

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

**TUESDAY, 22 JULY 2014
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP
Rudy D'Alessandro
Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Suzanne Pentz

Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner I
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Brett Webber, SPG3
Richard Gelber, SPG3
Chet Patel, Baywood Hotels
Rich Thom, Richard Thom, AIA
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
John Scott, Graboyes Commercial Window Company
Bill Steedle, Graboyes Commercial Window Company
Christopher DelRossi, Graboyes Commercial Window Company
Christopher Mrozinski, PREIT
Kyle Kernozek, BLTarchitects
Tom Gluck, Gluck+
Brian Novello, Gluck+
Cory Coleman, Gluck+
Bette Woolsey
Sarah Maxwell
Dan Reisman, Eckert Seamans
Jon Calder, Century 21
Al Paulo, DeBarbieri Architects LLC
J. Reinhold, Reinhold Residential
T. Wernock, Reinhold Residential
K. Frank
J. Rue
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Company
William J. Waffle
James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co.
Albert Wachlin Sr.
Albert Wachlin Jr.
Harry S. Murray, Campbell Thomas & Co.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 JULY 2014
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Jonathan Levy
Bill Commer, Uniqlo-WJCA
Doug Battersby, Uniqlo-WJCA
Tim Wanaselja, Meyer Design, Inc.
Chuck Kenezky, US
Rob Kettell
Janet Kalter
Igna Saffron, Philadelphia Inquirer

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 228-38 N 13TH ST

Project: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final

Owner: Foundation for BBBSA

Applicant: Matthew McClure, Ballard Spahr, LLP

History: 1946; Warner Brothers Film Distribution Center; William Harold Lee, architect

Individual Designation: 5/9/2008

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application for final approval proposes to construct an addition on the building at 228-38 N. 13th Street as it is converted from offices to a hotel. The building is bounded by 13th Street at the east, Florist Street at the south, Clarion Street at the west, and a private alley at the north. The historic building has a flat roof with small penthouse at the northwest corner. The east and south facades as well as a return on the north façade are finely finished. The west and north facades are utilitarian. There is an open loading dock and parking area at the rear or west.

The Art Moderne building was constructed by architect William H. Lee in 1946 as the Warner Brothers Film Exchange Building, a warehouse that served for a short time as a regional distribution center for movies. Several other movie studios maintained similar warehouses in the area of 13th and Vine Streets until the early 1950s, when the movie studio system collapsed. The building was later occupied by an insurance company, film production company, and non-profit organization. It was individually designated in 2008 for its architectural and historical significance. The interior is not designated and not under the Commission's jurisdiction.

The applicants first proposed a hotel project for this site in June 2014, when the Architectural Committee reviewed a nine-story version of an addition to this historic building. The Committee recommended denial of that design and some Committee members suggested that the applicants redesign the addition, setting it farther back from the front and south facades, making the tower taller, more slender, and vertically oriented, and adjusting the exterior cladding materials of the tower to better harmonize with those of the historic building. At its July 2014 meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed a design revised according to the Committee members' suggestions and approved it in concept. The Commission found that the proposal did not constitute a demolition in the legal sense, as the Preservation Alliance contended at the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 JULY 2014

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Commission meeting, because the character-defining features of the building as defined in its nomination would be retained and restored. The Commission agreed with Commissioner Robert Thomas that the revised proposal satisfies Standard 9 because the construction of the addition would not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property; and the addition would be differentiated from the old and compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property. The revised design that the Commission approved in concept is now proposed for final approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Historical Commission's approval in concept of 11 July 2014, Standard 9, and Section 14-1000 of the Philadelphia Code. The construction of the addition is an alteration (§14-203.15), not a demolition (§14-203.88), because the construction of the addition will not destroy historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property as defined in the nomination for the property. The proposed alteration is appropriate (§14-1005.6.e) because the addition will be differentiated from the old and compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Matt McClure, hotel developer Chet Patel, and architects Brett Webber and Richard Gelber represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins reported that the Historical Commission approved the project in concept. She asked the architects to describe the cladding of the addition. Mr. Webber described the exterior cladding as cement composite panels and terra cotta accent panels and the window system as a powder-coated metal with clear glazing. He stated that the two colors of the panels were chosen to defer to the colors found on the historic building. Ms. Hawkins asked why they chose cementitious panels instead of a material like cast stone. Mr. Webber responded that they have chosen a unitized rain screen system, which would be panelized per floor, giving an open reveal with sharp and detailed corners as well as thin joints. He stated that the finish of the chosen material is more compatible with the brick of the historic building; like the masonry of the historic building, it has a "tautness" to it. Mr. Webber stated that, in addition, they were seeking a material with an integral rather than applied color. Ms. Hawkins countered that nothing in Mr. Webber's answer indicates that they could not have chosen cast stone instead of a cementitious panel. Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Webber to confirm which elements of the façade would be terra cotta. He stated that the bases and sills of the panelized systems would be terra cotta. Ms. Hawkins asked if the terra cotta would have the traditional red color. Mr. Webber stated that it would not. He stated that terra cotta is available in a wide range of colors and the color they have chosen, which is depicted in the renderings, will harmonize with the colors of the historic building. He added that the terra cotta will be unglazed. Ms. Hawkins stated that unglazed terra cotta is highly susceptible to pulling in moisture. Mr. Webber stated that this rain screen system is independent of main waterproofing envelope of the addition. Ms. Gutterman asked if Mr. Webber had provided a detail of the rain screen system showing how it will be constructed. She stated that the Committee should know how the terra cotta accents are attached to the panels on the cladding for the addition. Mr. McClure stated that, typically, that type of detail is not provided until the staff reviews the final construction drawings to ensure that they comply with an approval by the Commission. Ms. Gutterman stated that, typically, the Committee also reviews all of the details for new construction. Mr. McClure questioned whether the Architectural Committee needed to review minor details related to the panel assembly for a new addition. Ms.

