

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

**TUESDAY, 18 DECEMBER 2012
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, Chair
John Cluver
Rudy D'Alessandro
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Amy Stein

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

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Al Behr, Lowes Hotels
Cindy Hamilton, Lowes Hotels
Dan Joy, Rule Joy Trammell & Rubio Architecture and Interior Design
Rick Staub, Lowes Hotels
John McDevitt, Please Touch Museum
Phillip Scott, KSK Architects Planners Historians
Johnette Davies, KSK Architects Planners Historians
Todd Curry, Emerald Windows
Adam Jeckel, Studio Agoos Lovera
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Company
Sandy Brown, United Sign Systems
Dante Salvo, T. N. Ward
J. Roller, J.K.R. Partners
Sarit Kadakia, Grossman Furniture
Mark Gamba, Coronado Condominiums
Dan Campbell, Larsen & Landis, Engineers
Michael Murray, Murray Development
Joseph Serratore, Joe Serratore & Company Architects

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mes. Gutterman and Stein and Messrs. D'Alessandro and McCoubrey joined her. Mr. Cluver joined the meeting while it was in progress.

ADDRESS: 1200 MARKET ST

Project: Alter entrances and storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Twelfth Street Hotel Associates, L.P.

Applicant: Robert S. Rule, Rule Joy Trammell + Rubio, LLC

History: 1930; PSFS Building; Howe & Lescaze, architects

Individual Designation: 1/30/1968

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to the ground floor of the former Philadelphia Savings Fund Society tower. The alterations stem from a desire, on the part of the ownership, to reconfigure the guest arrival experience at the property. Currently, hotel guests arrive at a Market Street entrance, which originally served as the entrance to the main banking room in the second floor. The proposal would relocate the entrance along Market to the retail entrance further to the east. The original 1932 ground floor was altered in the 1950s, and was only “restored” in 2000 for the conversion of the tower into the Lowes Hotel. In addition to this restoration, the rehabilitation of the tower included the closure of a subway entrance along Market Street, and the installation of a canopy over the main entrance to the hotel.

The proposed alterations would reverse some of work done in 2000. The existing canopy would be removed and the original “Philadelphia Savings Fund Society” aluminum letters restored. The canopy would be relocated to the retail entrance. This entrance currently does not lead to a retail space, but a restaurant space for the hotel. The applicant proposes two alternatives. Alternative A would reopen the subway entrance and install a revolving door. Alternative B would also reopen the subway entrance, but would install double-leaf doors at that location, and a revolving door at the retail entrance. This alternative would more closely replicate the original 1932 configuration. It is known from archival photographs that the retail entrance originally a revolving door. Alternative B, however, would necessitate substantial alterations to the storefront whose aesthetic impact is not yet fully understood; it may more closely resemble the original door configuration, but at the expense of a substantial reduction in the width and presence of the curved display storefront. Neither proposal would change the proposed canopy, which would retain the same dimensions in both alternatives. The proposed canopy would expand both entrances, and it would be wider than the existing. Lastly, the application proposes to extend the aluminum frieze over the storefront. The frieze would be extended five feet on to the sidewalk, and have recessed can-lights.

The staff contends that the proposed alterations would have an adverse effect on this internationally-recognized historic landmark. The proposed relocation of the canopy and the extension of the frieze over the storefront would disrupt the spatial relationship of the ground floor and the base of the building. Alternative B would restore a revolving door to the former retail space. However, the extent of the alterations to the storefront in order to accommodate the revolving door may far outweigh the benefits of restoring this door type.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application. Preservation consultant Cindy Hamilton and architect Dan Joy, and hoteliers Al Behr and Rick Staub represented the application.

