panel wood front door and shutters. No manufacturer or specification information has been provided.

In July 2011, the staff observed the alterations in progress without the approval of the Historical Commission or a permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. A violation was subsequently issued.

The 1996 designation photograph shows the building with six-over-six wood windows, six-panel door, and historic three-panel wood shutters at the first story. The building also had two historic fire markers that were removed.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Contractor Anthony Phelps represented the application.

Mr. Phelps apologized for not obtaining the necessary building permits. He explained that the door was custom made to match the door of the adjacent building. He stated that the muntins are not glued onto the glass. Ms. Hawkins asked how the muntins are applied to the glass. Mr. Phelps stated that they have pins that snap onto the frame. Ms. Gutterman asked about the location of the historic fire markers. Mr. Phelps stated that they have them inside the building because they are not finished working. Ms. Hawkins asked if the shutters were installed at the request of the client. Mr. Phelps confirmed that they were. Ms. Sell added that the shutters that were installed are different from the original shutters, but do utilize the shutter hardware. Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff would recommend approval of the shutters. Ms. Sell stated that the shutters are too large for the openings. Mr. Baron added that shutters were typically in a 60/40 configuration, so that the shutter rail would fall below the meeting rail of the window, allowing the shutters to be pulled closed from the open lower sash. Ms. Hawkins added that louvered shutters were typically operable and the new shutters have fixed louvers.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicant installed the sashes only or a unit within a frame. Mr. Phelps stated that he installed sashes that came within framed units. Ms. Hawkins stated that the subframe encloses the opening by two inches. Ms. Pentz added that the additional two inches changes the proportions of the windows and does not meet the Standards.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the door matches the neighbor's door. Mr. Phelps stated that the door design was requested by the owner in an effort to match the neighbor's door. Ms. Hawkins stated that the two-panel door with the fanlight mixes two different stylistic types and is inappropriate. Simply because a door is found on an adjacent building does not mean that it is appropriate for the building. The staff would have assisted the contractor in identifying the correct door, if he had applied for a permit and approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9.

ADDRESS: 411 S 18TH ST

Project: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dan Kristian

Applicant: William Middleton, WGM Architect

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a roof deck with stair house on the main block of the rowhouse at 411 S. 18th Street. The roof deck would cover most of the roof. It would be set back six feet from the front facade and would not be set back from the rear facade. The house is located in the middle of a short row of three houses. The row is bounded by streets on three sides. The staff contends that this deck will be conspicuous from public rights-of-way. The house currently has a deck at the second-floor rear.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, unless a mock up demonstrates that the deck would be inconspicuous from all public rights-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

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

Mr. Baron stated that the applicant invited him to the site to review a mock up of the deck, but when he arrived at the house and was shown up to the roof, he realized that no mock up had been constructed. Mr. Baron reported that he believes that a deck would be visible from the front and rear. He showed photographs of the site. Mses. Pentz and Gutterman stated that they agreed that it would be conspicuous from the street. Mr. McCoubrey also agreed. Ms. Gutterman stated that the stair house would be especially visible.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, unless a mock up demonstrates that the deck and stair house would be invisible from all public rights-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

ADDRESS: 14 S 03RD ST

Project: Construct building on site of demolished building
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Binyan 14 South 3rd St. LLC
Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch
History: 1894; Henry D. Dagit, architect; demolished after fire, 2004
Individual Designation: 5/5/1977
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Contributing, 12/12/2003
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a building on a vacant lot in Old City. A three-story, roman-brick, Renaissance Revival building stood on the lot. It was built in 1894 by architect Henry D. Dagit for John M. Doyle. In 1977, the building was individually listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. It was listed as contributing to the Old City Historic District in 2003. The building was destroyed by fire and demolished in January 2004. The lot has remained vacant. The Commission has plenary jurisdiction, not review-and-comment jurisdiction, because the lot is not “undeveloped.”

The application proposes the construction of a five-story building. The first story of the front facade would be clad with metal panels for the storefront. The upper stories of the front façade would be clad in brick veneer and have one-over-one aluminum clad windows.

Stucco, sliders, and balconies are proposed for the rear façade. The north or side façade would be parged in stucco with scoring. Aluminum-clad one-over-one windows and an entry door are proposed for this façade as well.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Rustin Ohler and Mark Wallace represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that he had advised the applicants to consider adding a cornice or entablature to the storefront to break up the very large, flat panels, which appear very awkward. He stated that he also advised the applicants to consider a tripartite storefront, which is typical of Old City. He noted that the civic association had objected to the design including the lack of window lintels and sills. He explained that the application proposes two options for the storefront.

