

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

**TUESDAY, 27 MAY 2008
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DAVID AMBURN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

David Amburn, Chair
Shawn Evans
Dominique Hawkins
Daniel McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner I
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

ALSO PRESENT

Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association
Christina Davis, Wesley Wei Architects
Wesley Wei, Wesley Wei Architects
Steven Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Monica Wyant, Wyant Architecture
Joe Federman
Ernest Weillier, German Society
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
Allen Roth, Joseph Callaghan, Inc
Jeffrey A. Cruse, Brandywine Workshop
Allan Edmunds, Brandywine Workshop
Alan Metcalfe, Metcalfe Architecture & Design
Christopher Kircher, Metcalfe Architecture & Design
Robert Snow, Agoos Lovera Architects
Robert Powers, Powers & Company
Leo Addimando, 806
Ashley Mets, 806
Randy Cotton, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Kevin Rasmussen, Rasmussen
Stephen Potts, SP Architects
Jeff Tommelson, SP Architects
Paul Stone, Emerald Windows, Inc
Todd Curry, Emerald Windows, Inc
Jim Flanerty, Malvern Hall
Beverly Penn, Malvern Hall
Paul Jablonski

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Amburn called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Hawkins and Pentz and Messrs. Evans and McCoubrey joined him.

136 N. 3RD STREET

Owner: Wesley Wei

Applicant: Christina Davis

History: c.1847 Designated: individually 12/31/1984, contributing to OCHD 12/12/2003

Project: Construct storefront

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a storefront with a center display window flanked by single-leaf doors and transom windows above. This proposal would replace a non-historic storefront of wood and concrete steps with stainless steel/aluminum channels, wood framed windows and doors, and diamond plate metal thresholds and steps. The historic storefront had a projecting display window over a basement access, flanked by double-leaf doors with transoms.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Wesley Wei represented the application.

Mr. Wei stated there was no original historic fabric below the steel lintel at the first floor. The historic storefront was long lost. He noted, however, that granite storefront piers exist below the sidewalk level and the basement steps appear to be original fabric. He explained that the proposed storefront design is a three-part schema, paying homage to the historic configuration with modern material. Ms. Cote explained the staff's recommendation of denial by stating that historically the storefront would have been composed of granite or possibly cast iron with wood double-leaf doors, a projecting display window, and a basement access way below. Mr. Wei explained that the single-leaf door is proposed for ADA compliance. Mr. Evans asked if the location of the proposed metal channels corresponds to those of the historic granite piers. Mr. Wei stated that the locations of the new storefront members were based on the historic locations. Ms. Cote added that the staff objected to the materials and the overall contemporary nature of the storefront. Mr. Amburn stated that he did not object to the materials and the more contemporary design because the historic storefront has been lost. Ms. Hawkins commented that she did like the design, but was struggling with the fact that this highly visible storefront would not be restored to its historic appearance. Mr. McCoubrey observed that the flat stucco piece above the storefront was the result of a stone entablature having been removed. Mr. Evans suggested that a metal channel referring to the historic element be used in place of the stucco band. Mr. Wei confirmed that a metal channel could be applied in that location. He also stated that he intended to retain the fire escape. Rich Thom of the Old City Civic Association opined that it is difficult and costly to restore a Greek Revival storefront when no historic fabric remains. He added that Old City Civic Association supports this application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval provided a metal channel replaces the stucco band with the staff to review details.

210 W. WASHINGTON SQUARE

Owner: Zukin Realty/210 W. Washington Square Associates

Applicant: Jeff Wyant

History: 1928, Ralph Benker, architect Designated: Significant to SHHD 3/10/1999

Project: Install door in window wall

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a single-leaf door in the in the center of the window wall of the southern bay. The Commission approved a similar proposal for the northern bay in August 2005. This application proposes to remove the stone sill and salvage the existing metal panel for re-use in the new door.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Commission's August 2005 approval.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Monica Wyant of Wyant Architecture represented the application.

