

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

**TUESDAY, 13 DECEMBER 2011  
ROOM 578, CITY HALL  
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

**PRESENT**

Dominique Hawkins, Chair  
John Cluver  
Nan Gutterman  
Dan McCoubrey  
Suzanne Pentz

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

**ALSO PRESENT**

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance  
Edward Bell, Lawson Bell Architects  
Chris Carter, John Milner Architects  
Barbara Eberlein, Eberlein Design Consultants  
Beth Vernick  
Pete Porretta, Lighthouse Architecture  
Betty Mon, Mon & Associates  
Ian Smith, Ian Smith Design Group  
Paul Horvat  
Lorna Katz Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association  
Anthony Finio  
Ralph DiGiodomenico  
James Clark, Four Seasons Siding  
Joanne Phillips, Esq., Ballard Spahr  
Matt Cox, Fossil  
Sanford Bruck  
Matt Caffrey, Milrose Consultants, Inc.  
Dionne Barborini, HBC Architects  
Michael Sjöholm, HBC Architects  
Vaughan Graves  
James Clark

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

**ADDRESS: 2031 WALNUT ST, UNIT 1F**

Project: Replace storefront windows, add door and railing

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: B-L-A-C Holding Company

Applicant: Betty Mon, Mon & Associates Consulting

History: 1855; storefront added

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to install new aluminum storefront windows and doors in a non-historic storefront. The building was originally a residence. The ground floor was altered in the middle of the twentieth century, when a storefront was installed at ground floor. The storefront features a recessed entrance with a large display window and a mezzanine level above with jalousie windows.

The application proposes to retain the mid twentieth-century storefront surround and most of the existing knee wall. The application proposes two storefront doors, one at either end of the storefront. The western doorway would replace the recessed doorway and be installed at the plane of the front facade. The installation of the second doorway, at the east, would necessitate the removal of a small section of the knee wall. The door at the east would be slightly smaller than the door at the west, producing a strangely asymmetric configuration.

The new casements windows would replace a large plate glass window at the ground level and jalousie windows at the mezzanine level. A hammered aluminum railing would be installed in front of the mezzanine-level casements. The hammered aluminum railing at the mezzanine level would extend beyond the mezzanine level window opening and attach to the face of the surround. The pickets of the railing would be curved, not straight.

The application also proposes a string of LED lights above the storefront, but no details have been submitted.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the storefront doors are symmetrical; the railing has straight spindles and does not extend beyond the masonry opening; and the lighting details are provided; with staff to review the details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Pete Porretta, property owner Beth Vernick and expediter Betty Mon represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the submitted drawings of the railing are inconsistent. Mr. Porretta clarified that the balusters of the proposed railing would be curved, but that he does not have any objections to making them straight if preferred by the Committee. He also noted that the smaller door to the east can be made larger, to be symmetrical with the door at the west. Mr. Cluver asked why the proposed door to the east was smaller than the other door. Mr. Porretta answered that the door to the west exists and its width is an existing condition. He explained that he had chosen a smaller door because the size is standard, but, given that they were proposing an entirely new storefront system, the new door could be made to match the width of the existing door. He noted that having a smaller door on the east gives prominence to the main entrance on the west; the different widths distinguish the main entrance from the emergency egress door to the east. He noted that he would prefer that the emergency egress door was

smaller. Ms. Hawkins asked if he could accentuate the main entrance by lighting or signage rather than a difference in the two doors. Mr. Porretta explained that they are currently not proposing any signage. Ms. Vernick stated that they are contemplating a small vertical sign on to the left hand side of the main entrance, but that it is not currently proposed. Mr. Cluver asked if the existing door would remain. Mr. Porretta explained that the existing storefront would be removed, except for the existing door. The color of the new storefront would match the existing door. Ms. Hawkins asked if there would be a code conflict with out-swinging casements at street level. Mr. Danta answered that such a question was better answered by a plans examiner at the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Mr. Cluver stated that the casements would probably have to swing into the space rather than out to the sidewalk owing to building code restrictions.