Mr. Joy explained that the hotel operators seek to reconfigure the hotel lobby. He described the interior lay out as inefficient. He noted that the hotel industry in the city has become increasingly competitive and they seek to remain viable. He stated that the original interior layout, which created a flow towards the banking space on the second floor, was a very successful design for the bank, but does not work for a hotel. The original bank entrance did not have an internal connection to the retail space on the first floor. Mr. Joy explained that the proposed design would diminish the amount of space allocated for the restaurant and devote space for the creation of a lobby and lounge. He stated that the reconfigured lobby would be accessed via two entry points; the former retail entrance and a reopened subway entrance. He stated that two options are presented, which include different door configurations. He stated that it is important to enter the lobby in a direct line, rather than the curvilinear path guests currently take. The proposed alterations would create a movement spine from the street to the lobby desk. He noted that the existing hotel entrance would become an entrance to the conference space only. Mr. Joy stated that the canopy, in its current location, disrupts the visual continuity of the former bank entrance. He explained that this vertically-oriented visual element should continue uninterrupted to grade. He stated that the canopy would be moved from its current location to a new location over the former retail and subway entrances.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the canopy would increase in size from the existing configuration. Mr. Joy answered that the canopy could retain its existing size, but that they propose a slightly wider canopy to span both new entry points. He pointed out that the application also proposes an extension of the top section of the storefront. He noted that this element is not something to which they are “married.” He explained that the five-foot extension is proposed in order to mitigate an on-going issue with falling ice in the winter. He stated that he does not feel the extension is architecturally necessary, but it is purely proposed to operate the facility in a safer manner. He noted that they are open to suggestions on this element. Ms. Hawkins asked for an explanation on the level of change necessary at the storefront to accommodate each of the two door proposals. Mr. Joy explained that there would be no change for Option A. He elaborated that there would be changes to the former retail entrance in order to accommodate the revolving door in Option B. Ms. Hawkins noted inaccuracies in the drawing. Mr. Joy clarified that the extent of the alteration necessary to accommodate the revolving door is not yet fully developed.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the original bank entrance would remain operational. Mr. Joy answered that the entrance would remain open to the public and would be used to access the conference space. Ms. Gutterman asked if there was a specific need for a revolving door, rather than double-leaf doors. Mr. Joy explained that the hotel lobby has a severe air funnel effect; it is very difficult to retain a constant temperature. He elaborated that there would be air locks inside, but that the revolving door would eliminate having all sliding doors open at the same time, and thereby eliminate the stack effect.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the ice problem. Mr. Joy stated that the ice falls from the cantilever above the ground floor and from the tower. Ms. Hawkins asked if they had considered a heat element at those locations. Mr. Joy stated that, in order to eliminate the problem, the entire height of the façade would need to be treated. Ms. Hawkins described this element as a “big gesture for a small problem.” Mr. Staub stated that the hotel had been sued over injuries to pedestrians. Mr. Joy stated that they could look at the heat element option. Ms. Gutterman pointed out that creating a five-foot cover for pedestrians to walk under is not wide enough to allow for traffic to move in both directions. She also noted that ice does not fall directly down and that wind and other factors dictate where and how ice falls from a building.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the strongest element of the design of this building is the black granite ground floor, which sweeps around the corner. She explained that introducing an element that would project from this section is not a good solution. She noted that the canopy at the former bank entrance is also not ideal, but was a compromise at the time of the conversion of the building for a hotel use. She stated that she would be open to reopening the subway entrance and installing paired doors. Mr. Joy stated that the continuation of the vertical element of the bank entrance is also very important, but it is currently visually obstructed by the existing canopy. Ms. Hawkins stated that all of the façade elements were strong; it is a very strong and successful design. Ms. Stein agreed with Ms. Hawkins. She stated that the proposed alterations would be a significant change to one of Philadelphia's most important landmarks. Ms. Gutterman echoed Ms. Hawkins' objections to the proposed design. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the proposal would yield five entry doors into the hotel, which in his opinion may be confusing for hotel guests. He agreed with the other Committee members and expressed his objection to the proposed canopy, but embraced the proposals to reopen of the subway entrance and install double-doors in the entrances. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that either door option would be acceptable to him. He stated that a revolving door would not be detrimental to the façade. He echoed the rest of the Committee members in regards to the other elements of the design. He encouraged the applicant to reconsider the design of the canopy, rather than merely shifting the existing canopy to the east and placing it over two new entrances.