Ms. Wyant stated that the interior space is a restaurant and the proposed door would provide a street-front entrance. Mr. Evans asked if a new tenant had been found for the space. Ms. Wyant responded that a new tenant had not been identified yet. The door would make the space more desirable. Mr. Evans suggested that a floor plan and other documentation should be submitted for review. Ms. Hawkins concurred, stating that an approval could create a snowball effect with future requests for signage, canopies, and lighting. Mr. Amburn opined that the signage and entrance were appropriate for the garden area to the side of the building, but not this historic window. He advised against recommending approval without a prospective tenant and clear plan in place. Mr. McCoubrey concurred and stated that a more substantive case could be made if a tenant with clear needs was in place.

Steven Weixler of Society Hill Civic Association told the Committee his organization had been given assurances that the mullion dimensions of the door installed in the other window in the front façade would not markedly change from the historic window dimensions, but the installed door has a heavier mullion. He stated that this is a very important Art Deco building that faces Washington Square and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. He stated that the Association is opposed to additional penetration on the front and believes that a reasonable entrance with proximity to the sidewalk can be developed elsewhere.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the possibility of reconfiguring the interior plan of the restaurant. Ms. Wyant was unsure about the interior plan and noted that any tenant would prefer the sidewalk entrance over the garden entrance that now exists. She asked if the door proposal could be approved with restrictions related to future signage, canopies, and other alterations.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the existing signage in the north bay. Ms. Cote stated that she did not know if the Commission had approved that signage. Mr. Evans stated that he would not recommend approval of similar signage in the south bay.

Ms. Wyant opined that historic buildings need to be preserved but also need to evolve. She perceived the addition of this door as a minimal intervention to provide the restaurant with a much-needed street-front entrance.

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

2200 PINE STREET

Owner: Robin L. Perry

Applicant: Joe Federman

History: 1895; contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District

Project: Legalize cornice alteration

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the alteration of the cornice. At the time of designation, the original cornice on the north façade had been removed; however a small piece of the cornice on the east facade remained intact. In September 2007, a staff member observed the removal of the cornice and the installation of siding over the area on the north façade. A violation was issued. Subsequently, in January 2008, a staff member observed that the siding was removed, but the cornice had been constructed into a box-like configuration and the remnant piece of cornice on the east façade had been altered. These alterations were also done without a permit or the approval of the Commission.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Committee. Joseph Federman represented the application.

Mr. Federman explained that the contractor installed aluminum siding over the cornice to resolve water infiltration. He acknowledged that it was done without authorization. Mr. Federman expressed confusion about the nature of the violation. Mr. Baron explained that the Commission has the authority to review all proposals that would alter the exterior appearance of an historic building such as this one. He stated that the Commission typically requires that all work within the applicants scope of work be restoration work, moving the building closer to its original condition. Mr. Federman disagreed with the Commission's policy on this matter and insisted that he did not alter the cornice, but instead merely covered it. Ms. Sell commented that the cornice on Pine Street had been removed when she visited the site in September 2007. Mr. Danta explained that, after receiving a complaint from the public, he visited the site in September 2007 and observed that the existing metal cornice was removed and most of the siding had been installed. He also observed a truck that contained large amounts of mangled metal. Mr. Baron stated that a replacement cornice should be reinstalled to match the design of the return that exists beneath the metal of the illegal cornice on the 22nd Street side. Mr. Amburn suggested that the applicant remove the metal cover over the return and examine the correct profile of the cornice beneath. Mr. Federman objected to the restoration of the entire cornice and he said he will only uncover the return.

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

730-732 S. BROAD STREET

Owner: Allan Edmunds

Applicant: Alan Metcalfe, AIA

History: 1868; designated 5/26/1964 and 4/27/1971

Project: Restore front façade and cut entrance and window

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to clean, repair, and restore the stone façade of this firehouse, which is now the home of the Brandywine Workshop. This application also proposes to cut a modern entrance in the first story of the north façade. The entrance will consist of a

glazed garage door, double doors, and windows surrounded by a metal “shadow box” projection. A large circular window is proposed to be cut into the second story of the north façade. Historically, this elevation was a party wall and not exposed. The neighboring three-story building was demolished between 1977 and 1979.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Committee. Allan Edmunds and Jeffrey Cruse of the Brandywine Workshop and architects Chris Kircher and Alan Metcalfe represented the application.

