

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

**TUESDAY, 25 MAY 2010
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL**

PRESENT

John Cluver
Rudy D'Alessandro
Shawn Evans
Suzanne Pentz

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Erin Coté, Historic Preservation Planner II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

Pui Tong Chin
Yao Huang, YCH Architects
Lorna Katz-Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Ian Cope, Cope Linder
John Bushnell, Cope Linder
Stephen Tai
Richard Scafidi
Herb Reid
Richard Wesley, Wesley Architects
Hanna Cohan, Wesley Architects
Ron Patterson, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP
Joseph Volpe, Cooperage
Stephen Beacham, Daroff Design
Michael Williams, Hill International
Lisa Deats, Historic Philadelphia, Inc.
Amy Needle, Historic Philadelphia, Inc.
Jeffery Hayes, Jeffery Hayes Architect
Robert Koochigian, O'Donnell Naccarato Engineers
Msgr. Michael T. McCulken, Cathedral Basilica of SS. Peter and Paul
Lucy Stackhouse, Fairmount Park Trust
George Wilson, Meyer Design, Inc.
Adam Montalbano, Moto Designshop, Inc.

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Pentz and Messrs. Cluver, D'Alessandro, and Evans called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

133 N. 11TH STREET

Owner: Pui Tong Chin

Applicant: Yao Chang Huang, YCH Architects

History: c. 1840

Designation: Individually designated, 4/25/1974

Project: Demolish rear ell, wall, roof, and dormer, construct addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes demolition, alterations, and an addition at the rowhouse at 133 N. 11th Street. It proposes to demolish the rear wall of the main block at the second, third, and fourth floors, rear slope of the roof and dormer on the main block, and a small rear extension. The large, non-historic, one-story rear addition would be retained. A large, rear addition would be constructed at the second and third floors; a deck would sit on the addition. A new, nearly flat roof without dormer would be added to the rear half of the main block. The front façade would not be altered.

The rear of this building opens onto Clifton Street, a service alley. The proposed alterations would be visible from the alley and obliquely at a distance from Cherry Street.

The proposed demolition may be extensive enough to exceed the “significant part” threshold in the legal definition of “demolition.” If it does, it would qualify as a “demolition” in the legal sense. In that case, the Commission may not approve the proposal “unless the Commission finds that issuance of the permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Commission finds that the building, structure, site or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.”

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application. Property owner Pui Tong Chin and architect Yao Chang Huang represented the application.

Mr. Farnham advised the Committee that it should determine whether the removal of historic fabric proposed in this application exceeds the threshold that separates alteration and demolition. He reminded the Committee of a recent application for 117 and 121 Pine Street, which proposed the removal of the rear roof and dormer; the Committee opposed those removals. Mr. Farnham acknowledged the deteriorating conditions at the property and noted that the rear faces Clifton Street, a service alley.

Mr. Huang explained that the current owner has owned the building for many years and it has been vacant above the first floor for four years. He stated that the building is in very poor condition. He reported that the rear dormer has been leaking, allowing significant water infiltration. Mr. Huang stated that they would like to build additions at the second and third floors at the rear and to raise the rear roof for more headroom. A deck would be built on the third-floor addition. He explained that the rear is difficult to see from the public right-of-way. He added that several neighbors have already modified the rears of their buildings. Mr. Evans stated that the application proposes to demolish most of the historic building, with the exception of the front façade and front slope of the roof. Mr. Huang stated that the floor structures would be salvaged if possible; however, water has leaked into the building, destroying some of the structure. He noted that the chimney would be retained, although it was not shown as retained on the drawings originally submitted.

In response to Mr. Farnham's contention that this application proposes similar demolition to last month's rejected application for 117 and 121 Pine Street, Mr. Evans countered that this is a very different location. He asserted that it would not be worth saving the rear of this building because "this area is not going to become Pine Street." He added that the floor plans show that the building is unusable.