Ms. Pentz joined the meeting.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the new storefront would be mounted in the same plane as the existing storefront. Mr. Porretta answered that it would be installed in the same plane. Mr. McCoubrey asked if there was enough structural material to attach the railing within the masonry opening to eliminate the overlap of the railing on the storefront surround. Mr. Porretta answered that there was not enough structure present within the storefront surround. Ms. Gutterman pointed out that the railing seems very high. Mr. Porretta stated that the railing is of a standard height and that it may seem high because the ceiling and windows at the mezzanine are low.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that, if the railing must overlap onto the stone storefront surround, then its visual impact at the surround should be minimized. Ms. Pentz opined that the railing would likely have to be anchored on the sides. Mr. Cluver suggested that the anchors could extend over the veneer but that the pickets could be removed from the overlapping sections to minimize their visual impact. Mr. Porretta stated that it was a good suggestion and that he was not opposed to removing the overlapping pickets.

Ms. Hawkins asked if a railing would be appropriate to this building. Mr. Porretta distributed photographs of buildings within a two-block radius with railings at the second floor. He noted that this feature is found throughout the district. Mr. McCoubrey reiterated his objection to the overlap of the railing over the stone surround. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that a flange could be installed between the masonry opening and the new storefront to secure the railing without attaching it to the façade.

Ms. Hawkins questioned the need for the LED light. Mr. Porretta stated that the lighting would be use to create ambiance and not really to illuminate the sidewalk. He clarified that it would be very dim to create a luminous wash on the façade.

Ms. Hawkins stated her opposition to recommending approval of the proposal as submitted. The other Committee Members were in favor of approving the proposal based on the staff's recommendation.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the storefront doors are symmetrical; the railing has straight spindles and does not extend beyond the masonry opening; and the lighting details are provided; with staff to review the details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ADDRESS: 1807 DELANCEY PL**

Project: Install roof deck and stairhouse

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Richard Vague

Applicant: Christina H. Carter, John Milner Architects

History: 1864; façade replaced

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a roof deck and stair enclosure. The stair enclosure would be constructed of metal and glass above the existing stair well in place of an existing sky light. It would be located in the middle of the building, away from both facades. The stair would be extended to the roof to allow access to the roof deck. The deck would be constructed of wood and metal with metal cable railings. The drawings submitted with this application do not show the structure of the proposed deck in detail. The height of the deck surface above the roof surface should be indicated. The application does not provide sufficient information to determine whether the deck will be conspicuous or inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, especially Delancey Street. The applicant should construct a mock-up of the deck to allow the Historical Commission's staff to verify that the deck and railing would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided a mock-up demonstrates that the deck and railing will not be conspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Christina Carter and Bob McDonat, and interior decorator Barbara Eberlein represented the application.

Regarding the public visibility of the deck, Mr. Danta clarified that "inconspicuous" would mean that it could not be seen from Delancey Street. Ms. Carter stated that they expected to build a mock-up to show that the deck would not be visible. She explained that they had already done the field exercise and that the drawings reflected the set-back necessary to ensure that the deck was invisible from Delancey Street. Mr. Danta asked if the field exercise had taken into account the added height of the deck structure above the roof. Ms. Carter answered that they indeed accounted for the added height in their calculation of the appropriate set-back. Ms. Carter explained that they are proposing to restructure the roof owing to poor drainage and have the roof slope towards the back. She noted that the roof currently drains to the middle of the roof. She stated that they had calculated approximately seven inches of structure above the restructured roof plus the height of the decking and railing. She reiterated that their calculations were conservative and that the deck would not be visible from Delancey Street.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the location for the proposed HVAC equipment. Ms. Carter explained that there are two I-beams present at the rear of the ell and that they would use the existing beams to support the new equipment. Ms. Gutterman asked if they had considered screening the equipment to minimize its visibility. Ms. Carter stated that they had not considered screening the equipment. Ms. Gutterman noted that adding two more units on those beams would create a wall of mechanical equipment. Ms. Hawkins asked if they had considered lowering the beams

since the roof would be restructured. Ms. Carter answered that they had not considered that option.