After a question from Ms. Hawkins, the applicants clarified that the project will be undertaken in phases. The applicant informed the Committee that, as funding becomes available, the Workshop will further develop the space for outdoor concerts and events. The workshop will submit additional applications for those projects.

Mr. Evans stated that more information is needed regarding the façade restoration. He explained that the submitted plans only show areas of damage or weakness and provides no information about repair procedures. Mr. Baron indicated that the details of the façade restoration can be approved at staff level, after the appropriate documents are submitted. Mr. Amburn commented that an engineer’s report would assist with the review. Mr. Kircher responded that such a report is due to in his office today.

Ms. Hawkins opined that the installation of a modern entrance on the side elevation is appropriate and respectful of the historic façade. Mr. Kershaw indicated that the party wall would be restuccoed in a color to match existing stucco.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the façade restoration owing to incompleteness, but approval of the installation of an entranceway and window in the north elevation, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

611 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: German Society

Applicant: Glenn Werner, AIA

History: 1888; William Gette, architect; individually designated 10/11/2000

Project: Construct elevator tower

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story elevator tower on the west façade of the German Society of Pennsylvania for ADA accessibility. The west façade is a brick elevation with stone quoins, but without fenestration.

The first story of the addition would be set back two feet from the façade and house an entrance vestibule. The second story, encasing the elevator, would be set back about ten feet from the façade. The tower would be constructed with a brick veneer, modest cornices on both levels, and vertical wood windows with brick sills.

The staff suggests that the entry vestibule be set back from the front façade of the historic building to reveal the quoins.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the vestibule set back from the front façade of the historic building to reveal the quoins, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Committee. Architects Glenn Werner and Blake Krevolin and Ernest Weiler of the German Society represented the application.

Mr. Werner clarified that the building is four stories and not two stories as indicated in the overview. Mr. Werner introduced the plans, which incorporated the staff's suggestions. Mr. Werner also presented paint and brick samples.

Ms. Sell noted that the application has revised; instead of for wood windows, it proposes clad wood windows for the side of the new elevator tower. Mr. Werner acknowledged this change.

Mr. Evans observed that the brick in the designation photograph did not have thick mortar joints like the brick sample provided.

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

1701-1709 ARCH STREET

Owner / Applicant: 1701 Partners, LP

History: Built c. 1915, Ballinger & Perrot, architect/engineers

Project: Repair terracotta, alter storefronts, replace revolving door, cut windows.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a combination of restoration and alterations to the Robert Morris Building. The applicant proposes repairs to the terracotta that entirely clads this Gothic Revival building. The material has experienced typical weathering and deterioration, such as cracking, fire-skin failure, and deterioration of previous repairs. The applicant proposes to use Conproco terracotta restoration products. The applicant proposes to eliminate all failed terracotta lips at horizontal elements from the fifth floor upwards, and repair them with a flush patch. These elements are mostly found on window sills, cornices and other horizontal bands of the façade. The applicant proposes to restore the lips on the lower four floors. The applicant also proposes to remove obsolete ventilation louvers and replace them with solid caps of the same color as the adjacent terracotta units.

The application also proposes some façade alterations at ground level; these include the replacement of all storefronts with new aluminum display storefronts to match the original configurations. The ornate stained-glass transoms would remain undisturbed. Two individual storefronts along Arch Street would be altered to eliminate their entry doors. The main entrance to the building along 17th Street has a non-historic revolving door. The applicant proposes to replace the revolving door with a two-leaf aluminum door in a custom color. In that same elevation, a new gate is proposed for a side alley.