Gutterman stated that the applicants should have provided the details regarding the assembly of the panel system that will be used to clad the addition. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that a sample of the panel showing how the terra cotta trim attached to the cementitious material would be helpful for the Committee. Mr. Webber stated that he did not have a sample with him today. Mr. McClure thanked the Committee for its comments.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the original material of the parapet on the historic building. She noted that the drawings call for a metal coping. She suggested that the original might have been terra cotta, which was later clad in metal. Mr. Webber replied that he believes that the metal coping is original. He stated that they intend to retain or, if necessary, replicate the coping in the original material. He reported that they have not been able to remove a piece of the coping to see what lies beneath it. Ms. Hawkins stated that she would be surprised if original coping was metal. Mr. Webber stated that they would restore to the original state.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the attachment of the proposed glass canopy at the historic entrance. Mr. Webber stated that the canopy would have a cantilevered steel frame. He stated that it would be similar to, although smaller than, the canopy at the Meridian. He stated that the canopy would be installed within the existing granite doorway opening. Ms. Hawkins asked about the proposed drainage system for the canopy. Mr. Webber stated that they intend to capture the rainwater rather than letting it shed to the sidewalk, but he has not yet finalized the drainage detail.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the roll-down garage doors proposed for Clarion Street would be solid or transparent. It was noted that Clarion Street is the service alley running along the west side of the building. Mr. Webber stated that the doors will have some transparency. He stated that they are shown as coiled-roll doors, which will allow some visibility through them. They will be part solid, part transparent. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the garage doors should not be solid, but should have some transparency to be more pedestrian friendly. She asked Mr. McClure about the level of traffic on Clarion. He stated that there is very little traffic on the service alley. Ms. Hawkins stated that she was confused by the proposal for solid garage doors. She stated that, if it is a security concern, transparent doors can be made secure. Mr. McClure thanked the Committee for its comments.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the fence on 13th Street. Mr. Webber stated that that will be a custom-made metal fence and will be about eight or nine feet tall. Ms. Hawkins asked if it needed to be that tall. She asked Mr. Webber what he was hoping to achieve with such a tall fence. She asked if it represented another security concern. She suggested that it should be six feet tall. Mr. Webber stated that the height of the fence is related to the scale of the building and of the features behind the fence in the alley. Mr. McClure noted that such a fence is typical of a commercial area zoned C4. He stated that, if the Committee prefers a shorter fence, then they will gladly consider changing its height. Mr. Webber stated that the fence height is also intended to relate to the height of the nearby canopy. Mr. Gelber added that the height of the fence relates to the scale of the front façade generally. Ms. Hawkins stated that a six-foot fence would produce a more pedestrian-friendly environment. Ms. Gutterman disagreed with Mr. Gelber and contended that the height of the fence as proposed does not relate to the scale of the front façade. Mr. McClure thanked the Committee for its comments on the height of the fence proposed for the alley and again stated that they are willing to accept the Committee's recommendation on the fence height.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the signs. Mr. Webber stated that the sign at the roofline of the addition would be illuminated. He stated that they are proposing small, illuminated signs on either side of the doorway. The canopy would have channel letter signage without illumination. Mr. McClure added that the signage on the historic building would mirror the signage that is currently on the building.

Mr. Cluver asked for some clarification about the interior partitions between the rooms and how they will be perceived on the exterior. Mr. Webber stated that the glazing will be continuous on the exterior; there will be clear glazing at the rooms and shadowbox glazing where partitions and other solid elements stand behind the glass. Mr. Cluver asked if this system would support sufficiently robust partitions that would provide the requisite acoustic separation between the rooms.

Mr. Cluver asked how the remaining roof of the historic building will be treated. He asked if it would be used as a deck. Mr. Webber stated that the roof plan provided in the application shows that the roof will be unoccupied and have sections of green roof. There will be a skylight over the main stair. Ms. Hawkins asked about the height of the parapet. Mr. Webber stated that the historic height will be maintained. He added that it will accommodate the green roof and other features, which will not be visible from the street. Mr. McClure noted that they are seeking LEED Gold certification and the green roof will be used to dissipate storm water. Mr. Cluver asked again if guests will occupy the roof. Mr. McClure again stated that they would not. The roof will not be occupied. Mr. Cluver asked if they are proposing railings or other features for the parapet. Mr. McClure stated that they are not. Ms. Hawkins asked if the skylight or other features on the roof would be visible over the parapet from the street. The applicants again stated that nothing on the roof would be visible from the street.

Ms. Pentz asked Mr. Webber where the columns supporting the addition would be located. He stated that some would be located within the existing building and some outside it. He pointed out the locations of the columns on an architectural plan.

Mr. Cluver noted that a dark grey material, which has not yet been discussed, is shown on the south elevation. He asked if it was either the cementitious panel or terra cotta. Mr. Webber stated that it is a third material. Mr. McClure noted that it was added at the request of Mr. McCoubrey at the last review by the Architectural Committee. Mr. Webber stated that it is intended to elevate and differentiate the south façade of the building aesthetically. Ms. Hawkins asked whether that third material is even visible from the street, given that the addition is set back so far from the street. She noted that she was not requesting that they move the addition closer to the street. The applicants and some Committee members agreed that the material would be visible from the street. Ms. Pentz asked why one grey band appears thicker than another. Mr. Webber stated that they are the same, but look different in the rendering owing to the shadows that the rendering software generated.

Ms. Hawkins asked for a clarification regarding the change in glass at the partitions. Mr. Webber stated that the same glass will be used throughout the addition. Panels will be mounted behind the glass at the partitions. He contended that the glass will look consistent across the building.

Mr. Cluver stated that he is disappointed with the lack of details on the canopy. Mr. McClure stated that the submission deadline for the final review fell before the Historical Commission's review of the in concept application, making it difficult to determine what to include in the final

approval application. He stated that, as with last month's in-concept application, they will make revisions based on the Committee's comments for the Historical Commission.

Mr. Cluver observed that one of the windows on the front façade had been altered and has a different frame. He suggested that the applicants restore the window so that the two windows flanking the entrance will be the same. Ms. Cote stated that the staff can ensure that the windows are restored. Mr. McClure thanked the Committee for its suggestions.

