

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

**TUESDAY, 22 JANUARY 2013
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, Chair
John Cluver
Nan Gutterman
Amy Stein
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

Cindy Hamilton, Loews Hotels
Dan Joy, Rule Joy Trammell & Rubio Architecture and Interior Design
Michelle Behr, Loews Hotels
Harry Schwartz, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Rick Staub, Loews Hotels
Elizabeth Surin
Jill Fratto, Express Exeditors
Maria Cercero Slade, Aria Health
Richard Balderston, Aria Health
Anthony Bruttaniti, Architect
Robert Zambrano
Linda Carrafiello
Steve Tan
Jackie Gusic, Inhabit LLC
Dennis Daily, DeHaven
Tricia Desmarais Clark, Esq., Bochetto & Lentz, P.C.

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman, Pentz and Stein joined her. Mr. Cluver joined the meeting while it was in progress.

ADDRESS: 1200 MARKET ST

Project: Remove canopy, restore signage, reopen entrance, install canopy

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Twelfth Street Hotel Associates, L.P.

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

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

Individual Designation: 1/30/1968

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: The application proposes alterations to the ground floor of the former Philadelphia Savings Fund Society building, which has been adaptively reused as a hotel. This application is a revision of an application that was reviewed at the December 2012 meeting of the Architectural Committee. The Committee recommended denial of the earlier application, which was withdrawn before the Commission reviewed it. The current application responds to the Committee's comments.

The proposed alterations stem from a desire to reconfigure the guest arrival experience at the building. Currently, hotel guests arrive at a Market Street entrance at the western edge of the building, which originally served as the entrance to the main banking room on the second floor. The path from the entrance at the west to the lobby is confusing and indirect. The proposal seeks to eliminate the confusion with the creation of an entrance directly into the lobby. The proposal would relocate the main entrance along Market to two entrances to the east, a retail entrance and a former subway concourse entrance. The existing canopy would be removed and the original "Philadelphia Savings Fund Society" aluminum letters restored at the banking hall entrance. The former subway entrance, which was infilled, would be reopened and a revolving door installed. A new canopy would be installed, spanning the area from the subway entrance to the retail entrance.

The application proposes three options for the design of the canopy at the new location. All three canopies would be the same size and would span both the retail and subway entrances. Option 1 proposes a metal canopy similar to the existing one. Option 2 proposes a glass canopy with an exposed steel structure. Option 3 proposes a glass canopy with exterior cable tie backs. The staff contends that, of the three proposed canopy options, Option 1 is the most compatible with and sympathetic to this landmark building and is similar to the canopy approved by the Commission in 2000.

The previous application proposed the installation of a five-foot extension to the top section of the storefront; that element has been withdrawn from this application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of Option 1, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Preservation consultant Cindy Hamilton, architect Dan Joy, and hotel representatives Michelle Behr and Rick Staub represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins thanked the applicants for the thoughtful revisions to the canopy proposal. She asked the applicants explain the proposed installation of the revolving door in the subway entrance. Ms. Hawkins noted that, historically, the revolving door was located in the retail entrance, not the subway entrance. Mr. Joy answered that they are willing to locate the

revolving door in either the subway or retail door opening; however, the installation of the revolving door in the retail entrance would require substantial modifications to the entranceway. He noted that the placement of the revolving door in the former subway entrance, as shown, is the client's preferred option. Ms. Hawkins stated that the discussion at the last meeting centered on the dimensions of a standard revolving door versus the dimensions of the historic revolving door, which would have been smaller. She asserted that altering the retail opening to accommodate a larger revolving door is not appropriate and asked whether a historically-accurate revolving door could be installed within the existing retail entrance. Mr. Joy noted that revolving-door standards have changed from 1932 to today. He explained that a historically accurate revolving door would be six feet in diameter; the current standard for a revolving door is eight feet in diameter. Ms. Gutterman asserted that guests would probably prefer not to use the revolving door with luggage. She stated that the restoration of the revolving door as it was in the retail space could be achieved, provided that swing doors were installed in the subway entrance. Mr. Joy stated that they would explore the possible restoration. Ms. Hawkins acknowledged that the restoration could be challenging, but encouraged the applicant to consider it carefully. She stated that both entrances are very distinct and that, since we know that the historic retail door was a revolving door, we should strive to recreate it as closely as possible. She noted that the new door type should be installed in the subway entrance if possible, given that that opening will be changing significantly.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the attachment details for the canopy. Mr. Joy stated that they had taken cues from the previous discussion with the Committee and decided to create a more sympathetic canopy, both in design and dimension. He noted that the canopy in Option A continues the design and dimensions of the fascia on the storefront. Ms. Gutterman stated that the canopy seems appropriate, but expressed concern in regards to the attachment to the fascia and the canopy's relationship to the storefront. She suggested that a reveal may be a good solution that respects the original massing of the storefront and would allow for a smoother transition rather than the abrupt joint as currently shown. Mr. Joy conceded that the attachment details have not been fully designed and expressed his acceptance of Ms. Gutterman's suggestion. Ms. Gutterman stated that, although the intention of the canopy is to match and blend with the fascia at the storefront, a reveal would differentiate it and make it appear as its own element. She suggested a three-inch reveal would probably be acceptable and stated that the staff could work with the applicant on that final detail.