Along the west party wall, the applicant proposes to cut new windows. On that same elevation, the applicant proposes to install a roof deck with metal railing. The roof deck would be accessed by modifying existing windows. The plans also show the introduction of mechanical equipment on the roof of the annex. The equipment would be shield from visibility by a metal mechanical screen of unspecified design. The open Philadelphia fire stair would be enclosed with single-lite windows. Lastly, an elevator is proposed for an existing light well.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of all exterior work, except the mechanical screen owing to incompleteness, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and 9

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Engineer Allen Roth, architect Robert Snow, and preservation consultant Robert Powers represented the application.

Mr. Danta explained to the Committee that he and Mr. Baron had conducted a site visit to look at repair samples for the terracotta. He added that the samples looked satisfactory, except for some color variations that could be corrected at a later point.

Mr. Danta stated that remnants of the original storefront had been discovered in one of the bays. This discovery yielded the dimensions and profile of the original storefront, which was previously unknown. Mr. Baron added that the staff recommendation of approval was based on their verbal assurances that the storefronts were to be restored, but that the applicant was now presenting a storefront profile that would not recreate the historic profile. Mr. Amburn clarified that the Committee's previous recommendation of approval was predicated on the fact that information about the original storefront was unknown. It is now known.

Mr. Danta stated that the staff also concluded that the revolving door was not original to the original construction of the building, but that it most likely dated to the expansion phase. Mr. Danta pointed out a historic photograph showing the building soon after construction in which French doors with an arched canopy can be seen where the revolving door now stands. Mr. Evans noted that the circular top was not original. Mr. Danta thought it was difficult to pinpoint the time of the modification. Mr. Baron clarified that, because this entrance will be the only point of entry into the lobby of the hotel, the applicants are seeking double-leaf doors to allow luggage and other large items to pass easily through the doors.

Mr. Snow stated that he is not convinced that the storefront remnants found indicate the configuration of the original storefront. Mr. Powers stated that the 17th Street storefronts have stainless steel profiles whereas the corner detail on Arch Street appears to be bronze. He thought that there is an inconsistency in material. Mr. Baron opined there is one complete storefront. He believes that the bronze corner piece is a separate piece that fits over the joint. He opined that this configuration is entirely consistent with other storefronts of the same period. He noted that, on the ground level, one perceives the delicacy of the storefronts. To install a wide-mullion, squared-off, aluminum storefront system would be a detriment to the building.

Mr. Powers opined that repairing the lips up to the 4th floor was a reasonable compromise. He noted that they are also working with the Preservation Alliance on this matter because the Alliance holds a façade easement on the building. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the lips were visible up to the 9th floor from the corner of 17th Street and the Parkway. Mr. Evans suggested keeping the lips up to the 6th-floor transition point. Mr. Roth expressed concern over the longevity of the repairs.

Mr. Snow stated that the owner proposed three small penthouses that are slightly above the parapet height but not as visible as the mechanical equipment. Mr. Evans suggested painting the mechanicals a different color to help disguise their masses. Mr. Evans requested sightline studies to document the impact of the penthouses on the roof line. Ms. Hawkins opined that the lack of information was problematic. Mr. Snow then asked to have this portion taken off the table, until sightline studies and more details could be provided.

Mr. Gallery expressed concerns about the spiral stairs at the roof penthouses and asked the applicant to reexamine their position on the roof. He also expressed concern about the rail and screening of the mechanical equipment on the lower roof. The architect explained that the rail of the roof deck would be open.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application with the following revisions: the lower roof mechanical screen and railing is painted a neutral color; and the terracotta lips are repaired up to the 6th-floor break. The Committee voted to recommend denial of upper roof penthouses, owing to incompleteness, and the storefront details.

1924 BRANDYWINE STREET

Owner/Applicant: Sandra & Mark Colatrella

History: c. 1870; designated, October 2000

Project: Roof-top addition, rear façade alterations

OVERVIEW: This application proposes additions to the rear façade and roof-top of this carriage house. The house extends from Brandywine through to Monterey Street. The Monterey Street elevation has suffered some alterations to masonry openings, but retains its massing and scale. The applicant proposes to construct a bay window on this façade that extend through the cornice level into the mansard. On the ground floor the applicant proposes to create a garage door. The applicant proposes to eliminate the existing roof deck, and construct a one-story addition in its place. The addition would open onto a roof deck on the rear portion of the roof that would extend over the proposed bay window. The addition would be visible; however, no sight line studies were submitted to assess the visibility.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Architect Kevin Rasmussen represented the application.

