

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

**TUESDAY, 22 JULY 2008
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DAVID AMBURN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

David Amburn, Chair
John Cluver
Shawn Evans
Dominique Hawkins
Daniel 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

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Sabra Smith, Preservation Alliance
Elise Vider, Preservation Alliance
Michael Fettner, Lyman & Ash
Elizabeth Warshawer, Curtis Institute
Roberto Diaz, Curtis Institute
Seth Cohen, Venturi Scott Brown & Associates
Constantine Doukakis, Keast & Hood
Tim Noble, Noble Preservation Services
Sophie Boyer, Councilman Green's Office
Michael Brookshier, RAZAKCO
Alan Razak, RAZAKCO
Mary Daniels
Carl Primavera
Charles Loomis
Bonnie Schmelz
Tania Rorke, Three Bears Park
Mark Ueland, UJMN Architects
Jacqueline Roberts
S. Soctta
Karen Loveland, D2 Solutions, Inc
Helen Fele, Philadelphia Girls' Rowing Club
Judith Repp, Judith Repp Architects
Richard Thom, Richard Thom Architects
Steven Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Amburn called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Ms. Hawkins and Messrs. Evans and Cluver joined him. Ms. Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey joined the meeting later.

1610-1618 LOCUST STREET

Owner: Curtis Institute of Music

Applicant: Curtis Institute of Music

History: 1610 Locust Street, John H. Converse House, Wilson Brothers architects, c. 1893, individually designated 2/28/1967, significant in Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District

1612-1616 Locust Street, c. 1960, non-contributing in the district

1618 Locust Street, Charles Custis Harrison House, c. 1855, John Notman architect, façade alterations by Wilson Eyre, 1888, significant in Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District

Project: Demolish all but front facades of two buildings, restore facades, construct building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the entirety of the non-contributing building located at 1612-1616 Locust Street and all but the facades of the significant buildings located at 1610, and 1618 Locust Street. In their places, it proposes to construct a ten-story building incorporating the historic facades. The building will house practice spaces and residences for students and faculty of the Curtis Institute, a music school located on the 1700-block of Locust Street. The Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application for this project at its meeting of 9 November 2007. At that meeting, the Commission found that the demolitions of all but the Locust Street facades of 1610 and 1618 Locust Street for the construction of the proposed Curtis Institute rehearsal and residential building are necessary in the public interest. With this finding, which allowed for the approval of the demolition, the Commission unanimously approved the project in concept with the following conditions:

- a. the demolition permit not issue until the new construction permit issues;
- b. the Curtis Institute provides binding assurances that the project will be completed;
- c. the Curtis Institute submits photographs and measured drawings of the extant buildings at 1610 and 1618 Locust Street to the Commission;
- d. the Curtis Institute commemorates 1610 and 1618 Locust Street with a suitable exhibit that is prominently and perpetually displayed; and
- e. the front facades 1610 and 1618 Locust Street are completely restored to their 1893 and 1888 appearances, respectively.

The current application for final approval provides information related to the restoration of the historic facades and the construction of the new building only. It does not address the claim that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or the Conditions A-D. The Commission can decide whether or not to review the evidence that the demolition is necessary in the public interest again, but the applicant should be prepared to present the evidence, perhaps in an abbreviated form, to the Commission. The applicant should not assume that the in-concept approval is binding on the Commission. Section 6.7.c.3 of the Rules & Regulations states:

An endorsement of a review in concept of a development program shall not constitute a final review for permit purposes, shall not vest a right in a permit, and shall be subject to review of the final plans by the Commission before the Commission takes final action on a permit application and before a permit may issue.

Likewise, the Commission need not review material related to Conditions A-D, but the applicant should inform the Commission, preferably in writing, that it either accepts and will comply with the conditions or will contest them.

Condition E states that the facades of 1610 and 1618 Locust Street must be “completely restored to their 1893, and 1888 appearances, respectively.” The proposed restoration conflicts with this condition in several ways. At 1610 Locust Street, the applicant does not propose to restore the arched window that once graced the ground floor of this townhouse and can be seen in an historic photograph. Instead, the applicant proposes to maintain the non-historic storefront window opening and replace the existing aluminum window with a wood window that is related to the windows at the upper floors. The applicant proposes to selectively recreate eroded or damaged carved elements of the façade, with priority given to those elements visible from the street. The front door would be recreated in a simplified version, without the ornate metal grills that it once had. The balustrade at the third floor is proposed in either natural or cast stone. At 1618 Locust Street, the applicant does not propose to replicate the stained glass transom above the Wilson Eyre bay window. There appears to be sufficient photographic evidence to recreate the transom in clear leaded glass that replicates the design but not the colors of the original window.