Ms. Stein expressed her agreement with the staff's recommendation. She noted that the glass canopy options would be foreign to the palate and style of the building. Ms. Stein pointed out that the original 1932 design of the storefront had a step at the fascia, which disrupted the continuity of the fascia as it wrapped around the storefront. She stated that Option A alludes to that original design in a subtle and successful manner. She stated that locating signage on all three sides of the canopy is overwhelming. She noted that perhaps it is the size and font of the signage that overwhelms the canopy. She suggested that signage should be primarily located at the front with the hotel's logo on the sides only. Mr. Staub explained that, owing to the direction of traffic on Market Street, having signage on the sides of the canopy is of utmost importance for the hotel. Ms. Hawkins stated that it may be a question of scale. She suggested that the sign be scaled appropriately to the canopy. She also suggested keeping the letters on the side, but eliminating the logo to create more room. Mr. Joy and Ms. Behr both agreed that they could scale and design the signage appropriately.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the applicant should provide more detailed drawings at the Commission meeting that address all the Committee's comments. She asked the Committee if

there was consensus that the revolving door should be at the retail entrance. Ms. Gutterman and Pentz agreed that it should be. Ms. Stein expressed her openness to either placement. The Committee agreed that Option A for the canopy was the most appropriate.

Harry Schwartz of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Alliance concurs with the Commission's staff that Option A is the most appropriate. He expressed hesitation for a final approval without more details, but was pleased that the Committee had so thoughtfully discussed those details that were of concern to the Alliance, such as the doors and signage. He pointed out that there is a historic sign at the former subway entrance and wondered whether it would be restored as part of this alteration. Mr. Joy answered that the sign would be preserved and restored.

Ms. Gutterman advised the applicant to salvage and store all materials that will be removed as part of the alteration, in particular the black granite at the subway entrance. Mr. Staub concurred and noted that the hotel has a stock pile of replacement stones.

Ms. Hawkins asked for clarification that, as part of the current application, the former "Philadelphia Savings Fund Society" letters would be restored back to the original banking entrance. Mr. Joy answered that the restoration of that sign was still part of the application. Mr. Staub noted that the size of the letters may change. Ms. Hawkins stated that a restoration must be done faithfully in order to be classified as a restoration. She asked the staff if it was aware of a possible deviation from the original design and front size. Mr. Danta answered that it was not, and that it had only endorsed a faithful restoration. Ms. Hawkins reiterated that a scaled drawing would answer many of the scale questions that have arisen. Mr. Joy added that the hotel may want to include some smaller signs at the former baking entrance. Ms. Hawkins stated that they were not shown in the submission. Any additional signage proposals should be added to the revised drawings in order to be reviewed for approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Option A, with the revolving door in its historic location at the retail entrance, and the salvaging of all original materials, with the staff to review details including but not limited to the final design and reveal of the canopy, doors, and restoration of the Philadelphia Savings Fund Society sign, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

ADDRESS: 500 SPRUCE ST

Project: Enlarge opening and install window, alter doorway

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Elizabeth Surin and Jason Weintraub

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto Designshop Inc

History: 1972

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the front façade of a Redevelopment Period townhouse in the Society Hill Historic District. The building was constructed in 1972 for mixed use. It originally housed a doctor's office and residence.

The application proposes to enlarge a ground-floor window opening and install a new window on the front façade facing Spruce Street. There was no window at the first floor of this façade

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 JANUARY 2013

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

originally, as is shown by a photograph taken in 1973. The window opening in question is not original and is not appropriately located, proportioned, or oriented for the building. It is set high on the façade and is horizontally oriented, while all other windows in the building are tall, narrow, and vertically oriented. The opening be enlarged and vertically oriented to better match the windows at the second and third floors. The proposed divisions of the window could better reflect those of the original windows.

The front doorway would also be altered. The front doorway currently has an arched transom, which would be squared.

The application also proposes alterations and minor work to a rear deck, the installation of a new skylight, the installation of new security guards, and masonry restoration.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the doorway alterations, but approval of all other work, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Adam Moltabano and owners Elizabeth Surin and Jason Weintraub represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked the other Committee members if they had any concerns about the proposed alterations related to the skylight, window grills, and deck. The Committee members did not express any opposition with those alterations.