Ms. Hawkins asked if anyone in the audience would like to comment on the project. No one offered comments. She noted that there had been comments on the in-concept application of this project and again asked if anyone including the representative of the Preservation Alliance wished to comment. No one including the representative of the Preservation Alliance offered comments.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Historical Commission's approval in concept of 11 July 2014, Standard 9, and Section 14-1000 of the Philadelphia Code, provided the following conditions are met:

1. details of the panel system, glazing, canopy, parapet wall, garage door, and fence are submitted;
2. color samples of cladding materials for the addition in relation to the historic materials are submitted;
3. it is confirmed that the roof of the historic building will not be occupied;
4. designs of any railings to be installed on the roof of the historic building for occupancy are submitted; and,
5. the locations and configurations of all HVAC equipment are submitted.

ADDRESS: 205-09 RACE ST

Project: Construct building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Second and Race Streets, L.P.

Applicant: Daniel Reisman, Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellot, LLC

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a mixed-use building at the northwest corner of N. 2nd and Race Streets. The Commission's jurisdiction is limited to review-and-comment jurisdiction at this vacant lot in the Old City Historic District, which is considered an undeveloped site. The Commission reviewed and commented favorably on a mixed-use project for this site in June 2005, but the building was not constructed.

The proposed building would include almost 15,000 sf of retail space at the ground floor, 148 residential units at the upper floors, and 28 parking spaces in the basement. The building would be 51 feet tall at the west end, where it would abut historic buildings, and 197 feet tall at the east end. The parking entrance and loading would be accessed from Florist Street, a service alley.

The site is adjacent to the Benjamin Franklin Bridge approach and is near the interchange of I-95 and I-676.

STAFF COMMENT: The proposed building is appropriate for this location within the historic district, which mediates between the densely developed three to five-story historic buildings to the west and the very large infrastructural systems to the north and east. Along Race Street, the building would maintain a 51-foot cornice height and would be visually broken down into series of components that would replicate the rhythms of the facades in the historic district. The tall section to the east, which is visually distinct from the base, would correspond to the size and scale of the bridge and highway. Like many historic buildings in the area, this building would have retail space at the ground floor. The vehicular entrance and loading area would be appropriately located on the service alley. The application should be supplemented with information about exterior materials and finishes.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Jeffrey Brown, attorney Dan Riesman, and architect Tom Gluck represented the application.

Mr. Gluck summarized the design of the proposed building. He noted the 51-foot cornice height at the west and stated that he endeavored to design a building that feels like a series of smaller elements rather than monolith. He noted the undulating façade, which breaks the building down into smaller components. He pointed out the notch, which allows for the continuation of the cornice line below the taller section. The proposed materials include vision glass for the windows within the bedrooms and living rooms, and painted metal panels in two different colors. The building transitions from a more traditional building with punched openings at the west to a more contemporary building at the east. The subtle differences in materials give the impression of a shorter building. Mr. Gluck noted that they are working with the Streets Department to widen the sidewalk in order to create a larger public space and create an openness and relief. Ms. Hawkins voiced suggested that the design works for the pedestrian when walking east on Race, but not when walking west up from the river, where the building will look very large. Mr. Gluck responded that the building is intended to respond to the very different scales at the two ends of the site. The building is intended to assist in the transition from the smaller-scale area to the larger-scale area and back.

Mr. Baron asked about the locations of the white metal versus the black metal. Mr. Gluck corrected him, responding that the two metal colors are not black and white, but are darker and lighter. He stated that the panels are used in such a way to reduce the appearance of the size of the building. He showed the locations of the panels on a rendering. He stated that the panels on the façade closest to the historic buildings on Race Street would be a mid-tone gray. At the ground floor, the eastern section of the Race Street façade, the retail area, would be glazed storefronts. Mr. Cluver asked about the size of the metal panels. Mr. Gluck responded that the panels would three to four feet wide by eight feet tall. Smaller panels would be located where grids intersect. The joints between the panels will be narrow but legible.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the location of the mechanical units. Mr. Gluck responded that they would be located in three places, most on top of the taller portion of the building, some on the lower roof area, and some at the rear. Ms. Hawkins asked if any equipment would be located near Race Street. Mr. Gluck responded that the mechanical equipment would not be located near Race Street. He added that the lower roof will be an occupied green roof. Ms. Gutterman asked if the parapet was tall enough to obviate the need for a railing. Mr. Gluck responded that

it requires a railing as shown on the drawings. He added that it would be a painted steel railing, but it could be mesh. He explained that the design had started as a parapet, but was changed to a railing when the building began to feel top heavy.

Ms. Hawkins opened the discussion to comment from the public. Rob Kettell objected that the proposed building exceeds the former 65-foot height limit that was an aspect of a zoning overlay that was repealed in August 2012. He distributed a copy of that obsolete legislation to the Committee members and contended that the reasoning set forth in the legislation still made sense today. He listed reasons why he favored the 65-foot height limit, which included retention of the historic character and economic vitality of the area, retention of light and air, and avoidance of overshadowing smaller historic structures. Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants if the zoning for the project is by right. Mr. Riesman responded that it is by-right and reported that they are receiving a height bonus for mixed income housing and LEED Gold certification.

Janet Kalter, an Old City resident, expressed her disappointment that the Historical Commission would consider a building of this height for Old City. She stated that she appreciates what the architects have done to try to minimize the mass of the building, but stated that she feels that the building will be “mammoth.” She suggested holding the Architectural Committee meeting at site so that the Committee members can appreciate the location and the impact the proposed building will have on it.

Bill Waffle, representing the owners at 122 New Street, stated that those he represents approve of the design as good architecture and he commended the architects for creating something that is not banal. He stated that the site is zoned for a building of this size and it should be approved.

Bette Woolsey of 225 Race Street stated that she is distressed by the size of the proposed building, which will be very close to her residence. She expressed additional concern about access to Florist Street, as it is her only entry to her elevator. She concluded that the location is not appropriate for this building. The building is well designed, but does not belong at the site.