In addition to the restoration details, two other features of the design raise concerns. The structural drawings for the stabilization of the free-standing facades propose the insertion of numerous stainless steel Helifix Dryfix anchors directly into the historic brick and brownstone of the facades to tie the cladding and backing together. To install the anchors, holes would be drilled in the front facades, the anchors inserted, and the holes patched. Anchors installed from the interior side of the facades would be more appropriate and would not result in dozens of patches on the historic facades. At the Architectural Committee meeting, the applicants offered to install the anchors from the interior.

Likewise, the proposed interior windows in the historic facades raise concerns. The historic wood, leaded, and stained glass windows in the retained historic front facades would be backed by metal windows in the interior. It is unclear whether these interior metal windows would be operable or fixed. This configuration may trap moisture between the old and new windows and may create heat pockets, both of which could accelerate the deterioration of the historic windows.

The design of the new building has remained largely unaltered from the conceptual review. The applicant has refined some elements along the Locust Street façade to harmoniously link the new building to the historic facades of 1610 and 1618 as well as the rest of the block. The use of brownstone and granite in the new construction continues the refined, restrained appearance of the block and establishes a clear link to the historic surroundings. The biggest changes occur along Latimer Street and at the residential tower. The Latimer Street façade has been changed to create a more pedestrian friendly environment. The applicant now proposes a clearly defined entrance along this elevation. The mechanical systems and louvers that were located along Latimer have been moved to the penthouse. This change in the location of the systems has led to the elimination of residential space in the penthouse.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the following conditions and the staff to review details, provided the Commission confirms its finding that the demolition is necessary in the public interest, pursuant to the Commission's decision of 9 November 2007, §14-2007(7)(k)(.4), and Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9:

- a. the demolition permit not issue until the new construction permit issues;

- b. the Curtis Institute provides binding assurances that the project will be completed;
- c. the Curtis Institute submits photographs and measured drawings of the extant buildings at 1610 and 1618 Locust Street to the Commission;
- d. the Curtis Institute commemorates 1610 and 1618 Locust Street with a suitable exhibit that is prominently and perpetually displayed; and
- e. the front facades 1610 and 1618 Locust Street are restored as closely as possible to their 1893 and 1888 appearances.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey recused owing to their firms' involvements in the projects. Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Architect Seth Cohen, engineer Constantine Doukakis, masonry preservationist Tim Noble, attorney Carl Primavera, and Elizabeth Warshawer and Roberto Diaz of the Curtis Institute represented the application.

Ms. Warshawer presented an overview of the Curtis Institute and its efforts to remain a world renowned music institution. She stated that approximately 40% of the student body are foreigners. To compete with similar institutions, Curtis must augment the amenities it offers including housing and dining facilities. Ms. Warshawer also mentioned that the number of applications to the school has dropped owing to a lack of dormitory space.

Mr. Cohen remarked that the close proximity of this project to significant institutions such as the Kimmel Center is critical to the development. He described the streetscape of the block and the differences between Locust and Latimer Streets. He stated that the project is intended to elevate and enliven the streetscapes. Mr. Cohen added that the second-floor rehearsal rooms are essential to the school's large instrument programs. He described the acoustics requirements for floor, wall and ceiling isolation. Mr. Cohen described the proposed building. He noted that the fifth floor on Locust Street will have a terrace and contain the lounge and laundry area. The dormitories will house four four-person suites on Floors 6 through 9. He stated that the mechanicals have been relocated from the basement to the penthouse of the tower. He added that the previous plan for faculty apartments in the penthouse has been removed to accommodate mechanical equipment. The tower is pushed back from Locust Street. The tower will be minimally visible from Locust Street and will be viewed as a separate project. Mr. Cohen described the revisions to the window design to reproduce the rhythm of bays. He noted that the façade material would be brownstone with bands of sandstone and limestone. He noted that it was not their intent to remove and replace original material on the historic facades, but to patch and repair the historic material. He noted that at 1610 Locust that they intend to maintain the existing storefront window masonry opening but replace the metal windows with more appropriate wood windows. He said that they did not wish to restore the original arched opening at 1610 because of the sill height of the arched windows would be 5' to 6' above the floor level. He stated that a 5' or 6' sill height would be problematic in the dining space behind the window. He explained that the door as well as the second-floor railing at 1610 Locust will be recreated from an historic photograph. Mr. Cohen described the rowhouse at 1618 Locust Street as a c. 1855 rowhouse with an 1888 renovation by famous architect Wilson Eyre. He said that they intend to repaint the cornice and bay a green color. Mr. Cohen stated that they now have enough information to and will recreate the leaded glass transom window in the first-floor bay at 1618 Locust.