Mr. Evans asked about the changes to the front façade, which he suggested occurred after designation. Mr. Farnham stated that the buildings in this row are not well documented in the Commission's files. He showed the Committee a photograph taken after designation that documents that the façade was painted, but not stuccoed. Mr. Evans contended that the front façade is the only façade that contributes to the public; he suggested that it should be restored. Mr. Farnham noted that the front facades of this designated row of buildings have been altered repeatedly since designation without permits or approvals. Ms. Pentz asked the staff if the Commission has documentation of the original conditions of these front facades. Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission does have early photographs of this row showing the facades before they were significantly altered. Ms. Pentz suggested that the front façade could be restored to mitigate the demolition at the rear. Mr. Huang stated that his client must repair the water infiltration and structural problems before he spends money on the front façade and storefront. He noted that his client does not have a tenant for the storefront at this time. Mr. Farnham retrieved a photograph from the property file showing the original condition of the early twentieth-century storefront.

Mr. Huang asked Mr. Farnham to clarify which buildings in the row are designated. Mr. Farnham replied that 125 to 133 N. 11th Street are designated. He stated that the building at 135 N. 11th Street, which is part of the c. 1840 row, was not designated because its gable roof had been demolished and replaced with a flat roof prior to 1974.

Messrs. Evans and D'Alessandro suggested that the Committee would recommend approval of the demolition at the rear if the early twentieth-century storefront was restored. Mr. Evans asked Mr. Farnham if such a recommendation would skirt the demolition question. Mr. Farnham said that any determination that the work at the rear constitutes an alteration or demolition is unrelated to any restoration at the front. He explained that the staff had chosen to base its recommendation of denial of the work at the rear on the Standards and not on the demolition clause in the ordinance because the staff feared that, if pushed in that direction, the applicant might be able to prove that the building could not be feasibly adaptively reused, leading to the loss of more historic fabric. He advised the Committee that it could determine that the work at the rear was an alteration and not a demolition and therefore recommend approval of it. However, he cautioned the Committee not to venture beyond the scope of work proposed by the applicant or to recommend approval of demolition of the rear on the condition that the storefront is restored. He advised the Committee that it could recommend approval of a package that includes work at the front and rear, but only if the applicant revised the application to propose the work at the front. He advised against a recommendation that appeared to authorize demolition in exchange for work outside the applicant's scope. Mr. Huang stated that the current scope does not include the storefront area. He asked the Committee to elaborate on its thinking and outline the work that should be done to the storefront.

Mr. Evans stated that he would recommend approval if the storefront were restored; the upper floors could be left as they are. Mr. Evans stated that the storefront cornice, transoms, windows, and door should be restored to the photograph in the Commission's files.

Mr. Chin stated that he is currently losing money on the building. The taxes have tripled, but the rent has not. Only the first floor is able to be rented. He stated that he must rehabilitate and add to the building to make it profitable. He agreed to restore the storefront if that was the only way to obtain an approval for the addition and alteration at the rear. Mr. Huang asked if the storefront would have to be replicated in wood. He stated that his client would prefer to replicate it in aluminum. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission may be willing to approve a storefront in the spirit of the missing early twentieth-century storefront. Mr. Huang also noted that he would need two doors at the storefront. The original only had one door. Mr. Farnham advised the applicants that, if they decided to revise their application to include the storefront work, then they should submit a revised drawing that includes the storefront. He also noted that the staff could approve a restoration of the storefront without referral to the Commission.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the first-floor front façade is restored to its early twentieth-century storefront appearance, with the staff to review details.

131 N. 20TH STREET

Owner: Dale You & Stephen Jay Tai

Applicant: Yao Chang Huang

History: c. 1860

Designation: individually designated, 4/28/1970

Project: Construct rear additions and deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct two additions at the rear of this property. One would be an addition to the non-historic rear garage. A roof deck with black metal railings would be constructed on this addition. The second would be an addition to a small stair tower for access to the deck. Both additions would be clad in stucco. This application also proposes to cut two new windows in the non-historic garage.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Yao Chang Huang and property owner Stephen Kai represented the application.