Mr. Rasmussen explained the architectural program and the goals of the project. He stated that the property is currently a rental property; it will be converted to a single-family residence.

Mr. Evans noted that the request for a garage opening on Monterey Street seemed unnecessary owing to the existence of a carriage door on Brandywine Street. Mr. Rasmussen noted that owners would like to enter a pedestrian door on Brandywine. Owing to the restrictions of the site plan, the best solution would be to cut a new garage entry at the rear of the property.

Mr. Danta explained that the staff believed both properties to have been separate buildings originally, and if so, the Monterey façade represented a rare survivor that shows what the street must have looked like in the nineteenth century. Mr. Rasmussen disagreed with that characterization. He stated that, in his opinion, the façade along Monterey was the rear façade of the Brandywine carriage house. He noted that the buildings share a courtyard in the middle; the two neighboring carriage houses also have courtyards.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the proposed rear bay is not an appropriate addition. She stated that the spatial relationship of the rear façade is completely destroyed by such an intervention. Mr. Rasmussen inquired whether the Commission approved modern design or just historicist additions. Mr. Danta answered that the Commission recently approved a contemporary addition

to the rear of a building at 13th and Spruce. Mr. Danta noted that the Commission is not opposed to modern design, but that the spatial relationship and massing of the addition must be compatible with the historic building. This addition would destroy historic fabric.

Mr. Amburn praised Mr. Rasmussen on the plan and design of the interior. However, he advised him to look into the possibility of flipping the plan, so as to use the existing carriage opening rather than creating a new one on a historic brick wall. Mr. Rasmussen stated that he would consult with his clients. Mr. Evans agreed with Mr. Amburn, and noted that the proposed rooftop addition is an acceptable design and properly set back. He asked the staff why they had recommended denial. Mr. Danta noted that the sightline study was incomplete and staff did not have enough information to address the impact of the addition on the carriage house. He further noted that the building to the west of the carriage house is lower, thus allowing for greater visibility of the proposed addition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of addition at the top of the mansard in concept; denial of the bay and the garage opening along Monterey Street, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

135 S. 18th STREET

Applicant: Stephan Potts, architect

Owner: 135 S. 18th Street L.P.

History: built 1913, architects, McIlvaine & Roberts, Contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District

Project: remove historic windows from doorway, new doors, signage

OVERVIEW: This proposal has several parts including replacement of doors, windows, and the installation of signage. In September 2006, the applicants requested the removal of the doors, historic transom and windows above the door and their replacement with a two-story glass doorway wall. The Commission denied that application and asked the applicant to retain their transom and windows. The staff approved a set of wood and glass doors which were installed recently. Now the applicants have returned with a very similar application to the denied application. They now propose to remove the wood and glass doors and the historic windows. They seek to replace them with all glass units. The framed classical transom which was revealed in their work, they covered with a sign, without seeking a permit. They would like to legalize that work. They propose to install banners in the rusticated building base flanking the doors and a large fabric sign on the east façade of the building to be visible from Walnut Street. The building already has plaque signs approved and installed at the corners of the structure. The staff thought that the total constituted too much signage, and had concerns about the attachments to the stone as well.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of all the work except for approval of the fabric sign on the east façade pursuant to Standards 5, 6, 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Attorney Carl Primavera, architect Stephen Potts, and developer Kathy Ragg represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that the Commission has already reviewed a very similar proposal for the main entrance to this building. In 2006, the Commission reviewed and denied the removal of doors, transom, spandrel and the glazing of the two-story opening. The staff subsequently reviewed an application for new doors, which was approved. Mr. Baron reported that, at the time of the

Commission's 2006 review, there was a metal covering with a canopy over the spandrel panel. As these accretions were removed, he observed the spandrel to be a panel with frame, but he was unsure of the material because of the paint. He stated that the applicants covered the panel with new signage that hides its details without the Commission's approval. Replying to a question from Mr. Amburn, he stated that the mezzanine windows and spandrel are original and therefore historic. He noted the panel detail on the window mullions and how the four-part design matches the grouped windows at the third floor.