Ms. Hawkins asked the architect to describe the proposal for the new window. Mr. Montalbano answered that the non-historic window would be enlarged to match the scale of the other windows in the façade. He noted that, although the muntin pattern does not copy the original pattern found in the other windows, it has been designed to complement that original pattern. Ms. Hawkins asked if the existing window was a later modification. Mr. Danta answered that originally the Spruce Street façade did not have a window at the ground floor, but that a window was inserted into that facade by 1980. He noted that the window does not match the size or orientation of the other windows on the 5th and Spruce Street facades.

Mr. Montalbano stated that, although the entrance door may be original, it does not relate to the style of the building; it seems to have been designed in order to mimic the older homes to the west. Ms. Hawkins agreed that the door clearly paid deference to the older homes and noted that it is an important element for this reason. Mr. Adam noted that it seemed out of place within the design of the building, even though it may be respectful of the pattern on the street. Ms. Stein asked if the enlarged window would respect the height of the arched doorway. Mr. Montalbano answered that the lintel of the enlarged window would be correspond to the height of the arched doorway. Ms. Gutterman noted that the enlarged window would not align with the windows on the 5th Street elevation. Mr. Adam concurred and stated that it would not. He explained that the enlarged window would be recessed at the lintel level to match the design of the other windows in the façade, but that it would not align. Ms. Hawkins questioned whether the new altered window should match the size of the other windows. She expressed hesitation about creating a window that mimics certain patterns of the original windows, but does not align with them. Ms. Stein agreed with Ms. Hawkin's observation. She also pointed out that the sill heights of the windows on 5th Street align with those on the older homes to the west. She suggested that the sill height be brought up to match those on the 5th Street elevation and the older homes to the west. Ms. Surin stated that she would prefer the sill height to match as well. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the window should mimic the original ones, or be very different.

The Committee members were unanimous in their opinion that the door should stay as originally designed. Ms. Surin asked if the sidelights in the entrance are part of original design, or if a wider door could be installed. Mr. Danta answered that the door design with sidelights is original. Ms. Gutterman noted that a wider door may be too wide and cumbersome to operate. Ms. Surin agreed to keep the door as is.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the alterations to the door, approval of the enlarged window, provided the sill and lintel heights matches those of the windows on 5th Street and the muntin pattern matches the windows along Spruce Street, and approval of all other elements of the application, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

ADDRESS: 111-13, 115, AND 117 WALNUT ST

Project: Construct single-family dwellings

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Society Hill Developers

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto Designshop Inc.

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct four townhouses on vacant parcels at the edge of the Old City Historic District. The Commission's jurisdiction is review-and-comment only on these undeveloped parcels. Individually-designated buildings once stood on the parcels, but they were demolished before the creation of the historic district and their individual designations were rescinded. The proposed townhouses would be four stories tall and contemporary in style. The front facades of the houses would meet the sidewalk; garages would be located at the rears of the properties. The design of the houses would be clearly contemporary, yet their massing and scale would be appropriate to the district. The proposed design and materials would also be appropriate for this location. The streetscape is varied, with a wide range of materials, scales, massings, and rhythms.

STAFF COMMENT: The proposed townhouses satisfy Standard 9. They would be differentiated from yet compatible with their environment.

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

Mr. Montalbano distributed renderings of the designs. Ms. Hawkins stated that the sun screens reminded her of southern architecture. Mr. Montalbano explained that the screens would be located on the south-facing façade of the townhouses and provide glare and sun control. He added that the main living spaces are located in the upper stories. Mr. Montalbano explained that the brick would be light gray and light brown with dark wood accents. He noted that the color choices relate to the palette on the street, which ranges from white to very dark brown. He pointed out the small gardens that are located between the screens and the facades of the houses. Ms. Gutterman asked if the gardens would be fenced off. Mr. Montalbano answered that they would not, and that they are elevated from grade by about three feet, which would give them some separation from the street and alleviate the need for fences.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 JANUARY 2013

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Ms. Stein stated that the proposed materials are too varied and it would be best to minimize the variety of materials. She also noted that the rear and side elevations of the townhouses are not designed. She noted that the east elevation is visible from the street. She suggested that the proposed stucco is not appropriate and that the elevation should be more integrated with the Walnut Street elevation. She encouraged the architect to use brick instead of stucco. Ms. Gutterman stated that it is difficult to understand how all the proposed materials relate to one another without a color rendering. Ms. Hawkins added that the little streets provide important view points.

Ms. Stein noted that the gutters are not well designed and would not work owing to the joggings around the elevation. Mr. Montalbano explained that the gutters are straight, except for one along the front elevation of the corner townhouses, which follows the bay. Ms. Stein recommended that the corner gutter be located internally.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that the design is generally appropriate to the district, but suggested that the variety of materials be reduced, that the east and north facades be finished in similar materials to the front façade, and that the gutters be located internally.