Mr. Baron described the Historical Commission’s “review-and-comment” authority. For new construction on undeveloped sites in historic districts, the Historical Commission can require applicants to present plans at public meetings of the Architectural Committee and Commission for comment, but the Commission cannot deny those projects. Once an applicant has presented a plan and heard the comments, that applicant has no obligation to incorporate the comments, but can proceed with the project. Ms. Hawkins elaborated that the Commission’s jurisdiction over review-and-comment applications is extremely limited; it is merely advisory.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee voted to concur with the staff’s comments. The proposed building is appropriate for this location within the historic district, which mediates between the densely developed three to five-story historic buildings to the west and the very large infrastructural systems to the north and east. Along Race Street, the building would maintain a 51-foot cornice height and would be visually broken down into series of components that would replicate the rhythms of the facades in the historic district. The tall section to the east, which is visually distinct from the base, would correspond to the size and scale of the bridge and highway. Like many historic buildings in the area, this building would have retail space at the ground floor. The vehicular entrance and loading area would be appropriately located on the service alley. The application should be supplemented with information about exterior materials and finishes.

ADDRESS: 801 MARKET ST

Project: Install marquee, awnings, and banner signs

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: PREIT Rubin Inc.

Applicant: James DeBarbieri, DeBarbieri Architects LLC

History: 1903; Strawbridge & Clothier Department Store; Addison Hutton, Grant Simon, architects

Individual Designation: 6/9/2006

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install an exterior marquee, awnings, banner signs, and lighting on the Market Street façade of the western half of the former Strawbridge & Clothier department store building. A similar marquee application was approved by the Historical Commission in 2012 for Philadelphia Inquirer signage, and a copy of the minutes from that meeting along with approved drawings are included with this packet. This application also proposes awnings at five other window or doorways along Market Street, for a total of six red canvas awnings with the white Century 21 logo. The proposed banner signs run the length of the second floor at both 823 and 801 Market and wrap around the building onto the South 8th Street façade. The banner signs project approximately three feet from the building. This application also proposes exterior up-lighting of the façade.

The application has been revised and supplemented since the Architectural Committee meeting. The revised submission for the marquee proposes a backlit Century 21 logo with channel letters. The revised submission includes three pages of awning details. The applicant has adjusted the slope of the awnings in an effort to visually align the tops of the awnings. The proposed banner signs have been lowered and the attachment details have been revised. More information about lighting has been included.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Alfredo Paulo and Jonathan Calder and Valentino Vettori of Century 21 represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether projecting signs are allowed on this building per the zoning code. Ms. Broadbent and Mr. Paulo responded that they believe projecting signs are allowed.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the Historical Commission had previously approved a similar canopy design, but that this current application proposes that the window awnings are bracketed into the masonry rather than within the masonry openings. She stated that the awnings should be located within the masonry openings, rather than attaching to the face of the masonry. Mr. Paulo responded that the current plan is to try to reuse the existing brackets for the awnings that have been removed. Ms. Hawkins responded that the awnings he is referencing are actually located within the jambs of the masonry and do not span over the masonry; however, the type of awning structure that is proposed in the application is more structure than a simple shed awning, with a different slope and more permanence. Mr. Paulo responded that the details need to be worked out with the sign company, and that they will try to use light gauge framing. He stated that only the marquee awning will use back-lit lettering, and the other awnings will not be

illuminated. He added that the Philadelphia Inquirer marquee was heavier than what Century 21 is proposing, so they might be able to reduce the required steel support system. However, they will still need to drill into the building for the marquee as a life safety measure to tie back to steel supports.

Mr. Paulo explained the locations of the proposed banner signs, with two signs proposed for the second floor of 823 Market Street and the rest spanning the length of 801 Market Street and wrapping around the side of the building onto 8th Street, all at the second-floor level. Ms. Hawkins and Gutterman expressed concern about Century 21 banner signs placed above a future tenant whose main entrance will be at 801 Market Street. Christopher Mrozinski, Vice President of Development at PREIT, explained that Century 21 will be occupying the entire second floor of the building and part of the first floor where the awnings will be located. Mr. Vettori clarified that the retail store will occupy 98,000 square feet, of which 70,000 is the second floor, so it is important to the client to show the public that the business is on the second floor as well.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the location of attachment for the banner signs. Mr. Paulo responded that they will need to provide details regarding the attachment, but it will require brackets on the interior of the building to secure the signs. He agreed that anchor holes will need to be drilled through the terra cotta, likely one half inch in diameter, and will meet a plate on the interior of the building. Mr. Cluver responded that the Committee would recommend that the holes go through the joint rather than the stone.

Mr. Cluver asked about the ceiling of the canopy. Mr. Paulo responded that they are still working on the details, but they will likely propose a full canopy return on the underside with no lighting. This will also pertain to the other awnings. Ms. Hawkins cautioned about this design and how it will hold up to the elements. Mr. Vettori responded that the reason for the return on the underside is to hide the brackets and to make it more aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Cluver stated that he was concerned that the marquee and awnings to not appear to align at the top. Mr. Paulo responded that it might be an error in the rendering.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the gutter shown in the drawing. Mr. Paulo responded that it is a French drain line that connects to the nearest drain line that is on the concourse level. This means that they will drill into the building, drop down vertically within the display window, go through the subfloor, and tie into the drain that is on the concourse level. He noted that this was approved previously by the Historical Commission as part of the Philadelphia Inquirer application.

Mr. D'Alessandro opined that he would like to see the top of the blade signs not go above the spring line of the arched windows.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Preservation Alliance does not have an objection to the canopy, but the awnings lack detail. He noted that there are three different window conditions, which he showed to the Committee using photographs. He stated that one of the doorways never had an awning when it was Strawbridge's. He opined that Strawbridge's may have omitted that awning owing to the difficulty of installing an awning at that opening. He stated that the three easternmost awnings show a location below the filigree, but if the goal is to achieve a uniform height, then the Preservation Alliance is not sure how the awnings can stay

below the filigree without covering up significant architectural detailing. He summarized that the Preservation Alliance recommends denial of the application as presented, owing to a lack of details.