Mr. Cluver asked if the Commission has accepted higher visibility at the rear of properties when reviewing roof deck applications. Mr. Danta answered that the Commission has generally approved decks that are visible along the rear façade of buildings, but not the front. Mr. Cluver noted that the location of the beams to support the new equipment is an existing condition and that the Commission could not ask them to relocate them. Ms. Hawkins agreed but stated that they could recommend denial of any new equipment proposed for those beams. Mr. Cluver stated that a screen would be an acceptable solution.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a mock-up demonstrates that the deck and railing as well as the new HVAC equipment would not be conspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

**ADDRESS: 3424 W QUEEN LA**

Project: Replace front doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Edward G. Campbell

Applicant: Edward G. Campbell

History: 1930

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Tudor East Falls Historic District, Contributing, 10/9/2009

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to replace main entry doors on the front façade of this house. The doors, which are original to the house, are unusual double-leaf doors with glass panes over panels. Other, similar houses in the development have the same doors, indicating that they are original to the construction of the house.

The application provides insufficient documentation to determine whether the proposed doors would replicate the historic doors. For example, the manufacturer's information submitted with the application does not show the new jamb details or the dimensions of the proposed door versus the dimensions of the existing doors. The manufacturer's information notes that the doors are "available in virtually any size," but it does not indicate the sized proposed.

The new doors should replicate the materials, dimensions, and configurations of the existing doors. The replacement should not be a single door, which would necessitate partially infilling the opening or the installation of sidelights, either of which would clearly deviate from the original design. The doors should be replaced in kind with new double doors.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the installation of double-leaf doors that closely approximate the design of the existing doors; denial of any closing down of the opening or sidelights, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

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

Mr. Danta informed the Committee that he had spoken to the applicant and property owner, Edward Campbell, and that Mr. Campbell had informed him that he could not attend the meeting owing to his work schedule. Mr. Danta clarified that Mr. Campbell intends to replace the doors and jambs to replicate the original design.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the new jamb would be installed within the existing jamb or if the original jamb would be removed. Mr. Danta answered that he did not know with certainty, but that he believed the applicant would remove the original jamb.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant had submitted any evidence that showed that the existing doors were beyond repair. Mr. Danta answered that the applicant had not submitted any close-up photographs that showed irreparable damage to the doors. He stated that the applicant had mentioned that energy efficiency was very important to him and also a desire to remove or replace the storm doors. Ms. Gutterman stated that, based on the photograph provided, the doors appeared to be salvageable. Mr. Cluver suggested that weather stripping would be a better solution than complete replacement. Mr. Cluver stated that the amount of glass in these doors would probably cost the owner an extra five dollars a year in their current condition. He stated that the problem is not the glass or the doors themselves but the seals. Mr. Cluver stated that removing the storms and installing new doors would be less energy efficient than maintaining the historic doors, weather stripping them, and installing more appropriate storm doors. Ms. Gutterman also suggested a storm on the back side of the glass within the door. Mr. Cluver stated that their suggestions offer the most economical solution and would not involve the expense of an unnecessary replacement.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

**ADDRESS: 110 ROXBOROUGH AVE**

Project: Legalize rear additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Paul Horvat

Applicant: Paul Horvat

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Manayunk Historic District, Contributing, 12/14/1983

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to legalize alterations to the rear of a mid nineteenth-century house in the Main Street Manayunk Historic District. The Historical Commission approved interior demolition and alterations in March and April 2010. The owner exceeded those permits, demolishing a rear one-story addition and constructing a two-story rear addition in its place. At the same time, most of the rear slope of the main roof was demolished and a very large dormer was constructed. The dormer, which is really a third-floor addition, includes a door out to the roof of the second-floor rear addition. The architectural drawings submitted with the application do not call for a roof deck, but it is very likely that a roof deck is intended for the location. A roof deck is noted in the application filed with the Department of Licenses and Inspections. Also, the Department will not allow a door out to a roof that does not have a code-compliant railing.