Mr. Huang introduced color photographs and described the proposal. He stated that the addition would be constructed on the existing, non-historic, stucco garage, where a deck is now located. A new deck would be constructed on the addition. He stated that he intended for the proposed windows in the garage to follow the rhythm of the existing windows. He explained that the deck would be accessed through a new addition on an existing stair tower. The stair tower addition would look like a pilot house and would block one window in the rear ell. Mr. Evans objected to the covering of the window. He stated that he was hesitant to recommend approval of an application that does not appear to be completely worked out. Mr. Huang contended that Mr. Evans was not reading the plans correctly and explained that the deck would be accessed through the pilot house and would be used by the first and second-floor occupants. Mr. Evans asserted that the corner properties are special and the historic massing should be retained. He also claimed that the stair would not work as proposed. Mr. Huang stated that he may be able to relocate the stair to the deck. The Committee members suggested that he restudy the design.

Mr. Evans advised that the Committee should not recommend approval of a deck that has no access, even if the deck itself was appropriate.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the addition on the garage and the two new garage windows, but denial of the deck and stair tower addition.

725 WALNUT STREET

Owner: 725 Walnut Street Real Estate Investors

Applicant: Frank Conlin

History: c. 1865

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

Project: Legalize replacement of storefronts

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the replacement of two storefronts that were installed without the Commission's approval. The proportions of the new storefront elements are awkward and their stained finish causes them to stand out from the building. Also, the photographs show a projecting plastic box sign, which the Commission did not review or approve.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the storefronts, provided they are painted to match the rest of the wood trim of the building, but denial of the projecting plastic box sign, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

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

Mr. Evans asked if the storefront openings were original. Ms. Cote replied that this building originally had storefront openings flanking the central entrance, but the openings were enlarged at some point.

Lorna Katz of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that the Association supported the approval of the new storefronts.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the storefronts, provided they are painted to match the rest of the wood trim of the building, but denial of the projecting plastic box sign, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

1910 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: Robert D. Harvey

Applicant: John Bushnell

History: vacant lot; building at the time of designation, c. 1886; accidentally demolished during construction on adjacent lot in 2005

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

Project: In concept: Construct residential building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes, in concept, to construct a six-story residential building on a vacant lot. A building stood on the lot at the time of designation. That building collapsed after

its foundation was undermined during the construction of the building to the east at 1906-08 Spring Garden Street. The proposed building would be taller than the historic buildings on the block, but would be similar to the new building to the east, which the Commission approved. Also, the Commission approved a five-story building for this lot at 1910 Spring Garden Street in 2006; however, that building was not constructed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Ian Cope and John Bushnell represented the application.

Mr. Cope stated that he was unaware that the Commission had approved a new building for the site in 2006. Ms. Cote showed the plans that were approved in 2006 to the Committee and applicants.

Mr. Cope stated that the building that they are proposing would align with the adjoining building to the east. He described the proposed building, which would have an office at street level, three apartments at floors two, three, and four and a bi-level owner's residence on the upper floor. It would have parking at the lower level, which would be accessed from the street at the rear. Mr. Evans noted that the plan approved in 2006 called for a five-story building. This application proposes a six-story building. Mr. Bushnell noted that the sixth floor would be set back. Mr. Evans stated that he was surprised that the Commission had approved the adjacent building; he objected to its blank mechanical penthouse. Mr. Evans stated that he was "uncomfortable" with the proposed double-mansard. He asserted that it would have a non-historic massing. He asserted that the profile from the west would be awkward. Mr. Cope responded that that profile would only be minimally visible down the narrow gap separating this building from the neighbor to the west. Mr. Bushnell stated that the upper floor would be set back about 13 feet and would not have a visual impact. Ms. Cote stated that the historic building that stood on the site, which collapsed, had a single mansard. Mr. Evans contended that the upper floors would be visible from the street because the historic building to the west is relatively short and Spring Garden Street is very wide. Mr. Cope asserted that the upper floors would not have a significant visual impact from the street.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked the applicants to comment on the materials. Mr. Cope remarked that the proposal is in concept, but they have made some materials choices. The main façade would be brick. The bay is currently depicted as wood, but they are also considering a metal cladding for the bay. The mansard would be clad in standing seam metal. The base would be limestone or cast stone. The windows would be double-hung with sliders at the upper floors.