ADDRESS: 170 S INDEPENDENCE W ML

Project: Install awnings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Curtis Partners LP

Applicant: Robert Stein, Compass Sign Company

History: 1910; Curtis Publishing Company building and Dream Garden mosaic; Edgar Seeler, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install awnings within ten bays on the 7th and Walnut Street or west and south elevations of the Curtis Publishing Building. The awnings would be made of an acrylic material in green embellished with the logo “Aria 3B Orthopedic Institute.” The awnings would fit within the window opening. No attachment information has been provided.

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 awnings would disrupt the continuity of the unobstructed bays and overall symmetry of facades.

In June 2010, the Commission reviewed a similar application for the installation of awnings and planters on the 7th Street side of this building. The application was denied. The lessee of the unit elected to install the awnings and planters without the approval of the Historical Commission or a permit from the Department of License and Inspection. A violation was subsequently issued. The awnings remain in place, but are illegal.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 JANUARY 2013

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Tenants Maria Cerceo Slade, Linda Michelle, and Dr. Richard Balderson and awning provider Robert Stein represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the window graphics were part of the submission. Ms. Slade confirmed that they may pursue an approval for the window graphics in the future, but they are only seeking approval of the awnings today. She explained that the window graphics would be vinyl decals placed on the interior of the glass at the bottom of the windows.

Ms. Slade stated that Aria Health has been serving northeast Philadelphia and Bucks County for more than 100 years and have the opportunity to extend their healthcare services to Center City Philadelphia. She stated that the building is beautiful and Aria is excited to be located in it. She explained that the application is intended to assist patients with way-finding and navigation. She reported that they selected a design that would not overpower but would rather underscore the beauty of the building while helping patients find their facility. She explained that many of their patients are elderly and have difficulty walking and seeing. Dr. Balderson affirmed that Aria provides services to disabled people. He explained that there is an ADA ramp for access, but elderly people tend to have not only mobility problems, but also vision problems. He explained that, now that Aria has moved into the space without signs, the problem is evident.

Ms. Hawkins stated that signage is a challenge for every business owner no matter the clientele. She opined that the awnings are inappropriate for the windows and do not relate to the architectural character of the building. She acknowledged the challenge of Aria's clients, but identifying the main entrance door would be more important than identifying every window.

Ms. Gutterman asked how the awnings would be anchored to the building. Mr. Stein explained that an aluminum frame would be anchored to the wood frame of the windows and not the granite. He noted that the property owner instructed that the awning attachments must not penetrate the granite. He asserted that the awnings would have a minimal impact on the historic fabric of the building. He explained that the awning material is fire-resistant and was required on another building they are doing in northeast Philadelphia. He noted that there are other materials, such as Sunbrella, that might have a better appearance and they would be willing to alternatively use those. He stated that the color selection is limited by the proposed material and the preference of the business.

Ms. Hawkins explained that the Committee members need to decide if the proposal is appropriate to the building. She contended that the proposal is not appropriate, but suggested that another awning scheme might be acceptable. She explained that the proposed location at the mid-point of the window is an inappropriate location for an awning. Ms. Gutterman explained a proposal for an awning under the decorative transom bar would be more appropriate than the awnings that split the larger arched windows; the meeting rail is not an appropriate location. Ms. Gutterman asked if the main entrance was located on Walnut Street. Ms. Slade explained that there are two entrances; one on 7th Street and one on Walnut Street, but the ramp is located on 7th Street. Mr. Stein explained that it is a large, multi-tenant building in which Aria only occupies one corner. He explained that there is no opportunity for signage at the main entrance because Aria is merely one of many tenants.

Ms. Slade asked if the Committee had any recommendations for changes to the proposal. Ms. Gutterman asked if directional signage at the doorway was a possibility. She explained that the proposed awnings would not direct anyone to the entrance of the building. Mr. Balderson

explained that the awnings locate the office for patients, making it easier for them to navigate once they are inside.

Ms. Sell noted that the awnings on the 7th Street side of the building, at the Cooperage, are illegal. They were installed without a permit. The Historical Commission denied an application for the awnings, which are located beneath the decorative transom bar, with the contention that they detracted from the continuity of the Beaux Arts architectural style of the building. The tenant installed the awnings despite the denial. Ms. Sell stated that the Architectural Committee recommended denial of the illegal awnings. Ms. Gutterman asked if the Commission denied the proposal based on the design or the attachment. Ms. Sell explained that the flower boxes are anchored into the granite, which is inappropriate, but the bulk of the Commission's discussion of that earlier application related to the appearance of the awnings on the façade of the building.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the proposed awnings would be located high above the sidewalk and should be located even higher, at the transom bar, from an architectural perspective. She questioned whether they would be effective for pedestrians in either location, given their height above the sidewalk. She recommended that a window graphic would serve the business better because it would be at the height of a person. She added that the graphic could include directional information about ADA entrances and could be bolder than what is included in the submission packet. Ms. Slade stated that it would be difficult to see from a car. Ms. Hawkins contended that the building is not difficult to find. Mr. Stein argued that elderly people may still have a problem with finding the location. Ms. Hawkins explained that bigger signage is not guaranteed to work if the clientele are challenged in that way. She continued that the Committee must be consistent in its review of appropriateness for the building. Ms. Gutterman emphasized that the reason the Cooperage signage was denied was because of the impact to the architecture of the building. Ms. Gutterman recommended that the applicant explore possibilities for signage around the main entrance as opposed to the windows. Ms. Hawkins noted that the Lights of Liberty of the Public Ledger Building nearby used flags and banners and that perhaps some of those options might be discussed with the landlord. She added that the window graphic could be used as a supplement. Ms. Gutterman observed that the Commission does not have jurisdiction over interior window treatments or graphics and they could be installed at any time. Ms. Sell added that the previous tenant of this unit used a window graphic as its form of signage.