Mr. Staub stated that the hotel market has changed tremendously in the past 12 years. He stated that they are ready to expend in excess of \$20 million to upgrade the building. He pointed out that the existing traffic flow in the lobby does not work at all. He stated that they want to stay in the building and alter it in ways that are sensitive to the significance of the building, but eliminating a canopy into the entrance is not acceptable for a hotel. He noted that several hotels in the city have large canopies, which are a necessity for the operation of a large and successful hotel.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated his support of the staff recommendation. He stated that the ground floor should not be altered with the proposed canopy. He acknowledged that the access to the lobby is confusing, primarily because there is no signage. He suggested that interior signage should be seriously considered. He described the proposed alterations as extensive for the problems, especially the falling ice. He noted that the need to close the sidewalk because of falling ice would only occur at most ten days out of the year. He stated that the alterations are inappropriate and excessive. He pointed out that either door configuration would be acceptable, as long as the design of the façade, specifically the curved storefront, is not altered. He described this building as not merely one of the most important buildings in Philadelphia, but one of the most important buildings in the country and one of the 100 most important buildings of the twentieth century. Mr. Joy clarified that they would be open to diminishing the size of the canopy.

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

ADDRESS: 4231 AVENUE OF THE REPUBLIC, MEMORIAL HALL

Project: Apply waterproofing system to dome

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Phillip E. Scott, KSK Architects Planners Historians

History: 1876; Memorial Hall, Herman J. Schwarzmenn, architect

Individual Designation: 7/6/1978

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application in-concept proposes to install a non-reversible coating on the outer dome of Memorial Hall in Fairmount Park. The outer dome has been experiencing water infiltration for years. The inner dome was temporarily wrapped during the rehabilitation of the building for Please Touch Museum in 2004. That intervention was a temporary solution, which protected the interior plaster finishes from further water-related damage. The current proposal is a long-term solution. The proposed material would be applied to the exterior of the outer dome. The material, known in the trade as Decothane, is a translucent mesh-reinforced epoxy. It can be tinted to match any substrate. The application includes manufacturer's specifications for the product. However, samples of the material were not submitted with the application. The applicant should provide samples of the material to allow for an assessment of its impact on the appearance of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff offers no recommendation, pending the review of a sample.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application. Architect Phillip Scott and John McDevitt, Vice President of Operations for the Please Touch Museum, represented the application.

Mr. Scott explained that the dome has been leaking from the day it was constructed. He stated that Please Touch Museum installed a temporary wrap on the inner dome, which started failing almost immediately. He noted that the temporary covering does not protect all areas that are currently experience water-related damage. He pointed out that replacing the dome itself is cost prohibitive. The proposed solution appears to be the most cost-effective and promising intervention.

Mr. Scott acknowledged that it is difficult to discuss the product without a sample and explained that a sample will be installed shortly. He described the material as a flexible material with an imbedded fabric that can be pigmented any color. Ms. Hawkins asked if the product was translucent. Mr. Scott answered that it was semi-transparent. He distributed photographs of projects where the product has been used. Ms. Hawkins asked if the material would be flexible enough to accommodate the thermal expansion and contraction of different materials, such as glass and metal. Mr. Scott answered that it is, and that the manufacturer has assured them it would perform as described. Ms. Gutterman asked where the product would be applied. Mr. Scott answered that it would be applied to all elements of the dome including the metal components except the masonry piers.

Ms. Stein asked if the dome leaks more in some areas than others. Mr. McDevitt answered that there is extensive failure and that it leaks throughout. He explained that the temporary wrap has outlived its life and needs to be replaced. Mr. Scott added that the temporary fix allows water to penetrate the dome and exposes the metal structure to water damage, while the proposed intervention would keep water out entirely.