Ms. Pentz asked about the Commission's jurisdiction over the site. Mr. Farnham advised the Committee that the Commission has full jurisdiction over the property because a building stood on the site at the time of designation. Ms. Pentz asked about the historic building. Ms. Cote stated that it was a four-story Italianate brick twin with a mansard, like the remaining historic buildings on this side of the block.

Ms. Pentz stated that she would recommend approval as submitted. Mr. Evans commented that he would support the proposal if the upper story were removed. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with Mr. Evans. Mr. Cope stated that there is no zoning height limit in this area. Mr. Evans again asserted that a building of six stories is too tall for the historic area.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the application, provided the height is limited to five stories.

668 N. 19TH STREET

Applicant: Dan Grover

Owner: Haleh Kadkhoda

History: 1895

Designation; contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize replacement of deck and porch flooring and structure

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the demolition and construction of a roof deck and two rear balconies. The previous roof deck was situated on the main block of the building and was present at the time of designation. The deck was demolished and reconstructed and two rear balconies were rebuilt without an approved building permit application by the Historical Commission or permit by the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

The staff met with the applicant on-site during the reconstruction and informed him of the Commission's jurisdiction and requisite permit. The work continued and is now complete.

In 2005, the applicant also installed vinyl windows without permit and applied to the Commission for legalization. The Commission denied the legalization. The applicant subsequently appealed to the Board of License & Inspection Review. The Board affirmed the City and the windows remain in violation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Contractor Dan Grover represented the application.

Mr. Grover stated that the property owner had hired him to repair the deck and rails, which had deteriorated. Some of the structure was deteriorated as well. He stated that the deck cantilevered out beyond the façade. He removed that section, pulling the deck back onto the roof. He added that he used a composite material. Mr. Evans asked if the balconies existed and were repaired or if they had been recently added. Mr. Grover stated that he had repaired the balconies. He asserted that he built nothing new. Mr. Grover added that he had no knowledge of the illegal windows. Ms. Sell clarified that the deck and balconies existed at the time of designation. She stated that, despite the fact that the deck existed at the time of designation, the recent work required a permit. Mr. Grover explained that he is not familiar with working in the city, but the property owner is an attorney. He stated that the owner-attorney investigated the matter and advised him that no permits were needed. Mr. Grover acknowledged that Randy Baron of the Commission's staff had visited the site while the work was underway and advised him that he needed to obtain the Commission's approval and a building permit for the work. Mr. Grover stated that he removed the decking and railings and moved the structure of the deck about 14 inches back onto the roof.

Ms. Sell explained that, although the deck existed at the time of designation and is grandfathered, it is only grandfathered as long as it is not modified. The Commission has the authority to review proposals to modify grandfathered features to ensure that the modifications comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Mr. Evans asked about access to the deck. Mr. Grover stated that it is accessed via a spiral staircase through a pilot house. He stated that he did not modify the pilot house. He stated that he repaired the deck to make it safe for the property owner, who was seven months pregnant. He stated that he completed the repair after being told that he needed a permit because he had committed to do the job.

Mr. Grover again stated he had no connection to the illegal window replacement. He stated that he has a contentious relationship with the property owner. He asserted the owner no longer takes his calls and has not paid him for some of the work. He explained that he had filed the legalization application because the building inspector had told him that he needed to make the application. Ms. Sell noted that he had signed the building permit application form attesting to the fact that he has the owners' authorization to make the application. Mr. Grover again stated that he made the application upon the advice of the building inspector, but did not have the property owner's explicit permission to submit it.

Several Commission members suggested recommending legalization of the work to the deck and balconies in exchange for the replacement of the illegal windows. The staff noted that the window violation is unrelated to the deck issue and should be enforced.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the legalization of the work to the deck and balconies, provided the illegal windows are replaced with historically appropriate windows, with the staff to review details.