Mr. Doukakis, an engineer with Keast & Hood, described the process for bracing the two historic facades during the demolition and construction. He explained that they will build internal pile structures to hold up the facades during the demolition because of the location of the Locust Street subway. He explained that tying the layers of the historic façades together with anchors from the exterior would be preferable to tying them together from the interior because it is less

expensive. He said that pinning the structure from the inside is feasible but more expensive for both historic structures. Mr. Evans inquired whether there would be any fears of spalling on the street sides of the façades if they were pinned from the interior. Mr. Doukakis stated that pinning from the interior could be undertaken without causing exterior spalling. Committee members expressed their preference for pinning from the interior to minimize the damage to the brick and brownstone facades of the historic buildings.

Mr. Nobel spoke about the delamination of the sandstone and contended that approximately 15% of the 1618 Locust front facade would need patching. He stated that Jahn patching material would be used to ensure a good color match.

Mr. Baron contended that the application presented at this meeting does not propose the restoration promised by the applicants and required by the Commission during the review in concept. He said that this project will result in the demolition of two very significant buildings. He asserted that the public deserves the restoration of the two facades in exchange for the approvals of the demolitions of the remainders of the two buildings. He stated that the complete restorations were the lynchpin of the in-concept approval. The configuration of the original first-floor window at 1610 Locust was unknown at the time of the in-concept review. However, since that review, the applicants have discovered a historic photograph of the façade. Mr. Baron explained that the original arched window could be restored using the historic photograph. He said he thought it should be executed in real carved stone as had been done at the Union League, not a cementitious patching material. He offered to aid the applicants with the restoration. Mr. Baron noted that the designation photograph of 1618 Locust includes the stained glass transom in the bay. It was removed by the former owner without the Commission's approval.

Messrs. Evans and Cluver opined that the proposed protruding bay in the new building was problematic and presented a break in an otherwise orderly, dignified street wall. Mr. Cohen replied that the bay plays with the precedent already established by other protrusions on the block including the bays on both of the historic facades that would be incorporated into the project. Mr. Diaz noted that the bay would be a great benefit to pedestrians, who could observe the activities taking place within.

Michael Fettner, an attorney with Lyman & Ash, which is located on the 1600-block of Latimer Street, stated that the requisite posters announcing the reviews had not been placed on the buildings. Mr. Primavera observed that Mr. Fettner had not suffered from any lack of notice; he was in attendance at the review. He also reported that the project team had informed Mr. Fettner and his colleague Cletus Lyman of every step of the process.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance opined that the bay is the most important aspect of the new design because it helps break up the façade into sections that replicate the widths of historic buildings on the block. He stated that the design is respectful and that the bay is a critical portion of the design. He questioned the impact of moving the mechanical equipment to the roof. He noted that the Commission can only approve demolitions if they are necessary in the public interest or an adaptive reuse of the building is not feasible, that is would impose a financial hardship on the property owner. He reported that the Commission had approved this demolition in concept as necessary in the public interest. He disagreed with the Commission's decision and asserted that there is a difference between the public interest and the public good. He supported Mr. Baron's opinion that this application, which does not propose true façade restorations, does not satisfy the conditions of the Commission's approval in concept.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval with the following conditions, with the staff to review all details.

- a. the demolition permit not issue until the new construction permit issues;
- b. the Curtis Institute provides binding assurances that the project will be completed;
- c. the Curtis Institute submits HABS-level photographs and measured drawings of the extant buildings at 1610 and 1618 Locust Street to the Commission;
- d. the Curtis Institute commemorates 1610 and 1618 Locust Street with a suitable exhibit that is prominently and perpetually displayed;
- e. the front facades 1610 and 1618 Locust Street are completely restored to their 1893 and 1888 appearances, respectively; including the arched, first-floor window, all masonry restoration in natural stone, and front door with ornate grill at 1610; and the leaded glass transom in the first-floor bay at 1618; and
- f. the pinning of the front facades of 1610 and 1618 from the interior, not the exterior as proposed.

340 S. 24TH STREET

Owner: Edward and Bonnie Schmelz

Applicant: Charles Loomis

History: c. 1830, altered c. 1970, contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler District.