Because the property is located near the corner of Roxborough Avenue and Cresson Street, the rear of the building is clearly visible from Cresson Street. The subject property is the second one in from the corner. The rears of all the properties in this row have been significantly altered, but the rooflines are generally intact.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the two-story rear addition; denial of the dormer and implied deck, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Paul Horvat and architect Ian Smith represented the application.

Mr. Horvat stated that if the deck is a problem, he would be willing to remove the door and install a window in its place. Ms. Hawkins stated that the two main issues are the deck and dormer.

Mr. Horvat distributed pictures of the neighboring property with a non-original dormer addition. Mr. Horvat stated that he is hopeful that he can retain the third-floor addition as built since it matches the second-floor ceiling height and is architecturally compatible with the house. He noted that he intends to make the house more useable. Ms. Hawkins stated that the neighbor's dormer is not part of this project and its legality is not known and therefore does not necessarily provide precedent. Ms. Hawkins stated that she used to live in a trinity and that it is a choice to live in such a small house and to accept its limitations. She noted that she understands the desire to have the footprint expanded. Mr. Horvat clarified that the footprint on the second floor had not been expanded, but that the ceilings had been raised by expanding the roof. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee should bear in mind the extent of illegal alterations, which went well beyond the approved permits.

Mr. Cluver stated that the alterations significantly changed the scale of this building from that of the surrounding row and neighborhood. Ms. Hawkins stated that she would be comfortable with a dormer addition, not such a large dormer addition. She also voiced her objection to a deck on the roof of the second-floor addition.

Ms. Gutterman asked if they could recommend a compromise recommendation that did not propose denying the entire application. Mr. Danta answered that they could recommend denial of all or part of the application.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the first and second-floor additions; denial of the third-floor addition and the implied deck; and approval of a gable roof dormer on the rear slope of the main roof no wider than five feet with single or double window in place of the extent dormer addition, with the staff to review details.

**ADDRESS: 223 MONROE ST**

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lisa Miclette Pappo

Applicant: Edward Bell, Lawson Bell Architects

History: 1745

Individual Designation: 2/26/1957, 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes a second-floor addition on an existing twentieth-century, rear, one-story addition. The building was constructed in the middle of the eighteenth century, before the Revolutionary War, and is largely intact. It is an extremely rare and important survivor. The addition would stand on top of the extant one-story addition and attach to the rear of the historic building at the second-story level. The rear addition would be visible only from a private driveway that leads to a parking area. The addition would necessitate cutting a four-foot-wide hole in the intact historic rear façade. The application proposes two alternate designs. In Plan A, the addition would attach into the roof of the building above the rear cornice; it would require removing a section of the historic brick wall and rear cornice. In Plan B, the addition would attach to the historic building below the cornice, but would still require removing a section of the historic brick wall and dismantling and reconstructing the cornice. The proposed interventions for this addition would remove and obscure too much significant fabric and therefore fail to meet Standard 9.

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

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Edward Bell represented the application.

Commenting on the concerns about alterations to the rear cornice, Mr. Bell explained that the western end of the rear cornice is rotten and would probably need to be rebuilt regardless of the addition plans.

Mr. Bell stated that his client would prefer the Plan A option because it is easier to flash. He noted that Plan A might end up saving more of the cornice, although it would be enclosed. All the Committee members expressed their preferences for the Plan B option, contending that it could still be made watertight with the correct flashing.