Harry Schwartz of the Preservation Alliance for the Greater Philadelphia and Society Hill Civic Association stated that they endorse the staff's recommendation, but would add Standard 2 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards: "The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided." He explained that awnings are not the appropriate way to deal with the problem. He added that they are not in favor of window decals, but understand that the Commission does not have jurisdiction over interior alterations. He stated that any alteration to the building should be respectful to Washington Square. He stated that the suggestion of banners is not something that he would address because it was not included in the application.

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

ADDRESS: 2501 S GARNET ST

Project: Legalize removal of wall and installation of parking pad, install gate

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Robert and Laurie Zambrano

Applicant: Anthony Bruttaniti, Bruttaniti Architecture

History: 1910; James H. and John T. Windrim, architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Girard Estate Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a parking pad that was constructed on this corner property without the approval of the Historical Commission or a permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. This application also proposes to install a gate within the new opening in the garden wall.

In October 2012, the staff observed the alteration of a non-historic rear garden wall and installation of a concrete slab. A violation was subsequently issued.

The Statement of Significance in the nomination of the Girard Estate Historic District specifically identifies the open green space as part of the district's significance. The district is historically significant because it was an experimental proposal for an alternative form of development to the typical rowhouse form, which offers little to no green space. Communal garages were constructed with this development as a place for vehicles in order to maintain the open, unencumbered, green experience.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application. Architect Anthony Bruttaniti and owner Robert Zambrano represented the application.

Mr. Bruttaniti explained that they have been granted for a zoning variance for a curb cut and parking on the property. He stated that neither they nor the Zoning Board of Adjustment knew that the property was designated as a historic property. He distributed photographs of the property prior to the installation of the driveway, signatures of neighbors in support of the installation, and photographs of neighboring properties with parking pads.

Ms. Hawkins explained that the Architectural Committee is charged with determining whether the proposed alteration satisfies historic preservation standards. The Historical Commission itself can consider additional information such as extenuating circumstances. She explained that whether the neighbors' parking is legal or in violation should not enter into the Committee's decision-making process today. She welcomed the applicant to present information about nearby parking pads to the Historical Commission.

Mr. Zambrano stated that his contractor applied for a permit and was told that, unless he installed a curb cut, he would not need a permit for the concrete. He explained that they opted not to install a curb cut because the granite curb is very low and it would be expensive to alter the curb. He explained that he had other work done to the house in the past and the permit application was referred to the Historical Commission staff for review. He stated that the inspector who wrote the violation explained that a permit was not required for concrete work and therefore, they did not realize that the Commission's review and approval was required for the

issuance of the permit. Ms. Hawkins acknowledged that it sounds like there was an error in the permitting process; however, the Architectural Committee's sole task is to determine whether or not the work satisfies preservation standards. Any additional information can be presented to the Historical Commission itself.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the yard was prior to the alteration. Mr. Bruttaniti stated it was made of concrete pavers and planters. Ms. Hawkins asked if any trees were removed. Mr. Zambrano stated that trees were removed by the City years ago because they were dead. Ms. Gutterman asked about the proposed gate design. Mr. Bruttaniti explained that it would be a wrought iron picket and showed a rendering that was included in the submission. Ms. Hawkins suggested a clearer photograph or specification of the proposed gate would be beneficial for the Commission's review.

Ms. Pentz asked if the communal garages still exist. Mr. Zambrano explained that they do, but there is an eight-month waiting list. He continued that they made attempts to obtain a spot, but their calls were not returned.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the application is challenging because it seems like the applicant pursued the correct avenues for permitting, but somehow fell through a crack in the process. She recommended that the applicant make the best case possible to the Commission. She explained that the Committee's job is different and it must review the merits of the application in relationship to the district. She stated that parking at this location is inappropriate to the character of the district. She explained that she understands that the applicant was caught in an unfortunate set of circumstances. She suggested that having a clearer detail image of the gate and very clear before and after photographs would be helpful for the Commission. Ms. Hawkins suggested that offering a different fence option might be helpful; perhaps one that is more solid, more like a garden wall, so as not to allow the parked car to be seen.