Project: Legalize windows, replace front door, construct deck.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of six vinyl windows on the front façade of this building overlooking Fitler Square. In addition to the legalization, the applicant proposes to enlarge an opening above the entryway and install a vinyl double-hung window; to install a new wood entry door; to install a synthetic slate roof over the entranceway; and to construct a roof deck with a metal guard rail. The deck would be visible from Fitler Square. The building had a roof deck in the same location as currently proposed; it was demolished illegally.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the legalization of the six vinyl windows and the installation of a vinyl window over the entranceway. Approval of the deck, front door, and synthetic slate roofing over entranceway, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Bonnie Schmelz and architect Charles Loomis represented the application.

Mr. Loomis acknowledged he and his client were aware that the vinyl windows were inappropriate for this property and agreed that they would be replaced with the appropriate windows. Ms. Hawkins asked if the wood shutters would be replaced in kind. She was told that they would be. Mr. Evans asked whether the roof over the entrance door would have been slate or cedar. Mr. Danta stated that, given the period of the alterations, it could have been either slate or cedar.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the legalization of windows and the installation of the vinyl window above door; approval of front door, deck, synthetic slate roof, and operable painted wood shutters that fit the windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

500 WOODLAND TERRACE

Owner/Applicant: Kevin Takakuwa

History: c. 1850, architect Samuel Sloan; individually designated 1/22/1963

Project: In Concept – Install curb cut, driveway and parking lot.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the rear yard of this property for the installation of a driveway, and three (or four) parking spaces. The applicant claims in his cover letter that the property had a driveway and parking area on the proposed location at an unspecified date, which was later filled in. However, this claim is not substantiated with any evidence. The Historical Commission file does not contain any photographs of the property with a parking area. The proposed driveway would require a curb cut along Baltimore Avenue.

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

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

Mr. Danta informed the Committee that the meeting notice letter to the applicant had been returned to the Commission stamped invalid address despite the fact that the letter was addressed as the applicant had requested.

The Committee members agreed that the introduction of a driveway on this historic site would not satisfy the Standards.

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

311-317 AND 319 DELANCEY STREET, THREE BEARS PARK

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Tania Rorke

History: Designed by Wilhelm Viggo Von Moltke & Colling Du Cob

Project: Rehabilitate park.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to Three Bears Park or Delancey Park. This park is a significant element of the greenways in the Society Hill Historic District. These landscapes woven through the streets of the district were one of the key components of the Society Hill Redevelopment plan. The 1958 Washington Square East Renewal Plan placed a strong emphasis on the perception of restored eighteenth and early nineteenth-century buildings amidst the public walkways, parks, and outdoor sculptures. Delancey Park was designed as a rest stop in the Greenways system. The park has two distinct spaces; half the park is devoted to a children's playground and the other half is devoted to adults.

The applicant proposes to alter the adult section to the park. The alterations would involve the installation of a fence around the inner face of a limestone fountain, which is currently filled in with soil and used as a planter. The applicant also proposes to remove all the light posts that encircle the fountain and replace them with unspecified new fixtures. The rest of the proposed work could be considered restoration and would include repaving, restoration of a water fountain, and the cleaning of water pumping stations.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Tania Rorke represented the application.

Ms. Rorke described the renovations to the west or children's side park, which occurred about three years ago. She noted that the fountain had not functioned since the 1980s, when it had been filled in and converted into a planter by neighbors. She stated that the City's Law Department had advised that the light posts are a liability. She clarified that new Franklin light fixtures would be installed on existing poles.

Ms. Pentz inquired about the liability issues. Ms. Rorke explained that children regularly play in the planter space; the two-foot tall fencing would eliminate that issue. Ms. Rorke stated that she had found a fencing company to work with, and there are gardening groups who would maintain the space.

Steven Wexler of the Society Hill Civic Association supported the application, but questioned the effectiveness or appropriateness of the fence in the fountain.

The members of the Architectural Committee agreed with the staff that the Redevelopment Era park has historical significance and should be preserved.

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

1221-1223 LOCUST STREET

Owner: Larry Krasner

Applicant: Jamie Wyper, architect

History: 1891, architects Furness Evans Company, altered for Princeton Club;
individually designated

Project: Renovate building, add deck and stair tower

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the renovation of this pair of mixed-use buildings bounded by Locust, Camac, and St. James Streets. The first floor will house a restaurant. The upper floors will include office and residential space. The rear or St. James Street façade of the building will be rehabilitated; a new door and windows will be installed. A stair tower will be extended on to the roof and a deck and HVAC units will be added. Most of the work is to a twentieth-century service wing addition to the original house and will be hidden or marginally visible from St. James Street.