333 S. 7TH STREET

Applicant: Vincent Corso

Owner: Richard Scafidi

History: 1831-39

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

Project: Rebuild chimney, replace watertable and bulkhead, alter windows and doors, etc.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore and alter the exterior of this corner property. Restorations and repairs include the replacement of all windows with the appropriate wood, true-divided-light sash, restoration of marble watertable and cellar bulkhead, repair and replacement of original detail on the dormer, siding removal and repair of the brick cornice, roof and gutter replacement, and exterior repointing.

Currently, the east chimney is leaning southward and an engineer's report states that it is dangerous. The previous removal of all masonry support beneath the roof has compromised the stability of the seven-foot remaining portion of the chimney above the roof. The engineer and applicant have provided two options to address the condition: 1) reconstruct the unstable portion of the chimney with the same massing in wood frame with a stucco finish, or 2) remove the unstable portion of the chimney, retaining an eight-inch outer wall only.

This application proposes to restore a third-story rear window opening on the main block, which provides access to a small deck, and create a new access to a deck by cutting a door opening at the corner where the rear ell meets the main block of the house.

The applicant also proposes to replace a window and sliding doors in non-historic openings at the first-story rear. These are not visible from the public right-of-way. The applicant proposes to replace a side gate, however, no information has been provided regarding its replacement.

Flower boxes, a flag pole, and fire marker are also proposed, but details are not provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of most aspects of the application, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9; except denial of the chimney removal and reconstruction, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6; and denial of the flag pole and fire marker, pursuant to Standard 3.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Richard Scafidi and architects Richard Wesley and Hannah Cohan represented the application.

Mr. Evans noted that the application did not include any information about the flower boxes, flag pole, and fire marker. Mr. Wesley clarified that he is not seeking approval of the flower boxes, flag pole, and fire marker. The owner will submit applications for the other items at a later date.

Ms. Pentz stated that the chimney is an important and highly visible feature of this house. She asked if they have developed any alternatives that would allow the retention of the original chimney. Mr. Wesley stated that the chimney is leaning substantially and is experiencing severe spalling and cracking. He stated that it is leaning more than two inches in 10 feet. Mr. Evans asked if it could be supported with new structure in the interior. Mr. Wesley explained that the entire chimney structure in the interior of the building was removed years ago. The section above the roof is supported with 3" x 6" lumber, which is failing. He reported that they investigated added steel structure to support the remaining piece of the chimney, but found that it was not feasible. Mr. Cluver reported that he had been involved with a similar project in which the chimney was supported on brackets. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz agreed that the brick could be supported without bringing the supports all the way down through the house. They noted that the chimney might need to be disassembled and reassembled.

Mr. Scafidi, the owner, said that he wanted to protect the historical significance of the house, but questioned the cost of stabilizing the chimney. Mr. Wesley suggested that the cost of saving this chimney would be exorbitant. Ms. Pentz observed that this is a main feature of the house and should be retained. She suggested that they consult with an engineer and determine the cost before making any assumptions about it. Mr. Wesley explained that they are offering to retain the profile of the chimney in brick with a stucco clad body behind it. Ms. Sell suggested a frame clad in brick instead of stucco. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Cluver stated that the mass of the chimney with a veneer of brick would satisfy the Standards. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed, contending that the chimney could be reframed in steel and clad with a veneer of original brick, greatly reducing the weight. Mr. Wesley stated that that may be possible. Mr. Evans suggested rebuilding the entire chimney through the house; he contended that it would add value. Mr. Cluver observed that the notes on the plans stipulate that the unstable sections of the chimney would be rebuilt. He asked what section was stable. Mr. Wesley replied that the front section is stable; it has a working flue. The Committee members agreed that either a restoration or brick veneer on the chimney would be acceptable, but the removal and reconstruction in stucco or the removal and partial reconstruction in brick would not be acceptable.

The Committee members agreed that the window and door changes were appropriate.

Mr. Wesley asked about the proposed restoration of the marble watertable. Ms. Sell stated that it could be approved at the staff level.