Ms. Gutterman asked how the material is applied. Mr. Scott explained that it is hand-applied in several coats, which bond into one. He noted that the pigments also bond to the materials and create a single unit. Mr. Scott noted that several test areas would be installed at the base of the dome to explore application methods and colors. He explained that each sample would involve different cleaning approaches to find the most successful approach. Ms. Gutterman asked if the color would match the oxidized-copper color of the dome. Mr. Scott answered that it would. He noted that the dome is not copper, but steel painted to look like oxidized copper. He added that they would likely try to pigment the product a more convincing oxidized-copper color.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the guarantees of the product. Mr. McDevitt answered that the manufacturer guarantees a 20-year life span for the product. He noted that the product can only be installed by manufacturer-approved installers. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the samples should be installed and checked for an extended period of time for performance, before a full installation moves forward. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the steel structure of the dome shows signs of deterioration. Mr. Scott answered that it does not show signs of major damage, and that it has been inspected.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asked if the material would be applied to the glass of the dome. Mr. Scott answered that the application would span over the glass and metal of the dome.

Ms. Hawkins stated that a sample is very important in order to review this application. All Committee members agreed and suggested that a mock up in the field must be reviewed in order to formulate a recommendation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in-concept, provided that an in-field inspection of a sample of the material demonstrates its appropriateness before any final approval is granted.

ADDRESS: 1516 AND 1518 SPRUCE ST

Project: Restore exterior

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: R & S Realty II L.P.

Applicant: Adam Jeckel, Agoos Lovera Architects

History: 1865

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes restoration and alterations to a double brownstone in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Square Historic District. The ground floors of both brownstones were modified in the early Twentieth century; 1516 Spruce in 1922, and 1518 circa 1940. The upper stories of both houses retain their mid-nineteenth-century facades. The application proposes to restore the ground floor of 1516 to its 1922 configuration; while 1518 would retain its 1940s alteration. Both facades would have their masonry patched and restored. Front façade windows would be replaced with true-divided wood-windows in the original mid-nineteenth-century light patterns. The front door for 1518 would be replaced with a single-light door.

The proposed alterations would mostly take place at the rear of the properties. The rears of the properties face a small street that has the character of a service alley, even though the front of an apartment building faces the street. Additions are proposed for both rear ells. The rear ell of 1516 would be extended with an addition that would respect the half gable and remain below the cornice level, thus retaining this important historic massing. The rear ell at 1518 was altered in the 1940s. It does not retain its original configuration. The ell would be altered with a small addition at the third floor. This addition would square off the rear façade of the ell. The side yard would be redesigned with plantings, an ADA ramp, and paving. All windows in the rear and side facades would be replaced with metal windows that would restore the original light configurations from the mid nineteenth century. Balconies would be installed where fire escapes are currently present.

Lastly, the eastern and western elevations of the houses, which were historically party walls, would be parged. The western elevation of 1518, facing the Tourrain Apartments, is currently stuccoed. The wall would be restuccoed in areas where that parging has failed. The eastern wall of 1516, facing the Drake, would be covered by an EFIS system. The proposed system would be installed up to the edge of the façade on Spruce Street. The staff suggests that an EFIS system should be kept back a minimum of 10 feet from the edge of the front façade so as not to disturb the return of the elaborate wood cornice.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the EFIS system on the east wall of 1516 Spruce is held back a minimum of 10 feet from the front façade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application. Architect Adam Jeckel and preservation consultant Kevin McMahon represented the application.

Mr. Danta informed the Committee members that the staff had provided the applicant with its recommendation. The applicant subsequently revised the proposal to satisfy the staff's recommendation. Mr. Danta distributed revised drawings that included a 10-foot set back of the EIFS from the front façade.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the visibility of the rear of the property. Mr. Danta answered that the rear is accessible to the public from a service alley dead ends behind the properties.