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

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

Mr. Baron explained that he had visited the site to view a mockup of the HVAC units. He said that they should be practically invisible from the public right-of-way in the proposed location. He said that the stair tower will be somewhat visible, but that this and other changes are proposed for a later addition to the building.

Mr. Evans acknowledged that the interior is not within the Commission's jurisdiction, but encouraged the owner to restore the significant interior, which had been the Princeton Club.

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

325 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: Nguyen Jack Trung

Applicant: Yao Chang Huang, architect

History: c. 1850 with modifications c.1900; contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District

Project: renovations, addition of bays/decks, rehabilitate façade.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes renovations to a long vacant and decaying building at the corner of 18th and Delancey Streets. The Commission approved a renovation plan in 1996, which was begun, but abandoned before completion. This plan largely follows those approved plans, but deviates with a change to the size of the rear bay and the addition of another deck. The plans call for the replacement of the mansard roof, new brickwork on the side bay, and the construction of a bay on the rear. A new deck on the side bay would be accessed through a new door in a cut-down dormer. The plans lack details for the replacement of the cornice, doors, stairs, shutters, and wood paneling on the bays. The drawing shows the replacement of a front window as a single clear pane rather than the leaded glass that existed at the time of designation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the missing leaded glass at the first floor front is replicated and the building is reroofed in slate, with the staff to review all details including window, door, cornice, bay, and stair shop drawings as well as slate shape and color, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10.

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

Mr. Baron described the long period of deterioration that the building has suffered. He explained that the application proposes two side decks, one of which was previously approved. He explained that the bays were sided with wood as is shown in photos dating to 1986. The cinder block, which is currently visible on the bays, dates to the approved but incomplete rehabilitation project. He explained that the new proposal calls for refacing the cinderblock in brick. He said that the earlier rehabilitation project had been approved and permitted more than 10 years ago. He noted that the new plans show an inappropriate door, transom, shutters and side door and provide no details.

The Committee noted the lack of details for many of the wood features. They objected to the second deck and the door through the mansard roof. They also asserted that, if the existing slate is removed, then the building must be re-roofed with real slate.

The applicant appeared at the end of the review and the Committee and staff summarized the discussion. The applicant agreed to meet with staff to correct these issues. It was also explained that this application does not include parking, which could be applied for under separate application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the front deck; approval of the remainder of the work, provided the building is re-roofed slate and the details of the doors, stairs, shutters, cornice and bay are corrected, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10.

1520 RACE STREET

Owner: Friends Center Corporation

Applicant: Mark Ueland, architect

History: 1856, individually designated

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add an entry vestibule to a connector that links the historic meeting house to a modern addition. The vestibule would enclose one window on the historic building. The applicant has shown two alternate designs. One is historicist, the other is in a more Modern style.

The staff recommends Alternate B, the more modern of the two designs, because it better matches the character of the Modern building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of Alternate B, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz recused owing to her firm's involvement in the project. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Friends Center director Vincent Muller and architect Mark Ueland represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the Friends Center has added many green or sustainable features to its buildings recently. He reported that the Center is adding conference spaces, creating a need for a more spacious entry vestibule. He showed the two alternates proposed for a vestibule addition.

The Committee members dismissed Alternate A as too historicist. They also thought that Alternate B had too much detail and solid features and should be reduced to a glazed box. Mr. Evans opined that it should have a flat roof and said the glazing should come right to the edge of the historic meeting house. Ms. Hawkins stated that she discerned enough problems with the application to warrant a new submission. Mr. Evans requested a site plan and a section through the vestibule showing the side of the meetinghouse. He said he needed to see the whole elevation to understand the massing. Ms. Hawkins asked for photographs for a visual sense. Mr. Amburn stated it was too articulated and suggested a simple glass box. Mr. Ueland explained they the Center is endeavoring to create a green complex that can serve as a model. He is concerned about the energy inefficiencies of suggested frameless glass windows. Mr. Evans suggested a minimal frame like that used at the Byrne Court House on Market Street.

Although not part of the submission, the applicants asked for the Committee's opinion on the replacement of all the historic windows in the meeting house. Committee members remarked that they would like to see a survey of conditions, but that the windows should be restored and interior storms used to increase efficiency.