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

ADDRESS: 2535 S 19TH ST

Project: Remove hairpin fence, install parking pad and gate

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Linda and Matthew Carrafiello

Applicant: Anthony Bruttaniti, Bruttaniti Architecture

History: 1909; James H. and John T. Windrim, architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Girard Estate Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a parking pad at this corner property. The parking area would be paved and a portion of the original hairpin fence around the side yard would be removed and a swing gate would be installed.

In July 2008, the applicant proposed a nearly identical project in-concept. The Commission denied the application. In August 2008, the applicant appealed the Commission's decision to the Board of License & Inspection Review. In September 2009, the Board affirmed the City and upheld the Commission's decision.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 JANUARY 2013

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

The Statement of Significance in the nomination of the Girard Estate Historic District specifically identifies the open green space as part of the district's significance. The district is historically significant because it was an experimental proposal for an alternative form of development to the typical rowhouse form, which offers little to no green space. Communal garages were constructed with this development as a place for vehicles in order to maintain the open, unencumbered, green experience.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application. Architect Anthony Bruttaniti and owner Linda Carrafiello represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the owner pursued the communal garage spaces. Ms. Carrafiello stated that there is a waiting list. Ms. Sell explained that the garages were built as part of the Girard Estate development and they are a row of one-story units with pressed metal cornices.

Ms. Hawkins observed that the property retains its original fence around an original side and rear yard and this application was denied in the past. Ms. Gutterman observed that there is an existing telephone pole in front of the proposed driveway. Ms. Carrafiello stated that the pole would be relocated to accommodate the entrance. She explained that the hairpin fence will remain, but will be retrofitted to allow for a portion of it to swing open and closed. She continued that the yard is currently paved and contains potted plants; there is a diseased fig tree that needs to be removed. She added that she has a letter from her neighbor who is not in opposition to the proposal.

Ms. Gutterman asked why there is a need for off-street parking considering there is on-street parking. Ms. Carrafiello explained that her husband is planning to purchase an energy-efficient car that will need to be electrically charged, which would require a driveway. She stated that there are similar installations throughout the neighborhood. She explained that she and her husband are senior citizens who, while not designated as handicapped, are not able to walk great distances after parking their cars on the street. She added that she recently had kidney surgery and her husband had major bypass surgery. She stated that professional and community commitments require travel by car. When returning home at late hours, it is often difficult to find nearby street parking. She stated that her husband is a City of Philadelphia judge and he has many commitments, and he thereby does not return home until late in the evening. She explained that the concrete at the proposed site is in need of repair, making it a good time for the requested changes. She stated that this project will not decrease the number of available parking spaces in the area. She stated that the shrubbery is not historical as she planted it in the 1980s, but it will need to be removed, per the landscaper, owing to disease. She explained that the rear garden area will be maintained.

Ms. Hawkins asked if any aspect of the proposal has changed since the Commission denied the earlier application. Ms. Carrafiello stated that the Commission was concerned with the hairpin fence during the earlier review. She explained that she will have an iron worker devise a mechanism to open and close a section of the fence so that it maintains its current appearance. Ms. Hawkins contended that the hairpin fence will not maintain its current appearance because it will likely require a mechanism that opens and closes the gate, a locking mechanism, a central rail, and other pieces that are different. She added that a curb will be cut down for access. She argued that she does not see how this proposal is different from the 2008 application. Ms.

Carrafiello asserted that the only issue in 2008 was the removal of the hairpin fence. Mr. Baron asserted that the minutes of the Commission's 2008 review specifically state that the fence was not the only issue. He suggested that the preservation of spaces is important.

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

ADDRESS: 2514 S 22ND ST

Project: Legalize windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Steve Tan

Applicant: Steve Tan

History: 1915; James H. and John T. Windrim, architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Girard Estate Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of vinyl windows that were installed without the Historical Commission review and approval. The historically appropriate windows for this house are wood one-over-one double-hung windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Erin Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owners Amy Liang and Steve Tan represented the application, but were not present at the commencement of the review.

Ms. Coté stated that it was her understanding that these windows had already been installed when the applicant purchased the property.

Ms. Liang and Mr. Tan joined the meeting. Ms. Hawkins explained to them that the Committee applies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties when reviewing proposals. She stated that the Committee looks at the merits of the application on its face and they do not recommend the installation of vinyl windows. Ms. Hawkins informed the applicants that the Historical Commission can take other factors into account, like the fact that the vinyl windows had already been installed when the applicants purchased the property. She suggested that the applicants submit a photograph from the time of sale that shows that the vinyl windows were already installed. Ms. Liang stated that they purchased the house at auction. Ms. Gutterman suggested that information about the auction may be helpful. Ms. Hawkins noted that merely because the previous owner installed the vinyl windows does not mean that the Historical Commission will allow the windows to remain.