Mr. Ohler reported that he had met with the civic association. He stated that, in response to its comments, he added row-lock sills to the window openings. He added that the civic association objected to the storefront design suggested by Mr. Baron. Instead of a cornice at the storefront, Mr. Ohler proposed simply canting the panel above the storefront, causing it to project out, giving the feel of a storefront cornice.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the design has been improved considerably since the last review. However, she objected to the narrowness of the brick areas between the windows. They are crowded into the middle of the façade, with wide blank areas to the outside. Mr. Ohler stated that he could adjust the window locations to provide better rhythms and proportions. Mr. Baron suggested that cast stone sills instead of the row-lock sills. They would be more in keeping with the character of the district.

Mr. McCoubrey asked why the floor-to-floor heights are so great. Mr. Ohler responded that they are seeking to match the floor-to-floor heights of a building on Market Street, which will attach to this building at the rear. Mr. Ohler directed the Committee to drawings of the streetscapes on both sides of the block. He claimed that there are buildings with similar heights on the block. Ms. Hawkins thanked Mr. Ohler for providing the streetscape information.

Mr. Baron suggested reducing the size and scale of the storefront panels to create a slimmer storefront. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the panels were too wide and the glass area too narrow. She suggested that the applicants should look at the adjacent historic storefront for proportions and scale. Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the proposed storefront was very awkward. Ms. Gutterman objected to the white color of the storefront. Ms. Ohler responded that it is aluminum colored, not white.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the design was not “acceptable” and he urged the Committee to recommend denial. He objected to the locations of the upper windows, the absence of lintels, and the row-lock sills. He asserted that the storefront was the most incompatible; the scale, materials, and lack of detailing make it unacceptable. He contended that the design should be more subdued. He stated that the architects should not be afraid of being historicist. Mr. Gallery concluded that the proposed building would be incompatible with the character of the historic district.

Joseph Schiavo of the Old City Civic Association stated that the proposed building is a strange combination of a c. 1850 styled building with a c. 1960 storefront. He contended that it would be incompatible with the historic district. He stated that the height was acceptable, but that sills and headers should be included at the window openings and the storefront should be redesigned. He rejected the aluminum material of the storefront. He suggested stone. He suggested enlarging the storefront window.

Mr. Baron stated that he had suggested the two doors in the storefront, one for the retail and one for the residential above. He asked the applicants how one would access the upper floors without an entrance. Mr. Ohler pointed out the side entrance on the plans, which is accessed from the street through a gate.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the upper window proportions were very strange and should be corrected. He and Ms. Hawkins suggested both lintels and sills. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the storefront was awkward and the aluminum incompatible. Mr. Ohler stated that the storefront design derived from the historic storefront that was lost in the fire. Ms. Gutterman suggested fixing the window proportions, and adding lintels and sills. She suggested reducing the massiveness of the storefront, in part by narrowing the vertical sections on the sides. She also suggested reducing the size of the signband area. She suggested articulating the cornice and storefront, adding terminations and other details. Mr. D’Alessandro suggested replacing the aluminum with a more appropriate storefront material. He objected to the flat panels. Ms. Hawkins stated that the design of the glazed section of the storefront will depend on the overall changes to the storefront.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

ADDRESS: 4259 VIOLA ST

Project: Legalize vinyl windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Nel Estates LLC

Applicant: Jhanel Wilson

History: 1895

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Parkside Historic District, Contributing, 12/11/2009

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize recently-installed vinyl windows. Original wood windows, some with round and pointed arch tops, were removed without a permit or approval and vinyl windows with square heads, regardless of the opening shapes, were installed in their places. Numerous people called and one wrote to the Commission to complain about the installation of the inappropriate windows. A neighbor reportedly salvaged some of the original windows. The staff requested a violation, which has been issued.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Jhanel Wilson, the owner of Nel Estates LLC, a real estate development company, represented the application.

Ms. Wilson stated that she purchased the property from another real estate investor in April 2011. She explained that she was unaware of the historic designation. She stated that the windows were in poor condition and she replaced them in the most economical way. She stated that she made “a substantial improvement to the house” and “it looks pretty nice.” She said that there are many vacant houses and vacant lots on the block. She asserted that she has contributed to the block. She asked the Committee to “overlook” the vinyl windows.

Ms. Pentz stated that many other houses in the historic district have been restored. Ms. Pentz stated that the windows that were installed do not meet the Commission’s standards. Ms. Pentz noted that only the sash had been replaced; the window frames remain. She explained to the applicant that she could install new, appropriate, replacement sash in the historic frames. Ms. Wilson stated that she was trying to meet a budget for this property and did not want to spend extra money on windows. Ms. Gutterman explained that the Commission has a process for those who claim that satisfying the preservation standards would create a hardship. Ms. Wilson stated that she thought that that process was only available to owner-occupants; she is a real estate investor. Ms. Gutterman stated that the Architectural Committee is a technical advisory committee that determines whether proposals satisfy the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards; this application does not. The Commission has a broader purview and can take circumstances into account. Ms. Wilson stated that she hopes that the Commission will legalize her windows because she does not want to pay the \$500 to \$800 per window that it will cost to install the correct sash. Mr. Baron offered to meet with Ms. Wilson to discuss the hardship process. He also suggested that she consider retrofitting and reinstalling the old windows, which a neighbor retrieved from the trash.