Mr. Cluver asked if the roof-top mechanical units could be pushed farther back on the roof and away from the front façade. Mr. Jeckel answered that, owing to code restrictions, if the units were located further back and closer to the rear edge of the roof, a guard rail may be required. He noted that the guard rail would be taller and more visible than the units themselves. Mr. Cluver advised that the units should be pushed farther back if at all possible. Mr. Cluver asked about the proposed light fixture on the front façade. Mr. Jeckel answered that the fixture would be a globe type. Mr. Danta noted that this fixture would reviewed by the staff for the final approval as a detail. Mr. Cluver asked if a new fixture would be installed in the location of the emergency light on the façade. Mr. Jeckel answered that the emergency light fixture would be removed, and the electrical box closed with a wall plate. Mr. Cluver suggested that the box be taken out entirely and the wall patched to match the surrounding brownstone. Mr. Jeckel accepted this suggestion.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the rear windows would be aluminum or wood. Mr. Jeckel answered that the rear windows would be aluminum in the original nineteenth-century pane patterns. Mr. Danta noted that the rear replacement of windows could have been approved at the staff level.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the EFIS system on the east wall of 1516 Spruce is held back a minimum of ten feet from the front façade, the mechanical units are set back as far as possible from the front façade, and the emergency light electrical box is removed and the wall properly patched, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

ADDRESS: 1113 MARKET ST

Project: Replace doors and signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Headhouse Retail Associates, L.P.

Applicant: Daniel DeSalvo, T.N. Ward Company

History: 1893; Reading Terminal Headhouse and Market; Wilson Brothers and Francis Kimball, architects

Individual Designation: 2/5/1981

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install signage and alter doors and storefront systems at the Hard Rock Café in the Reading Terminal Headhouse building, located at the northeast corner of 12th and Market Streets.

A 36-inch by 34-foot LED sign is proposed to wrap the corner entrance under the large guitar-shaped sign, replacing the existing channel letter signage.

In January 2012, the Commission's staff approved alterations to the corner entrance and the installation of a door in a non-historic storefront system in the bay to the east of the corner along Market Street. The details of the replacement corner entrance and new doorway were specified to match the details of the existing storefront systems along Market Street. That work was partially executed, but not entirely in compliance with the approval. This application proposes to amend the staff approval and install frameless glass doorway systems at the corner and in the storefront system in the bay to the east of the corner. The new doors would not match the existing storefront systems.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented to application to the Architectural Committee. Contractor Dan DeSalvo and sign manufacturer Sandy Brown represented the application.

Mr. DeSalvo stated that the frameless door proposal is not part of this application. He explained that they have installed the doors that were approved by staff in January 2012 and will finish the project according to that approval. Ms. Sell noted that the doors, as shown in the application, have been withdrawn from this application and the Committee will only consider the signage at this time.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the proposed signage is not appropriate for this building and that the current signage and guitar is ample signage for this location and business. She stated that this proposed signage is not compatible with the architecture and design of the historic building or the current signage. She noted that the current signage is appropriate. Mr. Brown argued that there is similar scrolling LED signage across the street. He also noted that the image on the screen could be static, not animated. Ms. Hawkins explained that the Committee cannot control content on this type of signage. Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance stated that the channel letters are appropriate and should be retained. He stated that the proposal is not consistent with the historic building or the original Hard Rock storefront design. Mr. Cluver stated that the guitar fits nicely in the corner of the building and the design with the channel letters is appropriate. Ms. Gutterman agreed that the channel letters should be retained.

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

ADDRESS: 1616-26 WALNUT ST

Project: Install signage and awnings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1616 Walnut, L.P.

Applicant: Jonathan Broh, JKR Partners LLC

History: 1929; 1616 Walnut Street Building; Tilden, Register & Pepper, architects

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install awnings and signage on the façade of this Art Deco building.