The Committee members expressed concerns about the width of the opening in the rear wall for the new stair. They observed that the drawing seemed to show a new opening that was more than four feet wide and would be lower than the current stairway window head. Mr. Bell conceded that the width of the opening could be incorrect by one or two feet in the drawing. He said that the top half of the small historic window opening would be infilled. Ms. Hawkins noted that, once the rear wall was enclosed inside the building, the Commission would have no jurisdiction over that section of the historic rear wall because it would be in the interior. Reacting to claims that the Commission should not strictly regulate the rear of this building because it is outside the public's view, Ms. Pentz commented that the Commission has, in fact, protected historic fabric that cannot be seen from the street in cases where the fabric is very significant, such as on Elfreth's Alley. Mr. Baron noted that this was true as long as that fabric was on the exterior, not the interior. Ms. Pentz noted that this stair could be constructed internal to the

building, without cutting through this exterior wall. She made a motion to adopt the staff recommendation and deny the proposal. The motion failed by a vote of three to two, with Ms. Gutterman also voting for denial.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she was reluctantly in favor of recommending approval of a version of Plan B. Mr. Cluver suggested narrowing and possibly lowering the connector to minimize the demolition of original fabric. Ms. Hawkins opined that the eastern jamb of the extant window should be the limit of the cut for the enlarged opening. She noted that the new wall will overlap the brick about an additional six inches. This will allow the shutters to remain as well and maximize the drainage slope for the new roof. Mr. Cluver made the new motion to recommend approval of a modified Plan B design that would only cut out brick between the western wall of the building and the eastern jamb of the existing stair window. His motion authorized the staff to review details to ensure that the original rear cornice is preserved as much as possible. This motion was seconded by Mr. McCoubrey and passed three to two. Mses. Pentz and Gutterman voted against the motion.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of a modified Plan B, provided that any brick removed from the rear wall would be limited to the area between the western wall of the building and the eastern jamb of the existing stair window and provided that the original rear cornice is preserved as much as possible, with the staff to review details.

**ADDRESS: 932 IRVING ST**

Project: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Anthony Finio

Applicant: Anthony Finio

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 11/24/1959

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a roof deck on a rear addition of this early nineteenth-century rowhouse. The rear addition itself has not yet been built, but it has already been approved. The historic house is three stories tall with a half gable roof; the rear addition is also three stories tall with a half gable. The deck would be located on the rear roof, behind the peak of the roof. The railing would rise above the ridge line. The roof deck might be minimally visible from the public right-of-way. It will be accessed from a stair at the rear, which will not be visible to the public. The staff recommends that the applicant prepare a mock-up to allow the staff to verify that the deck would be inconspicuous from the public-right-of-way.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided that a mock-up demonstrates that the deck will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roof Guidelines.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owners Anthony Finio and Ralph DiGiodomenico represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the rear addition, which cannot be seen from any right-of-way, has already been approved. He stated that the deck would sit on that addition. He displayed photographs of the building and pointed out where there might be some minimal visibility of the deck railing from the street. He recommended a site visit to determine the extent of visibility. Ms. Hawkins asked how much visibility would be acceptable. Mr. Baron suggested that the Committee might define that amount in inches of visible railing. He did express a concern that the deck might necessitate adding to the chimney. The Committee members were in favor of allowing an inconspicuous deck, with staff to determine conspicuousness with a site visit. They said that, if the chimney has to be increased in height, then the application should not be approved. Ms. Pentz stated that the deck was inappropriate.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that a mock-up demonstrates that the deck will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and provided that the chimney does not require alteration, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roof Guidelines.