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

ADDRESS: 245 S 16TH ST

Project: Construct trellis

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Peter Bloomfield

Applicant: Peter Bloomfield

History: 1840

Individual Designation: 6/7/1973

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

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

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Peter Bloomfield represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked for clarification on the extent of the proposed installation. Mr. Bloomfield explained that this application would hopefully be the first of five interventions along Latimer Street. He described the 1500-block of Latimer and noted that the side facade of the subject property faces the 1500-block of Latimer, which Mr. Bloomfield described as “not very nice.” He noted that there are many illegal dumpsters along the street. Ms. Hawkins reiterated her question and asked that the applicant focus on describing the extent of the application. Mr. Bloomfield explained that the application proposed the installation of a trellis along the side façade of his property at 245 S. 16th Street. He stated that he is in conversations with the City to turn Latimer into a “green street” and also to host a bicycle rental location. He distributed color renderings that showed a landscape proposal for the entire street, not only the subject property. He stated that the installation would not damage the wall and that the only physical intervention would be three holes to hold the trellis.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the subject property was the only property that was proposing the green initiative today, or if the application involved all other properties along the 1500-block of Latimer. Mr. Bloomfield answered that the proposal only includes his property and that he was not representing any of the other property owners on the block. Ms. Hawkins asked about the proposed materials for the trellis. Mr. Bloomfield answered that it would likely be painted steel, but that “frankly they had not even thought about it.” He reiterated that rubbish dumping is a problem along this stretch of the street. Ms. Gutterman asked about the material of the wall. Mr. Bloomfield answered that the wall is stucco over brick. Mr. Bloomfield stated that the exterior is original, except for the stucco on the side facade. Ms. Hawkins asked if the planter on the sidewalk would prevent a wheelchair from using the sidewalk. Ms. Gutterman expressed concern about live vegetation touching the masonry wall, and the moisture retention problems that this might cause. Mr. Bloomfield stated that, if it is properly installed, the vegetation will not touch the wall. He noted that there would be a two-inch separation. Ms. Gutterman noted that it might also create maintenance problems for the stucco on the wall.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 JANUARY 2013

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Ms. Pentz described the wall as character-defining. Mr. Bloomfield reiterated that the street has a rubbish and graffiti problem. Ms. Pentz asked how wide the trellis with vegetation would be. Mr. Bloomfield answered that it would be about eight inches and align with the cornice on the top. Ms. Hawkins noted that the final details rested on the type of planting that was selected, which the Commission would have no authority to regulate. Ms. Gutterman also noted that the attachment details of the planter may cause moisture penetration issues with the wall. Ms. Stein stated that she was concerned by the permanence of the trellis. She explained that, if the vegetation dies and the planters are removed, the steel trellis may remain on the building, which would visually alter the façade.

Ms. Gutterman opined that the application was incomplete and that more details should be submitted, specifically attachment details. She agreed with Ms. Pentz, who asserted that the wall is a character-defining element. Ms. Pentz stated that the proposed alteration is inappropriate, and does not meet the Standards, even if more details are submitted. She stated that the application should be denied owing to its inappropriateness, not because of a lack of details.

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

ADDRESS: 2015 DELANCEY PL

Project: Expand garage, construct roof deck and penthouse

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kevin and Amy Covert

Applicant: Jackie Gusic, inHabit, LLC

History: 1865

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck and penthouse addition. The roof deck would be set back eight feet, and the penthouse would be set back 20 feet from the front façade. They will be minimally visible from Cypress Street.

This application also proposes to expand the rear Cypress Street garage from one-car to two-car. The expanded garage structure roof would create a walk-out terrace at the first floor. The application proposes to access the terrace by converting the side bay window into French doors. Narrow stiles and rails are proposed to match the historic window dimensions and proportions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that a mock up of the deck and penthouse indicate that they would not be visible from Delancey Place, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jackie Gusic represented the application.

Ms. Cote informed the Committee that she had visited the site earlier that morning to view the mock-up of the roof deck and penthouse. She informed the Committee members that the mock-up was not visible from the street.

Ms. Stein stated that constructing the deck would present a technical challenge. Ms. Gusic noted that there is no other outdoor space for the home owners. Ms. Hawkins asked if the parking garages along the block were one- or two-car garages. Ms. Gusic answered that practically all of them are two-car garages. Ms. Stein stated that she was initially concerned that the slope of the parking area would create a water infiltration problem, but she has since discovered that the slope exists today without drainage problems. Ms. Gusic clarified that a French drain exists and would remain.