Mr. Scafidi asked if installing a fire marker would be appropriate. Mr. Evans stated that he did not think that it would be appropriate to install a fire marker that had not been on the house. He stated that historical fire markers are important documents. They should not be applied falsely. He suggested a Historical Commission plaque instead. Mr. Scafidi stated that he will undertake restoration to qualify for a plaque. Mr. Wesley stated that his client would like to remove the non-historic limestone watertable and replace it with a replica of the original marble watertable. He also intends to replace the cellar bulkhead.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the chimney reconstruction, but approval of all other aspects of the revised application, which does not include the flower boxes, flag pole, and fire marker, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

170 S. INDEPENDENCE MALL WEST, CURTIS CENTER

Owner: Curtis Partners L.P.

Applicant: Thomas Citro

History: 1914, Edgar Seeler, architect

Designation: significant in Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: In-Concept: Install awnings and planters

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install awnings and planters within four window bays on the S. 7th Street or west elevation of the Curtis Building. The awnings would be made of an acrylic "Sunbrella" material in black. Two would be embellished with the logo "Cooperage A Wine and Whiskey Bar." The awnings would be anchored to the marble façade and bronze and steel windows with a series of bolts and screws. The proposed planters would sit within four bays on the granite base, however, no information has been provided regarding size, material, or attachment.

Built in 1914 by Edgar V. Seeler, the Curtis Building is one of the most important examples of Beaux Arts and Classical Revival architecture in the City of Philadelphia. The exterior signage and embellishment would disrupt the continuity of the unobstructed bays and overall symmetry of the 7th Street elevation.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Restaurateur Joseph Volpe, attorney Ron Patterson, and Joe Laughlin, the chief engineer of the Curtis Center, represented the application.

Ms. Sell explained that, after this application was submitted to the Commission, the Commission received a complaint call alleging that work without permits was being conducted at this location. Ms. Sell stated that she visited the site in response to the call and confirmed that the work was underway even though the application had just been submitted and was awaiting reviews by the Architectural Committee and Commission. During the site visit, she had a conversation with the manager of the restaurant. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Evans confirmed that the

work had been completed. Mr. Evans stated that the anchors for the flower boxes have created spalls that have been improperly repaired.

Mr. Patterson stated that he had not been involved with the original permitting, but was brought in after the work was done. He acknowledged that the owner had been advised poorly and the work had been done without the appropriate approvals and permits. He stated that the awnings and planters are “handsome additions.” Mr. Laughlin explained that there were similar awnings on the building in the mid 1980s when the Norman Rockwell Museum occupied the space at the corner of 7th and Walnut Streets.

Mr. Laughlin stated that he has a very large supply of extra pieces of the original stone cladding for both the Public Ledger and the Curtis Center buildings, for which he is the engineer. He stated that he can easily repair the mounting holes if the awnings and planters are ever removed. Mr. Evans stated that he saw spots where the window boxes were installed that would require major Dutchman repairs. Mr. Laughlin stated that he had large pieces of marble for repairs. Mr. Evans and Ms. Pentz claimed that the attachment of flower boxes had damaged the marble sills. They should be removed before any further damage occurs. Ms. Pentz agreed that the planters should be removed because the nature of the attachments will result in further damage. Mr. Patterson asked if there were objections to the awnings. Mr. Cluver stated that he had no objection to the awnings, but he did object to the window boxes. Ms. Sell noted that there are no other awnings on the building at this point. She also noted that other awning proposals for this building have been denied. Mr. Laughlin explained that the denied awnings were proposed for another type of window on the building.

Lorna Katz-Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association urged the Committee to recommend denial of the application.

Mr. Patterson stated that, if the Committee provided some guidance regarding awnings and planters, then his client would submit a revised design based on that guidance.

Mr. Evans stated that he has not seen any details regarding the installation of the awnings. Such a detail should be provided.

Ms. Pentz stated that the Committee should deny these installed awnings and planters, but may later consider other proposals for awnings and planters.

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

150 SOUTH INDEPENDENCE MALL WEST, PUBLIC LEDGER BUILDING

Applicant: Robert Ashton, AIA LEED AP

Owner: CB Richard Ellis

History: 1926-27, Horace Trumbauer, architect

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

Project: Replace canopy

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace an existing bronze clad, steel, and glass canopy on Chestnut Street with a flat aluminum and glass canopy with an internally illuminated hanging aluminum drum. The new canopy would be eight feet from grade.