The building has two original storefronts, which flank the main entrance. The building was an office building, but is being converted to residential use. However, the two ground-floor spaces will continue their commercial uses. The storefronts each have a doorway directly to the sidewalk and a large, ornate Art Deco window. The storefront windows are comprised of transoms over large plate glass windows. They have decorative metal frames and transom bars. The storefront window at the east appears to be entirely original. Its twin to the west has been slightly altered but retains most of its original features.

Illuminated channel-letter signage is proposed for both storefronts. The signage at each storefront would be attached to a metal structure that would span the window opening and attach within the opening to the jambs. The structure would be located above the transom bar in the transom area. The signage attached to the structure would be metal lettering with internally illuminated faces. The proposed signs are currently generic, but would be customized based on the tenants' branding. The Historical Commission approved similar signage for the storefront windows in January 2012, but it was not installed. Awnings are proposed over each entryway to the retail space. The awnings would be fabric with closed sides and would be installed within the opening below the decorative masonry detail. Brass plaques are also proposed for the building façade between the entrances and storefront windows.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented to application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jerry Roller represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the application provides a conceptual design that, if approved, would be finalized within the set parameters when new tenants occupy the spaces. Mr. Roller affirmed that they proposed this design in order to be able to present a complete signage package to prospective tenants. He explained that a pre-approved design, the details of which could be reviewed by staff, would allow for easier negotiations with prospective tenants. He stated that, if a future tenant's design proposal exceeds these parameters, then the staff could forward the application to the Architectural Committee and Commission for consideration.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the second bar of the signage system does not appear to be necessary and the number of penetrations to the building could be decreased by a drop bar for an additional line of lettering. Mr. Roller argued that many brands along Walnut Street, like Kenneth Cole, have a double bar for signage. Ms. Gutterman asked about the dimensions of the glazing that would be revealed from the top of the lettering to the masonry. Mr. Roller stated that there would be at least four inches of glazing between the top and sides of the signage and the scalloped detail below the masonry.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance informed the Committee that his organization holds an easement on the building, which would allow the Alliance to be more restrictive than the Committee's recommendation. He stated that he is not sure if this application is an in-concept review or a final proposal as there are many variables that would change the appearance of the signage. He explained that the building has a strong symmetry that should be echoed in the signage. Mr. Cluver asked the applicant if illumination is necessary for this proposal along Walnut Street, given that there is significant street lighting. Mr. Roller asserted that its illumination is necessary for people to be able to locate the building and its stores. He argued that the street lighting is not enough, even at night.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the letters are no larger than 12 inches on the top bar and eight inches on the bottom bar and that there is a minimum of a three-inch reveal of glazing around the top and sides of the lettering and logo, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 3431 W PENN ST

Project: Install aluminum-clad windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Debra and Edward Homentowski

Applicant: Todd Curry, Emerald Windows, Inc

History: 1930

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Tudor East Falls Historic District, Contributing, 10/9/2009

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove deteriorated original steel windows from the front façade of the house and replace them with aluminum-clad windows. The new windows are a reasonable match for most of the dimensions of the historic windows except the central vertical mullion. The existing French casement windows have a central vertical dimension that is three and one-quarter inches wide. The new vertical element with the added post will be five inches wide. The staff has been working with another homeowner on options that may better match the historic dimensions and is awaiting additional information. Although new steel windows could be fabricated to match the historic dimensions exactly, they would likely be quite expensive and therefore infeasible. Other options include restoring the original sash and retrofitting them with a second layer of glass for added efficiency as well as other manufacturers' aluminum or clad units that may have thinner vertical mullions. The staff will present additional information at the Architectural Committee meeting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff offers no recommendation until additional information is collected.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Window provider Todd Curry represented the application.