The Committee recommended a resubmission with a site plan, section and photographs.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Standard 9.

1442 LOMBARD STREET

Owner/Applicant: Jacqueline Roberts

History: c. 1840 as house with corner store

Individually designated 1968, contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District, 1995

Project: Legalize door and shutters

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of two doors and vinyl shutters on 16 windows. The staff met with Ms. Roberts and her representatives on several occasions to explain the Historical Commission's process and specify the appropriate doors and shutters. Ms. Roberts did follow the process when she replaced her windows, but not when she replaced her doors and shutters. The doors and shutters are not appropriate in materials or design.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Windows Guidelines.

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

Mr. Baron informed the Committee of the many communications between staff and the applicant. The applicant was advised of the process, the appropriate windows and shutters, and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. She followed some advice, but disregarded other advice. She has explained in past communications that the area has not seen a lot of investment and that she is one of the few who has attempted to beautify the area. She also has concerns about the costs of replacing these items.

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

1601 JOHN F. KENNEDY BOULEVARD

Owner: One Penn Associates, L.P.

Applicant: Michelle Kleschick

History: 1929, designated 6/14/2000

Project: Install ATM

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a bank drop box install an ATM in a storefront along John F. Kennedy Boulevard. The drop box will be removed from the side window of the vestibule and replaced by glass applied with black-out film on the inside. The ATM would be surrounded by an aluminum panel.

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

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

Ms. Hawkins opined that an ATM was not appropriate in this location and suggested that the ATM be located inside. Mr. Evans and Ms. Pentz concurred. Mr. Amburn suggested that the mullion pattern should remain.

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

1201-1209 N. 2ND STREET

Owner: 2nd and Girard Company, LLC

Applicant: Barry Kaplan

History: 1871; designated 5/9/2001

Project: Install signage and drive-through canopy

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a blue metal internally-illuminated sign with cut-out push-through white letters. The sign would be mounted to the brick at the second-story level of the Girard Street façade. This application also proposes to construct a single lane drive-through canopy with accessory signage. The canopy will be finished in grey-beige, sand-finish stucco. Two of the canopy signs will be directional while a third sign will be a flat version of the proposed sign to be attached to the bank building, and will be face mounted to the canopy.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the internally-illuminated sign on the building, but approval of the drive-through canopy with accessory signage, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Barry Kaplan represented the application.

Mr. Kaplan explained that he had been working with staff on the large building sign. He stated that the original signage was three times as large. He explained that the bank wanted a presence and visibility on the street. The sign would be approximately 6'-8" by 3'-8" and mounted 20' above the sidewalk. Only the letters would be internally-illuminated; the background would be dark.

Mr. Cluver asked if the canopy would be located on Girard Avenue. Mr. Kaplan stated that it would be. Mr. Evans opined that the canopy was huge and described it as a freestanding gray box. He acknowledged the need for a protective cover but found the canopy and signage problematic especially for the urban setting. Mr. Kaplan informed the Committee that the canopy would have a sloping roof beyond the stucco walls and he stated that the canopy will not appear huge when viewed in relation to the building.

Mr. Amburn observed that the applicant is asking for two 80" internally-illuminated signs and one would be projecting from the historic building. Mr. Kaplan replied that the reason for the height and size is that there are trees blocking the view. He informed the Committee that this building is headquarters for Hyperion with offices on the second floor over the first-floor branch space. Mr. Amburn opined that the Commission would be more concerned with the sign projecting of the building than the canopy. Mr. Evans observed that the old signage space on the roof of the 2nd Street façade would be a more appropriate place for signage. Mr. Kaplan pointed out that that would only give his client signage on 2nd Street. Mr. Amburn pointed out that there would be the sign on the canopy.

Mr. Evans again expressed his concern about the size and design of the canopy. Ms. Pentz opined that the canopy would not be attached to the historic building. Mr. Amburn stated that perhaps the Committee could recommend approval of the canopy but not the sign on the building itself.

Mr. Evans asked if the Commission had approved internally-illuminated signs in the past. Ms. Coté replied that the Commission recently approved a similar sign, a metal solid background with light-up letters, for Roche Bobois at 3rd and Arch Streets. Mr. Amburn added that the Commission recently denied an internally illuminated plastic box sign on the 1400 block of Chestnut Street.