The Committee members asked the applicants if they had any evidence that the lobby and the doorway were originally two stories tall. The applicants stated they have no evidence either way, although they have searched for photographs.

Mr. Potts said that, when they removed part of the ceiling in the lobby, they found more than one floor system. He felt that the windows above the door are older but not original. When they began to clean the transom they found that it was plaster with colored to look like faux stone. They stopped the cleaning so as not to damage the material.

Mr. Primavera recalled that the project involved the conversion of an apartment building into a high-end extended-stay residence. The owner followed the Commission's recommendation, but, owing to a desire to attract a transient group, wanted to advertise the luxury aspect of the building by removing the four windows and creating a grander entrance.

Ms. Hawkins was concerned that the choice of color for the windows makes them stand out as a heavier element; she suggested that painting them to match the rest of the trim would make them disappear, emphasizing the opening. Ms. Ragg replied that they chose a dark color for the lower doors. They hoped to make the entranceway feel more like a single opening by painting the windows the same color as the dark doors.

Mr. Evans opined that the proposal is quite handsome and was impressed with the design. Mr. Baron commented that the Standards do not privilege handsomeness, but rather the preservation of surviving original fabric. Ms. Hawkins noted that the applicant chose to create a double-high interior space where one had likely not existed. She said the double-hung windows were part of the historic building and should be preserved. Although she admired the design as an architect, was not convinced as a preservationist.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for clarification on the spandrel panel, saying that it, more than the windows, obscures the light in the lobby. Mr. Baron stated the spandrel panel was historic fabric as well. He again reported that the Commission has already denied the removal of both the spandrel panel and the four windows. Ms. Hawkins noted that the applicant was requesting to remove historic fabric not to meet a code requirement, but rather to create an aesthetic effect. Although this may be desired, it is not appropriate from an historic preservation perspective.

Mr. McCoubrey thought the low doors under the large spandrel panel make the entranceway uninviting. The applicants argued that they would like to use the spandrel for their signage.

Turning to the issue of signage, Mr. Amburn agreed with previous approval of smaller signs at eye level at the corners of the building. He contended that the proposed banners are inappropriate. He was concerned about the maintenance of the banner material. All the Committee members objected to the banners at the door with concerns about damage to the stonework as well as the amount of signage. Mr. Evans and others objected to the idea of a large sign like a permanent billboard facing Walnut Street. Mr. Amburn said that he did not

object to the large banner. Ms. Ragg assured the Committee that she would not allow the banners to become worn.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance told the Committee that the applicants have done a beautiful job with the rehabilitation. He stated that this was not and is not a two-story lobby. Even with some of the ceiling cut out, there is a band that cuts across the windows two feet below the actual ceiling. He said that one photograph shows the white band from the outside, and another photograph shows a lowered roof, where the spandrel is blocking light from the space. The portion of the lobby that is double height is very shallow with geometric designs coming down from the ceiling, while the rest of the lobby is black and purple with a six-foot ceiling. He opined that the design is out of character with the historic building. Exposing more of it from the outside would be jarring. He thought that the upper four windows were not the problem, but that the spandrel blocks light from the lobby. He claimed that additional light could be obtained if the spandrel were reduced to a one-foot panel under the windows.

Mr. Hawkins restated that she thought the dark paint works against the applicant's intended effect.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, 9, and 10.

6655 McCALLUM STREET

Owner: Malvern Hall Condominium Association

Applicant: Paul Stone, Emerald Windows

History: 1925, architect, Ballinger & Company; individually designated

Project: Replace wood true-divided-light windows with simulated light windows on an as needed basis in this large building.