Mr. Cluver asked if the Commission had endorsed the use of Hardi plank. Ms. Cote answered that she was not aware of a Commission endorsement, but that the staff did not object to its use at the proposed location. Mr. Cluver stated that it would be difficult to make Hardi plank look like wood. Ms. Gusic stated that she could add some molding to make it blend better if necessary. Ms. Stein pointed out that it would be best to have a recessed panel rather than an applied moulding. She noted that the recessed panel detail should match the bay. Ms. Pentz asked if the windows would be replaced or restored. Ms. Gusic answered that the existing windows would be retained, restored, and reinstalled; they would not be replaced with new windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, based on the mock-up and provided the panels on railing and garage door are more sympathetic to the panels in the bay, with the staff to review details.

ADDRESS: 1601 LOCUST ST

Project: Install signage and door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1601 Locust LP/Allan Domb Real Estate

Applicant: Rotciver Lebron-Martinez, Express Expeditors

History: 1929; University Club; Grant Simon, architect; penthouse added, Cecil Baker, architect, 2002

Individual Designation: None

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 to alter the ground and second floors of this building, which has been converted from a club to residential and commercial condominiums. The application proposes fitting out the space for a retail store. A doorway on Locust Street would be modified with the removal of a door with sidelights and the installation of a double-leaf frameless glass door. Two metal halo-lit signs would be installed at the corner of the building above the first-floor windows. The application stipulates that the sign attachments and electrical connections would be inserted into and through mortar joints in the façade, but this appears impossible, owing to the thinness of the joints. The holes would likely damage the stone facade. In addition, the signs and the frameless door are not compatible with the character of the building. Canvas awnings and a compatible door with sidelights would be more appropriate.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Expediter Jill Fratto represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked if the current door was original. Mr. Baron stated that the door appeared to be a replacement, but that its design appeared original. Mr. Cluver opined that a double-leaf door might not meet the ADA requirement.

The Committee members remarked that the door could be either a single or a double-leaf door, but it should not be a frameless glass door. They suggested that the door or doors have solid stiles and rails and a paneled base and be topped by a transom.

The Committee members unanimously agreed that the proposed sign was inappropriate. They suggested canvas awnings instead. They recommended that the awnings should be consistent around the building on all facades. They recommended awnings on either the door or on the Locust Street façade.

The Committee members wondered if the step up to the door would be ADA compatible.

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

ADDRESS: 418 N 32ND ST

Project: Legalize windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Stephen Donnelly

Applicant: Denis Daily, De Haven Construction Company

History: 1860

Individual Designation: 2/25/1964

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of vinyl windows. The owner removed wood windows and installed vinyl windows with a shape and light pattern very different from the originals. He has retained the old windows, which are depicted in photographs. He claims not to have the funds to buy new wood windows. In such a case, the staff recommends that he reinstall the old windows until such time as funds are available for appropriate replacement windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Window installer Denis Daily represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that original windows at the first and second floors had been removed and vinyl windows of a different pane pattern installed in their places. Mr. Daily stated that the owner was unaware that the building was designated as historic when he undertook the window replacement. Mr. Baron responded that a building permit is required for window replacement in all buildings with more than two dwelling units. If the owner had sought the appropriate permit, he would have been informed that the building is historically designated and under the Historical

Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Daily said that the owner, Stephen Donnelly, does not have the money to install new wood windows. This building provides part of Mr. Donnelly's retirement income. Mr. Baron suggested that the wood windows that were removed and retained could be reinstalled. He also explained that the Historical Commission can take unnecessary hardship into account, but that would require a separate application with additional documentation.

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

ADDRESS: 1636 SPRUCE ST

Project: Legalize roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Alexander G. Bochetto

Applicant: Tricia Desmarais Clark, Bochetto and Lentz, P.C.

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a roof deck and related structures that were not built according to plans approved by the Commission. The Commission reviewed an application for a deck and stair house for this property several times in 2008 and eventually agreed upon a specific design. The applicant then constructed a deck that is more than twice as large as approved. He added a pergola that is particularly visible from the street. A violation was issued, which was forwarded to court for enforcement. The court has continued its consideration of the case to allow for the applicant to apply for legalization.

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

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

Mr. Baron explained that the Commission had approved a deck with small penthouse for this building, but the owner constructed them differently than had been approved. He noted that the applicants have supplied a roof plan documenting the as-built condition, but they have not provided any elevation drawings, which are needed to evaluate the legalization request. The applicants have indicated that they will provide the requisite elevations at a later time. The staff supplemented the application with photographs to document the deck and penthouse as built. The as-built structures are more visible from the public right-of-way than the approved structures would have been because they are closer to the edge of the roof. The Committee members reviewed the drawings and photographs and concluded that the as-built structures do not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines.

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

Tricia Desmarais Clark entered the conference room and introduced herself as the representative of the 1636 Spruce Street application. Ms. Hawkins informed Ms. Clark that she was late and the Committee had already conducted its review and formulated a

recommendation. Ms. Clark asked the Committee to reconsider its recommendation. Ms. Hawkins explained that the Committee had already voted on a recommendation and could not reconsider it.

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 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.