Mr. Baron opined that it is important that the awnings reveal architectural details such as a cast transom bar, and that that it is a more important factor than uniformity in the new awnings and canopy. He suggested that the issue of attaching to mortar joints should be left open for staff to review. He explained this suggestion by stating that a wide enough joint will allow for attachment at that location; however, attaching to a smaller joint may result in a fastener damaging the stone both above and below the joint; a better option may be to fasten into the middle of a stone, which is easier to repair.

Various Committee members offered varying opinions regarding the location of signage. Mr. Cluver opined that the placement of the signage feels lopsided and suggested the removal of the easternmost three awnings but recommended keeping the blade signs along the length of the second floor. Ms. Hawkins opined that blade signs do not belong on the 801 Market Street building. Rather, she stated, the signs are appropriate on the entrance building at 823 Market Street. She stated that the applicant could explore signage over the door at 801 Market Street that is responsive to the architecture, as that will not be the main entrance but there will be cash registered located at that entrance. She reiterated that additional information is needed about most of the signage.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application as presented, with the clarifications that the canopy over the main entry is generally acceptable, but other options for the awnings and blade signs need to be explored that better resolve the tension between the retail needs of the tenant and the character of the historic building, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 1520-28 SPRUCE ST

Project: Replace wood windows with aluminum windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Touraine, LP

Applicant: John Scott, Grayboyes Commercial Window Co.

History: 1917; The Touraine; Frederick Webber, architect

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the removal of wood windows and the installation of aluminum windows above the third-floor level on all facades of this large residential building. Views from the public right-of-way of large sections of the secondary facades are obscured by other buildings. The staff has worked with the applicant to craft a proposal in which the proposed windows closely match the original wood windows with regard to the sight lines and profiles. The wood windows at the first three stories of the building are being retained and have already been restored. Any leaded glass wood windows will also be restored rather than replaced, but the frames will be panned and a second piece of glass will be added on the outside of each sash.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Bill Steedle, Jack Scott, and Jeff Reinhart represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins questioned the applicants on the leaded glass windows. They explained that Beyer Studios will be re-leading the glass windows and installing them in mahogany frames to match existing details. Mr. Cluver asked about weep holes in the leaded-glass windows. The applicants responded that weep holes are being included in these windows.

Mr. Cluver asked about muntin patterns in the windows proposed for the locations labeled C1 and C. As currently proposed, the windows have no muntins, but the applicants will work with the staff on research to determine if the historic windows had muntins.

Mr. Cluver recommended that the air conditioners should be replaced with lower profile units.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details including the muntin patterns, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 640-42 N 18TH ST

Project: Remove infill; install windows and door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Albert P. Wachlin

Applicant: Albert P. Wachlin

History: 1924; Mortgage Security Trust Company; William Macy Stanton, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Significant, 10/11/2000

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to the removal of masonry infill from original openings and the installation of six windows and one door. The proposed windows will have transoms over operable panels. The heights of the operable and transom sections of the proposed windows are shown as approximately equal. The staff would recommend reducing the heights of the transoms to align the new transom bars with the transom bar at the existing door. The operable sections would therefore need to increase in height. The frames of the new windows should match the details of the extant second-floor windows on the 18th Street façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the new transom bars are located at the height of the existing transom bar and the frames match the extant frame, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Albert Wachlin and preservation consultant Kevin McMahon represented the application.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the transoms on the upper arched windows could be set slightly lower, to the spring point of the arches. Other Committee members suggested that the transom

bars should align with the existing transom bar at the door. They also suggested that the new window frames should match the profiles and details of the existing frames. The applicants indicated that they did not object to adjusting the transom bars or matching the details of the frames.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the new transom bars are located at the height of the existing transom bar and the frames match the extant frame, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 332 LAWRENCE CT

Project: Alter window opening; install windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jonathan and Yvonne Levyn

Applicant: James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Company Architects

History: 1970; Lawrence Court Townhouses; Bower & Fradley, architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to enlarge a second-floor rear window opening, which is visible from Lawrence Court Walk in Society Hill. The window opening would retain the current height, but would be widened to allow for the installation of four casements where there are now two. With the new windows, the façade would lose its symmetry.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect James Campbell and property owner Jonathan Levyn represented the application.

Mr. Campbell stated that they are proposing this window alteration to provide more light and air for Mr. Levyn's new office space. He stated that the window is visible from the Lawrence Court Walkway, but cannot be seen from any other public location. He observed that the surrounding buildings have been modified including the neighboring house, which has a fourth-story enclosure. Mr. Cluver stated that enlarging this one window strays from the original concept of the building. He stated that it seems counter to the character of the building. Ms. Hawkins stated that the essence of this building is a three-story solid masonry building with punched openings. Ms. Gutterman stated that part of the problem with the proposal is the asymmetry that it creates. She suggested that both third-floor windows be enlarged to three casements instead, so that the symmetry of the punched openings is retained.

Ben Leech stated that the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia supports the staff recommendation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, but approval of the widening of both windows on the third floor from two casements to three casements symmetrically with a minimum of two feet of brick between the two windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 JULY 2014

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

ADDRESS: 1608-12 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Install internally-illuminated signage and banner sign

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Acorn Development Corp

Applicant: Beth Saracino, WJCA Inc.

History: Jackson & Moyer Clothing Store

Individual Designation: 1/3/1985

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of signage for the new retail tenant in this building. The signage would include internally-illuminated signs and banner signs.

The application has been revised since the Architectural Committee meeting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the banner sign and denial of the internally-illuminated signs, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Bill Commer and Doug Battersby and Shawn Brander of UNIQLO represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins remarked that the signage presented on the building model brought to the meeting differed from the drawings submitted to the Committee initially. On the model now presented, the signage covers a portion of the second-floor windows. Mr. Commer replied that the tenant, UNIQLO, would like to have identifying signage on the exterior of the building, but that the exact location is not as important as developing something that is acceptable to the various agencies with jurisdiction over the signage.