Mr. Baron summarized the staff's concerns, which centered on the potential loss of the original windows as well as the deviation between the dimensions of the existing and proposed vertical mullions. Mr. Baron explained that he has learned that the existing windows can be replicated in steel, but at a high cost, and that some aluminum and aluminum clad windows can better replicate the mullion dimension. He also explained that the existing windows could be retrofitted to function much more efficiently. This has been done by removing the paint from the windows, reglazing them with double-pane glass, and creating a gasket seal to prevent air infiltration around the edges.

Mr. Curry acknowledged that his window does not exactly replicate the dimensions of the steel windows, but noted that the window had been approved for another similar property in the historic district. Mr. Baron explained that that application had been approved because the historic steel window was already missing and the new window was replacing a non-historic vinyl window.

The Committee members commented that there should be some flexibility when reviewing replacement windows for side and rear windows in the district, but that the historic appearances of the front-façade windows, which characterize the buildings, should be preserved.

Mr. Cluver suggested that, to save energy, the owner should install gaskets around the edges of the existing windows where the most air infiltration occurs.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 18 DECEMBER 2012

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Ms. Gutterman contended that allowing the removal of the original steel windows would set a very bad precedent.

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

ADDRESS: 74 N 02ND ST

Project: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: PSNU Dhangela Properties

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto Designshop Inc.

History: 1920

Individual Designation: None

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 a design that has been revised since it was reviewed by the Architectural Committee last month. The application proposes adding signage to this corner property. A furniture store occupies several connected structures on the property. The project seeks to visually link the various structures with signage. Six banners lit by wall sconces would be added to the building. A metal channel with metal letters and indirect lighting would be installed across the facades of the building. The transoms above the windows would be restored with clear glass. A banner, painted signs, and a metal sign would be added at the side and rear. Large signs would span the parking areas on Arch Street and Little Boy's Way. Since the Committee reviewed this application at its November meeting, the proposal has been revised. On the corner building, the horizontal sign would be thinned down at the vertical piers to avoid disrupting those vertical elements. In addition, the application now proposes to remove the billboard on top of the building. The staff still has concerns about painting the stuccoed party walls a dark grey color. However, if they must be painted, then a cream or beige to match the underlying stucco material would be preferable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the application, provided the stucco is painted a cream or beige color with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Storefront Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Adam Montalbano and store manager Sarit Kadakia represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins thanked the applicants for listening to the Committee's recommendations and modifying the proposal since the last review by the Architectural Committee. She and others expressed a concern about the banner stretching across the parking area. Mr. Kadakia explained that the large banner is intended to convey the large size and scope of his showroom to potential customers.

Mr. Cluver questioned the drainage of the light channel and the possible rust staining that would result from poor drainage. Mr. Montalbano said that he would work on improving the design detail.

Mr. Baron stated that the painted signage could be construed as a mural, preventing the Commission from considering its content. The Committee dismissed his concern as absurd.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the banner spanning the parking lot, but approval of all other aspects of the application, provided the horizontal sign bands are no more than 24 inches tall, the stucco is painted a light-grey color, and the rooftop billboard is removed, with the staff to review details.

ADDRESS: 2201 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Replace metal cornice in fiberglass

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Coronado Condominium Association

Applicant: Eric Larsen, Larsen & Landis

History: 1910; Coronado Apartments; Milligan & Webber, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a deteriorated pressed metal cornice and replace it with an identical cornice in fiberglass. The staff met with the engineer to discuss the possibility of restoring the existing cornice or, failing that, to replace the cornice in its original material. The engineer is investigating both options and will discuss them with the Committee.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that repair or replacement in the original material proves infeasible, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Engineer Dan Campbell and property manager Mark Gamba represented the application.

Mr. Campbell explained that Mr. Baron had asked him to document the condition of the cornice in photographs and to price out the replacement of the cornice in its original metal material. Mr. Campbell passed around his photographs of the extensive and consistent damage throughout the cornice. He claimed that, because of the amount of bird guano in the lower parts of the cornice, it is not possible to assess the damage to that area at this time. Mr. Campbell said that he recently sought bids for replacing the cornice in metal; two of the three bids provided prices that were less expensive for metal than for fiberglass.