**ADDRESS: 722 PINE ST**

Project: Legalize vinyl siding on dormers

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Vaughan C. Graves

Applicant: James Clark, Four Seasons Contracting Company

History: 1830; doorway and sash, c. 1855

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to legalize the cladding of the dormers with vinyl siding at this early nineteenth-century rowhouse. The staff reviewed and approved a permit application to reroof this building. At the time of the approval, a staff member met with the roofing contractor and explained that, to meet preservation standards, the dormers should be clad in wood siding. The staff member drew a sketch for the contractor showing the appropriate treatment of the sides or cheeks of the dormers. At that time, the roofing contractor stated that he would not alter the dormers, but would leave them in their existing condition, which was his prerogative. The staff explicitly indicated on the approved permit application that the approval did not include work to the dormers. Despite this exclusion, the dormers were clad with vinyl siding. Upon learning of the illegal work, the staff requested a violation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Contractor James Clark and property owner Vaughan Graves represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that he had explained to the roofing contractor and had drawn a diagram to show how to treat the sides of the dormer in wood if work to them was necessary. Mr. Baron displayed a photograph submitted by the applicants showing a neighboring dormer covered in vinyl siding. Mr. Baron noted that the dormer in the photograph is a rear facing dormer that has been extensively altered.

The Committee members asked Mr. Clark if he had been informed that he would need an additional permit to work on the dormers. Mr. Clark conceded that this was true, but explained that when he started to do the work he found areas of leakage at the dormers and had no time to obtain the wood clapboards. He noted that the owner also had concerns about later maintenance and asked him to rebuild the dormer and install the vinyl siding. He explained that he and the owner decided undertake the unpermitted work and apply for approval after the fact. He stated that also needed to be able to guarantee that the roof would not leak. Mr. Baron noted that numerous dormers on similar building had been successfully resided with wood clapboards. He also stated that the work in question included the removal of wood details from the face of the dormer. The Committee members observed that Trex, an artificial wood substitute, might be appropriate in place of wood to reduce maintenance.

The applicants asked whether the Commission had approved vinyl siding on neighboring dormers. The Committee members said that they had not recommended approval of such siding, and noted that the staff could answer specific questions about particular addresses.

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

**ADDRESS: 206 S 03RD ST**

Project: Legalize vinyl windows and door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Anthony J. LaRocco

Applicant: Anthony J. LaRocco

History: 1830; façade replaced, c. 1910; storefront, after 1957

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to legalize a storefront window and door and vinyl windows in a second and third-story bay.

In the 1999 designation photograph, the building had a 16-light storefront window, a 9-light, two-paneled door, and six-over-six wood double-hung windows in the second and third-story bay. A historic photograph from 1957 shows one-over-one, double-hung windows in the bay. This was likely the original window configuration when the bay was constructed about 1910.

In 2008, the staff observed exterior façade alterations that included the installation of a single-light storefront window, full-glass door, and awning at the first story and vinyl windows in the second and third-story bay. The Historical Commission and the Department of Licenses & Inspections had not approved or permitted the work. A violation was subsequently issued.

The application requests legalization of the storefront window and door and the upper-story windows only at this time. The current application does not address the awning.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the storefront door and window; denial of the vinyl windows in the bay, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

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

Mr. Cluver asked why the staff recommended approval of the storefront door and window. Ms. Sell replied that at the time of designation, the door and storefront window were non-historic and within non-historic openings. She explained that the door and storefront window could be approved at the staff level.

Ms. Hawkins asked about storefront material behind the signage. Ms. Sell stated that it is brick infill.

The Committee members agreed that the vinyl windows in the bay were not appropriate.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the storefront door and window; but denial of the vinyl windows in the bay, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

**ADDRESS: 1616-26 WALNUT ST**

Project: Alter storefront, install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Metro Commercial Real Estate

Applicant: Thomas Howell, Howell Belanger Castelli Architects

History: 1929; 1616 Walnut Street Building; Tilden, Register & Pepper, architects

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to install a metal bar, called a “canopy” or a “brow” within a storefront window and over a door. The bar over the door would include metal signage reading “FOSSIL” and be halo lit from behind. The canopy and signage would fit within the openings and be bolted into the masonry.