Mr. Cluver questioned what the panels at the second floor or the banner sign at the top of the building would achieve from a marketing perspective that would not be achieved by the ground-floor signage. Mr. Commer responded that the second-floor signage is perceived to be the primary signage, as it is located over the portal, while the ground-floor signs are secondary. Ms. Gutterman asked about the material from which the second-floor signs would be constructed. Mr. Commer responded that they would be acrylic, as presented in the application. Mr. Commer noted that they have not yet detailed the drawings, as they were waiting for input from the various agencies.

Mr. Cluver noted that signage in front of the panels or windows would not be appropriate for the building. He also noted that he believed that the signage laws do not permit signage above the second floor. Mr. Commer noted that the staff had already recommended pulling the signage into the building, but that their client wanted them to pursue this route anyway.

Ms. Hawkins reiterated that placing the signage in front of the spandrels or in front of the windows was not appropriate, and asked the applicant about a third option. Mr. Battersby responded that they might consider painting the backs of the windows and illuminating them from within. Mr. Commer noted that the client, UNIQLO, would need to consider and approve of this option. Mr. Battersby also noted that they had considered moving the signs to the limestone

spandrels between the first and second floors, but that the spans across the masonry were too narrow to fit a substantial sign. Mr. Cluver suggested suspending signage from the arched vestibule entry. Ms. Hawkins asked about the material of the arched ceiling. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the ceiling is decorative plaster.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the white glazing in the first-floor transoms. Mr. Battersby responded that the white would be a film applied to the back of the clear glass, replacing a current green film. Ms. Gutterman asked why they would not use that space as a potential signage location. Ms. Hawkins noted that this is a challenging building for signage, but added that it is important to be respectful of the architecture of the building. She noted that it is unfortunate that the UNIQLO logo is a perfect square. She commented that, as a consumer walking down the street, signage at the second and third floors would not be particularly useful, but agreed that the piers do not present enough square footage to provide adequate signage for a business. She noted that the white glazed area presented, to her, the best option for an area for back-light signage that could be funky and fun, and also provide extra visibility on the street. Alternatively, she noted, the interior of the storefront windows could be utilized for signage as well. Ms. Gutterman noted that awnings would not be an appropriate solution for the building. Mr. Commer agreed.

Mr. Cluver commented about the height of the proposed banner, asking whether it could be installed at a lower level. Mr. Commer asked whether he meant vertical banners or blade signs, noting that, from UNIQLO's standpoint, they would be desirable, but that he was not sure if they were an option. Ms. Hawkins replied that there are certain zoning areas in which blade signs are not permitted. Mr. Cluver asked how a projecting sign would be different at the street level than at the top of the building, and Ms. Gutterman responded that the flag pole currently exists. Ms. Hawkins asked if it would be possible to suspend the sign from the existing arm to bring it closer to the street level. Mr. Commer responded that that could be an option, as long as it was secured.

Ms. Hawkins opened the discussion up to public comment. No one offered comments.

Ms. Hawkins reiterated that she does not believe that the proposed signage is appropriate over the frieze or second-floor windows, but that the applicant has the flexibility to do whatever they would like behind any piece of glazing. She recommended exploring those options. She also noted that she does not oppose the proposed banner sign, per se, but if the applicant chose to tether the sign at a lower level to the building, that would need to be reviewed.

Ms. Gutterman agreed with the staff recommendation, of approval of the banner sign, provided that it is allowable by zoning, and denial of the internally illuminated signs as proposed in the drawings and on the model presented at the meeting, with the recommendation that the applicant consider back-lit signs on the interior of the windows, and, if it is allowable, a larger banner sign suspended from the flag pole.

Mr. Commer asked if Ms. Gutterman was rejecting any exterior signage, and Ms. Hawkins responded that the recommendation was not for the rejection of any exterior signage, but for the two proposals currently before the Committee, noting that the square branding limits the placement of signage on this building. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if it would be possible to get a square by incorporating numerous panes of glass. Mr. Commer responded that that might be a possibility.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the banner sign, and denial of the internally illuminated signs covering the frieze between the second and third floors as well as the second-floor windows.

ADDRESS: 401 N BROAD ST

Project: Install rooftop cooling towers and louvered vents

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Gerald M. Marshall

Applicant: Robert Thomas, Campbell Thomas & Company Architects

History: 1929; Terminal Commerce Building, North American Building; William Steele & Sons Company, architects

Individual Designation: 5/11/1994

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install electrical power generation equipment primarily within the warehouse portion of the building and the associated cooling equipment on the roof of the headhouse and warehouse. The installation of the power generation system requires the installation of louvers within approximately 30 window openings of the building, including 26 bays of the warehouse portion of the building, and three windows of the headhouse. To achieve the necessary ventilation for the new power equipment, the proposed alterations for each street façade are as follows:

- **Callowhill Street:**
 - o Remove glazing from windows in seven bays of the warehouse
 - o Leave existing steel window frames in place
 - o Install louver systems behind and separate from the frames
 - o Selectively remove muntins from upper corner of six of the seven openings to accommodate a 24" diameter vent pipe that extends 30" from the building façade.
 - o Install one air louver within existing metal panel banding at ground floor of headhouse
- **13th Street:**
 - o Remove glazing from windows in seven bays of the warehouse
 - o Leave existing steel window frames in place
 - o Install louver systems behind and separate from the frames
 - o Selectively remove muntins from upper corner of four of the seven openings to accommodate a 24" diameter vent pipe that extends 30" from the building façade.
- **Noble Street:**
 - o Remove stucco infill from 12 bays along the Noble Street façade
 - o Remove potentially deteriorated frames currently buried behind stucco panels
 - o Install fully louvered vent panels filling the masonry opening
- **Broad Street:**
 - o Remove glazing from upper sash of three windows on the second floor
 - o Install louver system behind existing frames

This application also proposes the installation of approximately 28' high rooftop cooling towers on the southwest portion of the roof, one set to be located on the headhouse portion of the building, and the other to be located on the warehouse. The installation of the units will be conducted in phases, with the Phase I cooling towers to be built on the headhouse in order to relocate existing equipment on the warehouse prior to constructing the Phase II cooling towers. According to the applicant, the minimum number of units required for Phase I is three.