Mr. Cluver wondered whether the fiberglass would provide a more accurate replica of the existing than the metal. Other Committee members expressed a concern about the spacing of joints in the fiberglass material.

Mr. Baron agreed that accuracy would be the most important question in any staff review of details, but contended that, if it is feasible to reproduce the cornice in the original metal material, then the Standards would call for the metal over the fiberglass.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposed replacement in fiberglass, but approval of the replacement of the cornice in pressed metal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 18 DECEMBER 2012

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

ADDRESS: 245 S 16TH ST

Project: Construct trellis

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Peter Bloomfield

Applicant: Peter Bloomfield

History: 1840

Individual Designation: 6/7/1973

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

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a trellis with a metal canopy, cable, and planters. A powder-coated steel canopy would be installed between the first and second-floor levels of the side or Latimer Street façade. It would project one foot and three inches from the building. The canopy would be broken into six segments that would span the entire width of the wall. In four areas, lattices of cable would run between the canopy and planters on the ground, which would be attached to the wall. The material of the planters is not indicated in the application.

Also, the large-size drawings submitted with the application include a photomontage apparently proposing a mural for the wall. Although the photograph of the wall is included on the otherwise-identical reduced-size drawings submitted with the application, the mural is not superimposed on the photograph. It is unclear whether the application is proposing a mural.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

Ms. Gutterman asked the staff why this addition had been proposed. Ms. Cote responded that, according to the applicant, the trellis is intended to prevent graffiti. The Committee members commented that there are other less intrusive ways to combat graffiti. They contended that the addition of the trellis system does not satisfy preservation review criteria.

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

ADDRESS: 516 CYPRESS ST

Project: Construct rowhouse

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: 513 Delancey Street LLC

Applicant: Joseph Serratore, Jos. Serratore & Co. Architects

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Non-contributing, 3/10/1999

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story, single-family dwelling on a vacant lot in the Society Hill Historic District. The lot is “undeveloped” and the Commission’s

jurisdiction is Review-and-Comment only. The 500-block of Cypress is a narrow street lined with a mix of rowhouses and garages.

Two schemes are proposed for the front façade. Both schemes propose four-inch veneer brick cladding. Both include solid-wood entrance and garage doors with transoms at the first floor. They propose double-hung windows, decorative window guards, and composite trim and moldings. Scheme One is preferred by the property owner. Scheme One includes a second-floor projecting bay and a third-floor terrace on the bay. Scheme Two offers a flat façade with traditional row house fenestration pattern at the second and third floors. Two decks are proposed. One would be located on the two-story rear portion of the building. It would have an open spiral stair to access a roof deck on the main block. The roof deck would be set back 10 feet from the front façade and have metal railings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff comments that Scheme Two would be more compatible with the district. The windows should be wood or aluminum clad with exterior muntins.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Joe Serratore and developer Michael Murray represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins concurred with the staff recommendation, stating that Scheme Two would be more appropriated with the traditional fenestration pattern and the full brick façade.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the window guards. Mr. Murray replied that they are basically window planting boxes. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that they be removed from the design.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the shutters have louvers as was typical for upper-story shutters. He also advised that the shutters should correspond to the sizes of the window openings. He suggested that the transom over the garage be eliminated from the design. He stated that he preferred no garage at all.

Mr. Baron cautioned the applicant against using a “colonial brick” with a mottled color and suggested that the brick should be a single red color, as is typical in the neighborhood

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that Scheme Two would be more compatible with the district. The windows should be wood or aluminum clad with exterior muntins. The window guards and garage transom should be eliminated from the design.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 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.

Storefront Guidelines: Not Recommended: Using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy ... character-defining features of the historic building.