

**THE MINUTES OF THE 545TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**11 JANUARY 2008
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18029
MICHAEL SKLAROFF, ESQ., CHAIR**

PRESENT

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
James Brown
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
Michael Maenner, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Vincent Rivera, AIA
David Schaaf, RA, City Planning Commission
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

Erin Coté, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner I
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Assistant City Solicitor, Law Department

ALSO PRESENT

Charles Loomis, Loomis McAfee Architects
Richard Preskenis
Todd Curry, Emerald Windows
Jerry Roller, J.K. Roller Architects
Julie Forejt, J.K. Roller Architects
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sklaroff, the Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 545th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Brown, Leonard, Maenner, Merriman, Rivera, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, Smyler, and Wilds joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 544TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Upon a motion proffered by Ms. Merriman and seconded by Mr. Schaaf, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes, as corrected, of the 544th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 14 December 2007.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 18 DECEMBER 2007

Vincent Rivera, Chair

2215 WALNUT STREET

Owner: Richard Zeghibe

Applicant: Jerry Roller

History: c.1870, altered 1894 and 1902; contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, 8 February 1995

Project: Install metal awning

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a metal mesh awning over the side entrance to this building and replace the metal fire escape in kind. The awning would be attached to the metal fire escape and would not cover the Classical Revival door surround.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Architects Julie Forejt and Jerry Roller represented the application.

The Commissioners agreed that the proposal was appropriate.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Schaaf seconded the proposal, which passed unanimously.

36 N. FRONT STREET

Owner: Richard Preskenis

Applicant: Charles Loomis

History: 1833; individually designated, 6 January 1977; significant to Old City Historic District, 12 December 2003

Project: Construct third-and-fourth-floor roof decks

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the deck on the rear ell, but denial of the upper deck and stair, pursuant to Standard 2 and 9, the Roofs Guideline, and the Commission's policy on roof decks.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct decks on the rear ell and main roof of this loft building. The lower deck would be located on the top of the rear ell with a metal stair and guardrail leading up to the upper deck. The upper deck would be located on the main block and set back about 28 feet from the front façade. The decks would be constructed of wood with three-foot mesh metal guardrails around the perimeters. A hot tub is proposed on the lower deck. The decks would be visible from 2nd Street.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Charles Loomis represented the application.

Mr. Loomis explained that he had revised the proposal to comply with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the deck on the rear ell, but deny the upper deck and stair, pursuant to Standard 2 and 9, the Roofs Guideline, and the Commission's policy on roof decks. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

214 PINE STREET

Applicant: Todd Curry, Emerald Windows

Owners: Frank & Catherine Signorello

History: 1968, Frank Wiese, architect; contributing to Society Hill Historic District

Project: replace windows with simulated divided lights

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

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for replacing the windows on the front façade with wood simulated-divided-light windows.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Window salesman Todd Curry represented the application.

MOTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion.

Mr. Curry asserted that simulated-divided-light windows are appropriate for this mid twentieth-century building. Mr. Wilds stated that true-divided lights were a part of the design vocabulary of the Redevelopment Era. Mr. Curry claimed that the building is not "truly" historic. Mr. Sklaroff responded that, from the Historical Commission's perspective, the building is historic because the Redevelopment Era is within the period of significance of the historic district. Mr. Curry noted that the Commission recently approved this type of simulated-divided-light window for a Redevelopment Era building at 314 S. 2nd Street. He showed a sample of the proposed window to the Commission and described it. Mr. Wilds asked how closely this window would approximate the historic window. Mr. Curry stated that it is identical to the historic window except for the simulated-divided lights. Mr. Curry explained that advances in technology have led to this more affordable and more energy-efficient window. Mr. Sklaroff agreed that the Commission should support improvements that render historic buildings more energy efficient.