The original application offered two alternatives for the location and configuration of the cooling towers, but has been revised since the Architectural Committee meeting to document six different alternatives recommendation to minimize the number of units on the headhouse. Of the current options, Option 3 offers the fewest units on the headhouse portion.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the installation of the ground floor louvers along the Callowhill and 13th Street facades behind the existing frames, and approval of the removal of the stucco infill and installation of louvers along Noble Street, provided that the window frames are retained or recreated in all openings, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of the installation of louvers along the Broad Street façade; approval of the installation of the cooling towers on the warehouse portion of the building, and denial of the cooling tower on the headhouse as presented, with the recommendation that the location of the tower be reevaluated to minimize the visibility of the units from Broad Street, particularly as they impact the spatial relationships of the building's tiered facade.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Historic building architectural consultant Harry Murray, architect Tim Wanaselja, project manager Chuck Kensky, and George Wilson represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked if the applicant had any section drawings to help the Committee members understand the height of the parapet versus the height of the proposed units and setback on the roof. Mr. Wanaselja responded that he did not have sections with him, but that renderings of the 3D model were included to show views of the building and the proposed units from the pedestrian perspective walking north along Broad Street. Mr. Cluver asked for the heights of the various components, and Mr. Wanaselja responded that the parapet around the headhouse is seven feet in height, while the parapet drops to approximately three feet at the warehouse portion of the building. The height of the equipment with tonnage, Mr. Wanaselja noted, is approximately 28 feet.

Ms. Gutterman noted that the equipment is very large and that there are very few places where the equipment would not be visible.

Mr. Cluver asked what is determining the location of the rooftop equipment, and Mr. Kensky responded that the existing rooftop equipment limits the possible locations of new equipment. He noted that the equipment would be located in clusters, on the headhouse and warehouse. The first cluster will be located in vacant space on the roof, near the southwest corner of the headhouse. The second cluster will be replacing existing equipment, which will be migrated to the first cluster of cooling towers as the second cluster is constructed. As the building grows, more equipment will be migrated onto the proposed cooling towers on the south side. The north side equipment is dedicated to an existing tenant.

Ms. Gutterman asked why the building requires such extensive cooling equipment and Mr. Kensky responded that the building is being turned into a large data center hoteling site that currently serves critical facility phone systems. The additional equipment must be powered and cooled in the building.

Ms. Hawkins asked if any equipment could be located in one of the lightwells. Mr. Kensky responded that there is already equipment in the lightwells. Mr. Murray noted that there is already extensive equipment on the roof. Mr. Wanaselja noted that there was no air-conditioning originally in the building, so, as it becomes more occupied, new equipment to heat and cool the building becomes difficult to install.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the entire south side tenancy was being revamped or if they were adding tenants to currently vacant space. Mr. Kensky responded that there are vacant floors that will be filled with electrical and computer equipment. Ms. Hawkins asked for clarifications of the logistics of the proposed project. Is the application trying to shuffle equipment around and keep systems operational during construction or is there the flexibility to put this equipment in the optimal space for the building? Mr. Kensky replied that it is both. The first cluster of rooftop cooling equipment, on the headhouse, must be installed for some new tenants, and then migrate some of the existing tenants' equipment out of the way to install the second cluster, so they can fill in the vacant spaces in the building.

Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Kensky to explain which rooftop equipment would be remaining and which would be relocating. Mr. Kensky pointed to units on the south side of the warehouse roof, noting that those units would be removed and their cooling capacity added to the first cluster. It was essential, he noted, that the first cluster be constructed first so that cooling capacity of the current equipment could be added to that cluster while the second cluster is constructed in the location of the current equipment. It is important, he emphasized, that none of the equipment be down at any given time, since the services they provide are critical.

Ms. Hawkins asked how many units are necessary to have in place on a temporary basis in the first cluster in order to remove the existing equipment and install the second cluster. Ms. Gutterman clarified that the key is to minimize additions on the headhouse. Mr. Kensky responded that, if the first cluster was sized solely to remove and relocate the existing equipment in the second cluster location, he would need about two units of the four currently proposed or four of the six. Ms. Hawkins noted that her preference would be to construct only what is absolutely necessary on the headhouse to keep the systems running, and then use the vacated space on the warehouse roof for the rest of the equipment farm.

Mr. Cluver reiterated that the Committee would be much more concerned about units on the headhouse, while there is greater flexibility for those on the roof of the warehouse. Therefore, if there is a way to fit additional units on the warehouse, that would be preferable. He asked the applicant whether this project could accommodate all of the space in the building or whether more equipment would need to be accommodated on the roof in the future. Mr. Kensky responded that the current proposal is designed to handle the future use to full capacity, which is why the construction will be occurring in phases. Cluster two, he noted, would not be constructed for a while.

Mr. Cluver then asked how much of the large equipment is based on the heavy heat load nature of the equipment being installed in the building. Mr. Kensky responded that it is all equipment

cooling, and that if the building was occupied by another type of tenant, the necessary equipment would be considerably less.

Ms. Hawkins asked if there are other ways to reduce heat gain in the building. Mr. Kensky responded that there are no windows in the equipment rooms, as they are kept in environmentally controlled spaces. He noted, however, that they will have water side economizers.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the applicant explore the possibility of locating additional equipment on the warehouse as opposed to headhouse, and come to the Commission with an explanation of why that is or is not possible. If it does not work on the warehouse, he would like to see a new submission with sections showing greater detail of setbacks and relationships between the equipment and the building. Ms. Hawkins added that any equipment should be pushed as far as possible away from the edge of the building, particularly from the southwest corner of the headhouse.

Ms. Hawkins further noted that the applicant may need to explore using a combination of larger and smaller units. Mr. Cluver commented that, even if the units on the warehouse were to be larger and more prominent, that would be preferable to having two smaller, similarly sized sets of units on both the headhouse and warehouse.