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

ADDRESS: 642-48 N BROAD ST

Project: Install windows and panning

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia Corp. for the Aging

Applicant: Heather Lutzker, Graboyes Commercial Window Company

History: 1904; Snellenburg Clothing Factory; Francis Bros. & Jellett, engineers

Individual Designation: 4/29/1987

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the windows on the front façade of this large former industrial building with aluminum windows. The staff approved similar windows for the less significant north façade of the building several months ago. Wooden frames would be panned with an aluminum extrusion that matches the general form of the existing frames. The masonry to glass dimensions and the muntin sizes of the old and new windows would match one another closely. The current mix of various non-historic windows would be replaced in aluminum to match the original historic configurations. On large buildings, the Commission has sometimes required wood windows in place of historic wood windows up to a horizontal break that corresponds to the height of a rowhouse and allowed aluminum or other replacement material windows above. In this case, however, the historic windows do not exist at those levels; they were replaced with incorrect aluminum windows before designation. The original window material is also in some question; the building was described at construction as “fireproof,” which may mean that it had metal windows. For these reasons, an aluminum window that matches the historic design may be appropriate.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Window salespeople William Steedle and Heather Lutzker represented the application.

Mr. Baron noted that the Preservation Alliance holds an easement on the building. Mr. Baron displayed a newly-discovered image of the building showing the historic window pane configurations. After seeing the newly-discovered image, Ms. Lutzker agreed to revise the plans of the pane configurations to duplicate the historic configurations prior the Commission meeting. Mr. Baron explained that the windows at the north façade have already been replaced with windows like those now being proposed for the front façade. Ms. Gutterman observed that the panning will change the appearance of the windows. Mr. Baron agreed, but contended that the changes will be imperceptible. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the windows on the south side would be replaced as well. Ms. Lutzker stated that they will not. She explained that the owner is a non-profit, the Philadelphia Corporation for Aging, which will restore the exterior as funds become available. Ms. Pentz stated that she deemed the proposal appropriate; it meets the Standards. Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants if they could install a mock-up so that the staff could determine whether the new windows adequately replicated the historic windows. Mr. Baron and the applicants stated that there is no need for a mock-up; the proposed windows have already been installed on the entire north façade. Mr. Baron stated that the new windows in the north façade replicate the appearance of the historic windows.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he was confused by the application materials, which are inadequate, and by Mr. Baron’s presentation of them. He stated that he could not comment on the appropriateness of the proposal until he has a chance to review

additional information. Ms. Lutzker offered to provide Mr. Gallery with additional information. Mr. Baron added that the information about the historic pane configurations was obtained during the last week and was not provided to the Committee until today's meeting. He explained to Mr. Gallery what the historic window configuration had been. Mr. Baron informed Mr. Gallery that the Commission was unaware of the Alliance easement at the time of the approval of the windows for the north façade.

Ms. Pentz stated that the Committee should recommend the approval of the proposed windows and leave the pane configurations to the staff to work out with the applicants. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the panning is appropriate. The applicants explained that the window frames are in poor condition and were modified when the current non-historic windows were installed. Mr. Baron explained that the Commission has routinely approved a change in window materials for large buildings, where window maintenance is difficult. He added that this application would return the windows to their historic configurations. Many of the extant windows are modern windows with non-historic pane configurations. Mr. Baron also noted that this building was described as "fireproof" when it was constructed. Fireproof buildings of this era usually had metal, not wood, windows. Ms. Pentz and Gutterman asked about the approval of the replacement at the north façade. Mr. Baron explained that he approved the windows for the north façade at the staff level. He explained that he did so because the extant windows were non-historic and the façade is a secondary façade. He also noted that the Philadelphia Corporation for Aging had a grant for the windows that would have expired if the application had been forwarded to a monthly Commission meeting. Mr. Steedle noted that the north windows were also very deteriorated.

Ms. Pentz stated that she is convinced that the application satisfies the Standards. Ms. Gutterman stated that any recommendation for approval should be conditioned on the Preservation Alliance's approval. Mr. Gallery disagreed, stating that the recommendation should not be dependent on the Alliance's actions. Mr. Farnham agreed with Mr. Gallery. He advised the Committee to determine whether the application satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and then to base its recommendation on that determination. He observed that the property owner must obtain Mr. Gallery's approval, owing to the easement, for the project to move forward. Mr. Gallery may or may not extend that approval, depending on the outcome of his own analysis. The two approval processes should be independent, not linked. Mr. Baron can review the details to ensure that the correct pane configurations are restored.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:45 a.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.