In April 2010, the Architectural Committee reviewed an application that proposed a curved, brushed metallic gray aluminum canopy with illuminated signage with acrylic letters. The large, solid massing of the canopy would cover the entry door transom. The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9. The applicant subsequently withdrew the application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Stephen Beacham, Lisa Deats and Amy Needle of Historic Philadelphia Inc., and Michael Williams of Hill International represented the application.

Mr. Beacham stated that the current proposal responds to the Committee's recommendations provided previously. He displayed samples of the bronze material proposed for the canopy. He stated that the design is very simple, allowing views of the building behind it.

Mr. Cluver asked about the dimensions of the posts holding the canopy up. Mr. Beacham replied that they would be 3½" x 6"; the current posts are 2¾" in diameter. Mr. Beacham stated that the existing posts appeared diminutive, not substantial enough. Mr. Cluver objected to the dimensions of the proposed posts. Ms. Pentz disagreed.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the water drainage. Mr. Beacham stated that a pipe would run into the building, down a chase, and into the storm sewer. Mr. D'Alessandro objected to the plan. He asserted that the Committee should not recommend approval until it has reviewed the drainage plan details. Mr. Beecham stated that the current canopy drains onto the sidewalk. He offered to develop details for the drainage for review by the staff.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

21 SUMMIT STREET

Owner: William & Jane Farran

Applicant: Jeffery Hayes

History: c. 1870

Designated: individually designated, 8/2/1973

Project: Construct rear deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear deck with trellis at the rear of this mid nineteenth-century suburban villa in Chestnut Hill. The rear of this property has been greatly altered from its original nineteenth-century appearance. The deck would be constructed in a portion of the rear façade that dates to the 1980s. An original rear window would be modified into a door. A small deck at the third-floor rear would be replaced in kind, and some window panel modifications are proposed to the 1980s addition. The application does not propose any work or alterations to the front façade on Summit Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jeffery Hayes represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked about the finish on the wood deck. Mr. Hayes stated that it would be painted except for the top elements of the trellis. Mr. Cluver asked about the railings. Mr. Hayes stated that the railings would be a ½" plain stock. The Committee members concluded that the plans are appropriate.

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

230-32 S. HUTCHINSON STREET

Owner: David Watt

Applicant: Adam Montalbano

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

Designation: individually designated, 1/31/1961

Project: Restore facades, construct roof deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the facades of these three properties that have been consolidated into one residence. The grouping consists of two early nineteenth-century residences on Hutchinson Street and one late nineteenth-century garage along Latimer Street. The application proposes the addition of a roof deck. The deck would be located on the garage and it would face away from the main façade of the two residential properties on Hutchinson. The deck would be accessed through a pilot house at the rear of the two houses on Hutchinson Street. The construction of the pilot house would necessitate some minor alterations to the rear cornice and roof of the corner property. The pilot house would not be visible from any public right-of-way. The deck railing would be visible from Latimer Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Adam Montalbano represented the application.

Mr. Montalbano presented the proposal to the Committee. Ms. Pentz agreed with the staff that the design is appropriate. She observed that the deck is acceptable on the garage building because it is like a rear ell. Mr. Cluver suggested that the railing should be attached to the deck structure and not the parapet. Mr. Cluver asked about the garage door design, which appears differ from that seen in an historic photograph. Mr. Montalbano answered that he had tried to replicate the door in the photograph as closely as possible. He added that the Hutchinson Street door would not be operable. Mr. Danta explained that the designation predates the use of the nomination form. Therefore, we do not know why these houses were designated. He posited that they were not designated for the garage building, but for the early nineteenth-century houses. He suggested that the Commission could accept something other than a precise replication of the door for this building. Mr. Montalbano stated that he would be happy to work with the staff on the door and other details.