OVERVIEW: This application calls for the replacement of windows within this large condominium building on a piecemeal basis. The existing frames belong to the condominium association and would be retained. Unit owners are responsible for their sash. The building board president would like to apply on behalf of the unit owners to allow them to use these simulated units as they elect to replace their sash. The building is facing substantial expenses associated with shifting steps and other site work. They would like the cost savings they think will accrue from the simulated windows. In the past, the Commission has held piecemeal replacement to a very high match standard since the new windows will be seen next to the old. The proposed windows are reasonably close in many dimensions although seemingly not in terms of muntin depth. The building does sit very far back from the street on a plinth which will minimize their visibility. It should also be noted that many of the windows are covered by storm windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Jim Flannerty and Beverly Penn of the Malvern Hall Condominium Association and contractor Paul Stone represented the project.

Mr. Baron said that the dimensions of the proposed windows match the existing in most aspects; the depth of the muntins is the most significant difference. He explained that the Commission had traditionally allowed the simulated-divided-light windows above a transition at the fourth floor on tall buildings. He had worked with the building management to identify zones

on this low building similar to the Commission's earlier practice. Mr. Baron explained some extraordinarily expensive structural problems the condominium association is experiencing such as the failing walls and steps at the front of the building.

Ms. Penn stated that the goals are to allow the condominium owners to replace their windows as needed and as funds become available, and to ensure that the windows are uniform in appearance.

Mr. McCoubrey thought that these windows were a good match and that even true-divided-light windows typically would have less depth because of the need to accommodate the second piece of glass. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the condominium association could mandate what windows were used. Ms. Penn, who represents the condominium association, stated that they will provide the owners with lists of windows and companies that meet the Commission's approval.

Ms. Hawkins observed that, from a photograph, it appears the closest window is already more than two stories above the sidewalk and approaches the four-story criteria. She stated that she would recommend approval.

Mr. Evans said it would be important to get the information on the cost of the steps in a letter and to note this in the reasons for the approval of the simulated-divided-light windows.

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

5279-5281 AND 5283 GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Owner/Applicant: Paul Jablonski

History: 5281 and 5283 are houses c. 1810; 5279 is a shop c. 1850

Project: Legalize window alterations owing to financial hardship application.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of the installation of vinyl window sash and capping in the existing window frames in three adjacent historic buildings on Germantown Avenue. It also proposes legalizing the wood muntins added to the storefront window at 5279 Germantown Avenue. The three buildings are consolidated into two properties, 5279-5281 and 5283 Germantown Avenue. The owner resides in and rents apartments and storefront in the buildings.

The owner has provided several documents substantiating his claim of hardship including a letter from his realty management company showing that he has been in arrears for a number of years. He has provided detailed statements for the last three years showing that expenses have exceeded income by several thousand dollars annually. Owing to their location on Germantown Avenue, the buildings have proven difficult to rent.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Paul Jablonski, the property owner, represented the application.

Mr. Jablonski explained his financial situation, saying that he is retired and his social security nets \$600 per month. His expenses for the upkeep and maintenance of the buildings have left

him with a deficit. Mr. Jablonski replaced the storefront approximately five to seven years ago, and the windows over ten years ago. Mr. Baron recently discovered the non-compliant condition and requested a violation. Mr. Jablonski explained that the capping of the windows and the sash replacement were an attempt to prevent further deterioration.

Ms. Hawkins remarked that the capping is actually a disservice to the windows, owing to the moisture that can be trapped, causing further damage to the wood. The Committee members suggested that, as Mr. Jablonski has funds, he should remove the capping and repair and paint the frames. The Committee members also thought that the storefront window alterations were not appropriate to this Victorian storefront that almost certainly had a large plate glass window. They also found the vinyl windows inappropriate, but recognized that there may be a financial hardship in this case.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and to refer the application to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

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.

Windows Guideline: Not Recommended: Changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which noticeably change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of glazing; or the appearance of the frame.