Ms. Smyler asked Mr. Rivera to explain the Architectural Committee's recommendation of denial. Mr. Rivera responded that the Committee does not recommend approval of simulated-divided-light windows. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the proposed window was constructed of wood. Mr. Curry stated that it is. Mr. Wilds asked about the jamb liner. Mr. Curry described the jamb liner system. He will retain the extant frames and install a jamb liner. It will be hidden behind the exterior stop. The glass size will match the historic exactly. He pointed out that the window has a putty slope that replicates the historic muntin shape. Mr. Sklaroff asked if cost was the prompting the choice of a simulated-divided-light window. Mr. Curry replied that cost and energy efficiency are driving the decision. The Commission requested the staff's opinion of the window. Mr. Danta stated that this window replicates the appearance of the historic window, but is not a true-divided-light window. Mr. Wilds opined that the Commission should approve this window.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Mses. Smyler and Leonard withdrew their motion to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the application as submitted, with the staff to review details. Mr. Brown seconded the motion.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that this approval will set a precedent. He also stated that the Commission must take energy efficiency into account when it reviews window applications. Mr. Wilds added that this window is a very good replica of the historic window. Mr. Sklaroff reiterated that this approval will set a precedent and will indicate that the Commission will approve appropriate simulated-divided-light windows in the future. Mr. Farnham asked for a clarification; he asked if the Commission was directing the staff to consider simulated-divided-light windows as appropriate replicas for true-divided-light windows and therefore approve them at the staff level pursuant to Section 6.3.c.1.c of the Rules & Regulations. Ms. Merriman and Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the staff continue to forward simulated-divided-light window applications to the full Commission for the next three months to allow the Commission to further articulate a policy on the matter.

ACTION: The Commission voted unanimously to adopt Messrs. Wilds and Brown's motion to approve the application as submitted, with the staff to review details.

2129 GREEN STREET

Owner: Andrew Faytek

Applicant: Todd Curry

History: c. 1864; contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Install simulated-divided-light sash replacements

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes installing simulated-divided-light sash replacements. Originally, this building had four-over-four double-hung sash with 1-1/8 inch vertical muntins and 7/8 inch horizontal muntins. This application proposes to install four-over-four windows with 1-1/8 inch vertical true-divided-light muntins and 7/8 inch horizontal simulated-divided-light muntins with spacer bars.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. Window salesman Todd Curry represented the application.

Mr. Curry stated that his customer preferred this particular window for both economic and energy efficiency reasons. He described the window, which is double glazed. It has a simulated-divided-light horizontal muntin, which is narrow, and a true-divided-light vertical muntin, which is wide. These are the historic muntin widths. He claimed that no window manufacturer is capable of manufacturing a full true-divided-light window in this configuration. It can only be obtained as custom product. Mr. Danta reminded the Commission that it had previously approved a Marvin window of exactly this type for a building on Delancey Street. Mr. Sklaroff again noted that the Commission must promote energy efficient solutions for historic buildings. The Commissioners agreed that they should approve energy-efficient simulated-divided-light windows when they otherwise replicate the historic windows. Mr. Smyler stated that she understood that the Commission approved the previous application because it was for a modern building; this is not

a modern building. Several Commissioners asserted that they considered simulated-divided-light windows appropriately generally for historic buildings. Mr. Rivera asked why his fellow Commissioners were considering approving a window with mismatched muntin widths. Mr. Danta responded that the combination of wide and narrow muntins is the historically appropriate window configuration for this building. Mr. Farnham added that this window configuration was used historically on Italianate buildings to give double-hung windows the appearance of casement windows.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the application as submitted, with the staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1942 WALLACE STREET

Owner: Greta Braith

Applicant: Greta Braith

History: c. 1875; contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Install metal railings and gate

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a two metal railings and a gate at a side entrance to a condominium unit along 20th Street. The railings would have a simple vertical picket design and would be mounted into the mortar joints of the building and into the sidewalk, avoiding the marble steps. A simple vertical picket gate would span from railing to railing in front of the steps. There is no historic precedent for gating steps.

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

Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. No one seconded the motion.

Mr. Wilds stated that he opposes this application. Ms. Merriman agreed and asserted that this is an extreme response to a simple loitering problem. She suggested motion-detector-controlled lighting. Mr. Schaaf stated that the gate would be intrusive. He objected to the application. Although Ms. Smyler sympathized with the applicant's reasons for wanting the gate, she also opposed it.

Mr. Rivera told the Commission that the applicant had made a convincing argument for the gate during the Committee review. He stated that he considered it a safety matter. He also noted that it would be reversible and the railings and gate would not connect directly to any historic fabric.

Mr. Wilds asked his colleagues if they opposed the railings at the sides of the steps. They stated that they did not. Ms. Cote noted that she could approved the side railings without the gate at the staff level.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to deny the application. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 1. Mr. Rivera dissented.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 9:42 a.m., Mr. Wilds moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

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.