The storefront in question is one of two, which flank the main entrance to the building. They boast decorative Deco motifs that typify the late 1920s. Both storefronts were constructed as commercial spaces. The storefront window in question appears to be original. Its twin to the west has been slightly altered but retains most of its original features.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Joanne Phillips, designer Matt Cox, property owner Sanford Bruck, permit expeditor Matt Caffrey, and architects Dionne Barborini and Michael Sjöholm represented the application.

Ms. Phillips explained to the Committee that, after the submission, she and the property owner met with the staff to discuss concerns about attachment of the brow to the storefront window. She reported that the brow is integral to Fossil’s branding of their storefronts. She explained that they tried to address the concerns of the staff about covering the transom mullion by moving the brow away from the transom mullion, allowing views of it from the street. She stated that, prior

to the submission of the application, they also revised the proposal to be more compatible with the architecture of the façade. She added that the proposal is modest and would not entail any destruction or removal of historic fabric.

Mr. Cox stated that the goal is to place Fossil's brand identity on their storefront. The brand is identified by the metal brow in the mansard brown color with the Fossil logo letters above. He explained that in the original proposal the brow would have extended across the storefront window, the masonry and the recess above the door. However, the property owner recommended dividing the brow to fit within the niches of the window and door openings and not to protrude from the plane of the façade. He explained that once he had the feedback from the meeting with the staff, he revised the drawing again, pulling the brow away from the transom mullion. He showed a revised drawing of the proposed brow pulled away two inches from the transom mullion, but still recessed within the window opening. He concluded that this adjustment was the best compromise that met preservation standards and allowed them to maintain their brand identity. He showed photographs of their stores in other historic buildings and highlighted the consistency of the brow with the logo letters above.

Mr. Cluver asked the applicants if the brow would be lighted. Mr. Cox stated that only the sign over the door would be backlit. He added that the underside of the brow is painted a lighter color to give it dimension.

Ms. Phillips stated that Fossil has not yet signed the lease for this space. She stated that currently Fossil's only presence in Philadelphia is a kiosk in Liberty Place. She reported that this new space would be a flagship store for the company. She explained that branding is critical. She asked the Committee to consider the modest signage package. She stated that the 24-story building has been restored by the owner. Mr. Cox added that the signage is not only important for brand identity, but also as a connection of the door to the large display window. He explained that the Fossil executives liked the space, but found it difficult to immediately locate the door in relation to the window. He stated that the brow would connect the door to the window.

Mr. Bruck stated that Fossil asked him about possibilities for door relocation and that he explained to them that moving the door would not be an option. He explained that this proposal is the only compromise that Fossil would accept to sign the lease. He added that the lease is finalized and completion of it hinges on the signage agreement.

Mr. Cluver noted that, although his offices are located in this building, there is no ethical conflict of interest in his participation in this review because he has no financial stake in this project.

Ms. Hawkins stated that there are two parts of the proposal that are not compatible with the building. She stated that, first, covering the window mullion with the brow and dividing the window into two parts are inappropriate. She stated that, second, the location of the Fossil sign disrupts the vertical decoration. She suggested eliminating the brow at the window and moving the Fossil sign closer to the door within the undecorated horizontal panel of the vertical slot.

Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant how the brow is related to Fossil's identity. She opined that it gets lost in the masonry opening. She referred to photographs of other Fossil storefronts and noted that there are no brows without letters over the windows. She added that, if the sign on the brow over the door is lowered, then the Fossil brand identity is still maintained without adding the horizontal bar over the window. Mr. Cox responded that the brow with the lettering