Mr. Amburn stated that he was more opposed to the sign on the building than the canopy. Mr. Cluver suggested that the applicant redesign the canopy, turning the huge floating mass into something lighter. Mr. Evans concurred, adding that it is not in character with the neighborhood and may set a negative precedent. Mr. Evans asked about the extent of the Commission's jurisdiction over the canopy. Ms. Coté stated that the Commission has jurisdiction over the entire property and the staff recommended approval of the canopy because it does not touch or affect the historic building; that section of the property is currently vacant.

Ms. Pentz again objected to the illuminated sign on the building, but stated that she did not oppose the canopy. Mr. Evans voiced his support for a smaller, non-illuminated sign on the building. Mr. Amburn objected to method of attaching the sign to the building. The Committee was not opposed to the canopy in concept, but was opposed to this particular design.

Mr. Kaplan stated that he and his client discussed putting neon signs in the windows. He opined that the projecting sign was a better approach.

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

1401 ARCH STREET

Owner: AFIAA U.S. Investments

Applicant: Karen Loveland

History: built 1897-99, and 1926 and by 1917 the storefronts were altered from arches to a square-head configuration, Designated 6/24/1987

Project: Install entrance

OVERVIEW: This application proposes two options to install an entrance in a window bay on the Broad Street façade of the former UGI building. The new entrance would allow direct access to a retail space. Option 1A proposes cutting down the widow and installing a storefront system with double glass doors at the street level. Option 1B proposes a set of stone stairs on the exterior that match the existing stone façade with brass hand rails, and a new brass storefront system with double glass doors.

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

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

Ms. Loveland stated that the property owner is working with a potential tenant for the space, who requires direct street to the space. She offered two options. The first, which is the tenant's preferred option, would involve removing the limestone base and windows and installing a door system and interior stairs. The second option would retain the limestone base and install an exterior stair. The applicant was unsure how long the space had been vacant.

Mr. Evans asked about the historic use of this space. Mr. Amburn replied that it was the showroom for UGI. Mr. Baron added that it was also used as office space.

Mr. Amburn was not in favor of the exterior stairs solution on Broad Street and stated that he preferred Option 1A with the interior stair. He observed that the current storefront windows are not historic. Ms. Côté stated that the original storefront windows were replaced in 1917 and were again changed before the 1970. Mr. Evans stated that he could accept the lowering of the storefront with the interior stairs. However, he did warn that the alteration would be permanent, but the tenant may be fleeting.

Mr. Cluver asked if the Committee accepted the double-door configuration. He suggested a leaf-panel-leaf configuration to maintain the wider middle window configuration of the storefronts.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance urged the Committee to consider recommending denial of both options. He opined that this was a significant façade on Broad Street. He observed that the building is symmetrical from top to bottom and stated that changing one bay in this prominent location would mar the character of the building. He added that the retail space can be accessed through the main lobby. He stated that tenants are always temporary. Ms. Loveland remarked that filling the vacant space would be good for the city. Mr. Evans stated that, if the space could not be leased owing to the lack of street access, the applicant could file a hardship application.

Ms. Pentz approved of Option 1A, which is reversible and would have only a minimal impact. Mr. Cluver did not object to the lowering of the storefront in concept, but rejected the proposal as drawn. Mr. Amburn concurred. Mr. Evans stated that he was swayed by Mr. Gallery's comments and is now opposed to installing the entranceway.

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

14 KELLY DRIVE (BOATHOUSE ROW) , PHILADELPHIA GIRLS' ROWING CLUB

Owner: Philadelphia Girls' Rowing Club

Applicant: Judith Repp, AIA

History: 1861; Individually designated 1/5/1984

Project: In-Concept – Install stair to deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a stair from a non-historic wood deck leading down to the river's edge. Currently, there is a stair inside of the building. However, the applicant seeks additional space and a code-compliant means of egress. The stair would be visible from the river, but only minimally visible from Kelly Drive.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Judith Repp represented the application.

Mr. Amburn observed that the non-code-compliant existing stair is not shown in the submitted drawings. Mr. Evans stated that, when reviewing applications, the Architectural Committee should not consider code-compliance issues. Mr. Evans stated there was not enough information to approve the application, and asked for diagrams and plans to be supplied. Ms.

Repp clarified that this is an in-concept review to seek guidance from the Committee. Ms. Repp explained that the new stair would not attach to the historic portion of the house. Mr. Culver added that the existing deck is very different from the original building and therefore is indeed a non-historic portion of the house. Ms. Repp stated the existing deck was added in 1988. Mr. Evans asked if there was a master plan for exterior alterations to the house. Ms. Repp replied that there is a master plan that will be phased over time. Mr. Evans stated that the applicant should present the overall plan. Mr. Culver commented that he considers the proposal appropriate. Mr. Evans reiterated that he would like to review the master plan as part of the final review.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept, pursuant to Standard 9.