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

209-25 N. 18TH STREET

Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Applicant: Robert Koochagian

History: 1912, Henry Dagit, architect

Designation: individually designated, 5/28/1957

Project: Replace windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace all the windows at the rectory building of the Roman Catholic Basilica Cathedral. The rectory post dates the Basilica and is a fine example of Renaissance Revival architecture. The existing windows are double hung one-over-one wood windows. Several of them contain stained glass. The application proposes to replace the windows with extruded metal windows. There is no information related to the retention or reinstallation of the existing stained glass windows. The building sits on a prominent location at the intersection of Race Street and the Benjamin Franklin Parkway. The rectory along with the Basilica is part of the Parkway's architectural parade of grand public, civic and religious buildings. Three of the rectory's facades are clearly visible from the public right-of-way; two of the facades are visible from the Parkway. The north façade is not visible from any public right-of-way. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards recommend the retention of historic fabric or its replacement in kind, if the material has reached the end of its useful life. These windows could be successfully replaced in kind.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Engineer Robert Koochagian and Monsignor Michael McCulken represented the application.

Mr. Koochagian stated that the Commission had approved aluminum windows at the base of the dome and elsewhere at the basilica. Therefore, he concluded that aluminum windows would be acceptable in this case. He stated that the existing windows are at the ends of their lives and should be replaced with windows with greater energy efficiency. Mr. Cluver asked if the wood of the windows is deteriorated. Mr. Koochagian stated that the wood needs to be refurbished. Mr. Cluver advised Mr. Koochagian that the wood windows should be retained if they are in good condition. He said that interior storm windows could provide the sought-after energy efficiency at a fraction of the cost of new aluminum windows. Mr. Koochagian noted that interior shutters may prevent the installation of interior storm windows.

Mr. Danta stated that the building currently has exterior storm windows. He also noted that, as originally designed, the building was intended to have French casement windows. He asked the applicant to confirm that the building was not constructed with the casements, but was constructed with the extant one-over-one windows.

Messrs. Cluver and Evans asserted that the historic wood windows should not be removed unless it is demonstrated that they have deteriorated to the point that they must be replaced. They also asserted that the proposed aluminum windows do not even accurately replicate the details of the extant windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and 9.

RIDGELAND MANSION, CHAMOUNIX DRIVE

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Kimberly Hinkelman, Wellness Community

History: 1763

Designation: individually designated, 6/26/1956

Project: Construct addition to barn

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition to the barn at Ridgeland Mansion in Fairmount Park. The mansion and barn are occupied by the Wellness Community, a support center for cancer patients. The center is expanding its programs and must increase its square footage if it is to remain at this historic site. The applicant proposes a one-story addition of sympathetic design and materials. The proposed addition would be constructed on the side of the barn that faces away from the house. The proposed addition takes strong cues from the existing barn. The addition would rest on exposed stone piers, be clad in wood clap boards, and have a metal roof. A deck would be constructed at the rear of the addition, looking onto the woods surrounding the property.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect George Wilson and Lucy Stackhouse of the Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust represented the application.

Mr. Wilson explained that the addition would be built on piers to avoid digging up a terrace adjacent to the construction site. The proposed red metal roof would match the existing roof on the barn. The windows would be wood to match the existing.

Ms. Stackhouse explained that this design has undergone several levels of review with the Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust and its technical design committee, on which Mr. Farnham sits.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the scale of the double-hung windows. Mr. Wilson explained that they were designed to match the extant barn windows.

Mr. Cluver stated that the overall design concept is strong. He stated that there are several details to review.

Mr. Evans noted that the addition will cover three windows. He asked if they could be relocated. Mr. Wilson responded that they are not historic. They were installed in 1999.

Mr. D'Alessandro objected to the faux barn doors on either side of the entry doors. Mr. Wilson said that they were intended to match the faux barn doors on the main barn. He suggested that the fixed barn doors should be removed. Mr. Cluver agreed. The applicants agreed that they would remove the doors from the design.

The Committee discussed the proposed Hardiboard. The members agreed that there are pros and cons to the synthetic material. They agreed that it was appropriate in this case.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the faux barn doors flanking the entry doors at the addition are deleted, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:25 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 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.