Ms. DiPasquale commented that the staff's concern was particularly with the view of Option B coming north on Broad Street, in which the proposed units are starting to visually interfere with the tiered character of the façade.

Moving the discussion to the installation of louvers, Mr. Cluver asked why louvers are necessary on Broad Street. Mr. Kensky responded that they are installing a data center there, and have electrical and battery rooms, and are utilizing the louvers for hydrogen exhaust and free cooling of the equipment. The way the electrical equipment is positioned within the available space, he noted, it is not possible by code to run ductwork over top of it to go out of the Callowhill Street façade. Ms. Hawkins asked if the equipment is existing or if it will be installed during this project. Mr. Kensky responded that it is new equipment for a new tenant. The electrical equipment is being located on the south side of the building.

Ms. Gutterman excused herself from the meeting.

Mr. Kensky showed drawings depicting the interior plans including the location of the new interior equipment. He noted that the new equipment needed to be located near columns for structural support, and that they had explored multiple layouts before devising an option that would be functional. The purpose of the louvers, he noted, is to provide ventilation for the hydrogen equipment, and for free energy cooling. He noted that, if the Committee could accept one louver, they could delete the other two, but if none is possible, then he would have to find a completely new solution. Mr. Cluver asked about the nature of a hydrogen exhaust. Mr. Kensky responded that, when the hydrogen battery is charged, it gives off a small amount of hydrogen. Mr. Cluver asked whether the battery was noisy or noxious, and Mr. Kensky responded that it is not; it is only ventilated with a small fan.

Mr. Kensky noted that, if no louvers are allowed on Broad Street, then they lose their free cooling ability and energy savings. Mr. Murray asked about the amount of savings, to which Mr.

Kensky responded that it would provide approximately \$2,000 to \$3,000 in savings per year. Mr. Cluver asked about the size of the louvers, and Mr. Wanaselja replied that the louvers are currently proposed to take up the top sash of three windows. Mr. Wanaselja noted that the louvers do not need to be that large necessarily, but from a sizing standpoint are approximately 24 by 36 inches. Mr. Cluver asked for clarification. If the Committee was to recommend that no louvers along Broad Street, would the applicant be able to find a way to re-route the hydrogen, which is a programmatic necessity? Mr. Kensky indicated that they could find another route for the hydrogen ventilation. Mr. Cluver noted that, although the Committee does not want to seem unsympathetic to energy-saving solutions, the relative energy savings compared to the energy consumption in this case is nominal. Mr. Cluver commented that, because the Committee and Commission fight so hard to improve primary facades, he cannot support adding louvers to the main façade of this building. Mr. Cluver asked about the louver on Callowhill Street, noting that he thinks it would be acceptable, as long as it is painted the color of the surrounding metal panel.

Moving the discussion to the proposed first-floor louvers, Mr. Cluver asked if the proposed vent pipes had an arm or if they came straight out from the building. Mr. Wanaselja responded that they are straight. Ms. Hawkins asked if the size of the pipes is necessary, and Mr. Wanaselja responded that the size of the pipe is dictated by the size of the generator.

Mr. Murray explained that the pattern of louvers behind existing frames is already established in many of warehouse windows. He noted that the condition of the window frames in the stuccoed windows is largely unknown, but that photographs from the interior of the building indicate that they may be bulging in some areas and in poor structural condition. Ms. DiPasquale remarked that the staff believed that, in instances where the frames could not be preserved, the applicant could recreate the frames and install new louvers behind them. The building would benefit from such a partial restoration. Mr. Baron echoed Ms. DiPasquale's remarks, noting that the Noble Street and Callowhill Street facades are lengthy facades along public right-of-ways. He continued that, although the existing frames may be in poor condition, Standard 6 states that, in cases where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if there had been any contemplation to creating a common exhaust through the roof with sufficient carrying capacity for everyone. Such a system would be preferable to ventilating through individual windows. Mr. Kensky responded that it would be very difficult to construct a vertical shaft because of the tenants on floors above. All of the corridors, he noted, are filled with conduits, and, thus, headroom clearance is an issue. Ms. Hawkins asked why it was not possible to go up through one of the lightwells, and Mr. Kensky responded that the lightwell only extends down to the sixth floor. For future work, he noted, they will utilize those spaces.

Regarding the cooling towers, the Architectural Committee summarized its thoughts, suggesting that the applicants explore locating both new cooling towers on the warehouse portion of the building as well as the possibility of combining differently sized units, with an emphasis on minimizing size and visibility of the units on the headhouse. If it can be proven that both sets of units cannot be placed on the warehouse portion of the building, additional view angles, sections, and other information should be drawn up and presented for better understanding of the impact that set the units will have on the southwest corner of the headhouse.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the installation of the first-floor louvers behind existing frames in the warehouse section along Callowhill Street and 13th Street; approval of the removal of the stucco infill and installation of louvers along Noble Street, provided that the window frames are retained or recreated in all openings; denial of louvers along the Broad Street façade; and no recommendation on the cooling towers, pending the submission of additional information; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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.

§14-203(15) Alter or Alteration.

(a) As used in Chapter 14-1000 (Historic Preservation): a change in the appearance of a building, structure, site, or object which is not otherwise covered by the definition of demolition, or any other change for which a permit is required under The Philadelphia Code of General Ordinances. "Alteration" includes the reroofing, cleaning, or pointing of a building, structure, or object.

§14-203(88) Demolition or Demolish.

The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface.

§14-1005(6)(e) Review Criteria.

In making its determination as to the appropriateness of proposed alterations, demolition, or construction, the Historical Commission shall consider the following:

- (.1) The purposes of this Chapter 14-1000;
- (.2) The historical, architectural, or aesthetic significance of the building, structure, site, or object;
- (.3) The effect of the proposed work on the building, structure, site, or object and its appurtenances;
- (.4) The compatibility of the proposed work with the character of the historic district or with the character of its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape; and
- (.5) The design of the proposed work.

(.6) In addition to the above, the Historical Commission may be guided in evaluating proposals for alteration or construction by the Secretary of the Interior's "Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings" or similar criteria.