2523 S. 20TH STREET

Owner: Michael and Lisa Grasso

Applicant: Michael Grasso

History: 1910; Contributing to Girard Estate Historic District, 11/10/99

Project: Legalize windows and door

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of eight-over-eight, simulated-divided-light, clad windows, an eight-over-eight, simulated-divided-light, clad window and twenty-light door on the second story, and the panning of brick molds. The April 2000 designation photograph shows one-over-one windows, gated second-story door, and exposed brick molds.

The appropriate windows are eight-over-eight, wood, true-divided-light sash on the first and second stories and a six-over-six, wood, true-divided-light sash flanked by four-over-four, wood, true-divided-light sash windows in the dormer. The brick molds should be exposed. The appropriate second-story door is a wood, double-leaf French door with ten lights per leaf.

The applicant contacted a staff member in September 2006. The staff member advised the applicant on the appropriate windows and Historical Commission procedure, provided a historic photograph of the building, and documented the communication.

In November 2007, a staff member observed that inappropriate changes had been made to the property without the Commission's approval or a building permit and violations were subsequently issued.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

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

The Committee members agreed that the changes were not in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

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

304 RACE STREET

Owner: Hanlan Midgette, L.P.

Applicant: Sherry Yang

History: 1925; Individual designation, 6/5/1980; contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Legalize signage

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of an internally-illuminated, plastic, box sign and vinyl banner sign bolted to the façade of this building. The February 2004 designation photograph shows a small projecting banner sign. The current signs were installed after designation without the Commission's approval or a building permit.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

Architect Richard Thom spoke to the Committee as a private citizen, not in his usual capacity as a representative of the Old City Civic Association. He stated that the sign was atrocious in his opinion as a preservationist.

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

1803-05, 1807, AND 1809 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: Metropolitan Regional Council of Carpenters

Applicant: Robert Fitzpatrick

History: 1966; Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000, non-contributing.

Project: Reconstruct façade

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconstruct the front facades of the buildings on the 1800 block of Spring Garden Street. The project proposes to join 1803-09 Spring Garden Street with neighboring 1811-13 Spring Garden Street by constructing a curtain wall over the alley between the two sets of buildings and stretch the 1925 Art Deco façade of 1811-13 Spring Garden Street over the facades of 1803-09 Spring Garden Street. Materials, dimensions, and shop drawings have not been submitted for review.

1811-13 Spring Garden Street was originally constructed in 1875 and received its Art Deco façade in 1925. It is designated as contributing within the Spring Garden Historic District. 1803-09 Spring Garden Street were constructed in 1966 of brick and stucco and are designated as non-contributing within the district. The Historical Commission reviews non-contributing buildings to ensure there is no detriment to the historic district rather than the non-contributing buildings themselves.

The building at 1811-13 Spring Garden Street was constructed much earlier and independent of its neighboring buildings at 1803-09 Spring Garden Street. To stretch the historic façade over four additional buildings creates a false history, destroys the spatial relationships of the existing structures, and is adverse to the historic significance and integrity of the contributing building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Bob Fitzpatrick and Donald Kapzy of the Carpenters' Union represented the application.

Mr. Kapzy stated that the most recent building purchased was 1809 and it was their intent to stretch the façade of 1811-13 over 1803-09 for continuity. He stated that 1809, the Martin Luther King Building, would be designed as separate and would take on a different color with cast stone panels. He stated he intends to take down the parapet of 1809 and even it with 1811-13. He noted that he plans to extend the detailing of the 1811-1813 building to the other buildings.

Mr. Amburn noted that there is no functional reason for the change. Mr. Kapzy agreed, but stated that the union would like to tie the buildings together to appear as one. Mr. Evans agreed with the staff that the proposal does not comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He suggested that the applicants treat the property like a campus of buildings; the buildings should be differentiated. Mr. Evans stated the drawings are incomplete. He also suggested that extending the lights and railings across the facades is more in keeping with the Standards and would be more cost-efficient, while also achieving the unity the applicants are seeking. Ms. Pentz likened the proposal to a painting being stretched on a canvas.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance reinforced the staff's recommendation. The historic character of the building at 1811-1813 should not be applied to the other buildings, creating a false sense of history and marring the one historically significant building. He stated that 1809 Spring Garden is unique, well-designed building with a simple character and simple openings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 2:30 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.