has always been part of the company's identity. He explained that they chose the location of the signage because of the natural break created by the transom bar mullion in the window. He added that the brow within the window would break up the large scale of the window and provide a better scene for their small-scale window displays. He explained that they use the brow technique in tall windows to visually divide the space and focus the eye down onto the window display. Ms. Hawkins argued that there is opportunity for signage and the use of similar advertising techniques behind the glass. Ms. Phillips argued that a large wall sign blocked views of the transom before the building was restored. She explained that the sign was later removed to restore the building to its original appearance. Ms. Phillips added that the retailer would like to tie the window and door together with the unifying brow. She explained that they are not proposing a projecting sign, but need signage at this height in order to be seen on Walnut Street. She stated that they made an effort to create a proposal that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, not destroying any historic fabric and being compatible with the building, while also meeting the needs of the tenant. Mr. Cox responded to Ms. Hawkins suggestion to move the signage closer to the door and argued that shifting it down would cause it to lose its connection with the window. Ms. Hawkins stated that signage could be added to the window behind the glass, which could accomplish their goals. She suggested installing identical signage on the interior of the glazing. Mr. McCoubrey stated that historic window is an extraordinary composition and that the brow compromises the ways in which the window is perceived. He agreed with the suggestion to lower the Fossil sign over the door.

Mr. Cluver asked if the application proposes any other signage. Ms. Phillips responded that they may propose a small Fossil emblem plaque by the door, which she believes can be approved by the staff. Mr. Cluver stated that the proposal is minimal, respectful, and compatible. He stated that he is in favor of approval. Ms. Pentz agreed.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance distributed a packet of photographs to the Committee members. He stated that he supports the staff recommendation for denial. He explained that the building was carefully restored in the 1980s to its Art Deco character including the signs. He stated that the two display windows are huge and everything inside can be viewed from the street. Therefore, he opined that there is no need for signage for retail establishments. He referred to the retail store to the west and noted that the sign for "Joan Shepp" is small and is in keeping with the signs that were there historically. He stated that the florist in the location previously had a similar sign. He noted that the lettering of the Joan Shepp sign is in an Art Deco font. He added that the only other sign Joan Shepp has is one advertising its website in the lower corner of the window glazing. He explained that Joan Shepp has operated successfully for many years in the location without significant signage. He stated that the sign for the building, 1616 Walnut, is a modest sign of Art Deco character. He noted that the Max Studio sign, which currently occupies the space being considered by Fossil, while not Art Deco, is silver and blends in with the color of the façade. He showed a photograph of the Joan Shepp store and stated that the store uses the storefront window to highlight the products inside. He asserted that the window is used for advertising and promotion purposes. He described the neighboring building at 1608 Walnut Street as similar in character to this building. He stated that City Sports, a national athletic apparel chain, uses no exterior signage and that all signage or display is on or behind the glass. Mr. Gallery showed a photograph of the storefront in question, noted the decorative window mullion, and stated that the interior is highly visible from the street. He stated that the proposed signage is entirely inconsistent with the historic signage on this building. He showed photographs of other buildings along Walnut Street and described how businesses have created signs that fit into the architecture of the buildings. He showed two photographs of other Fossil stores from the company's website and noted that use of the brow

is not consistent. He explained that the building is perfectly symmetrical. He acknowledged that the mullions in the windows are not the same, but everything else about the building including signage is symmetrical. He contended that the decorative vertical Art Deco design over the door is one of the most important architectural features of the building because it links the tower to the base of the building. He opined that, if a horizontal piece is inserted into a vertical element, it will disrupt the symmetry and the architectural element that unifies the building. He distributed an illustration of a possible solution for signage depicting use of the glazing in the transom, elimination of the brow, a Fossil sign on the pier similar to Joan Shepp, and a Fossil sign over the door in the panel without the lower brow. He explained that the large storefront window allows signs on the exterior to be more modest and in keeping with the architecture of the building. He stated that his solution is consistent with the historic character of the building and gives the store a high degree of visibility.

Ms. Phillips stated that using the Joan Shepp sign as a comparison is not plausible because the stores and their advertising philosophies are very different. She asserted that they are different stores that used different types of signage and should be treated differently. She contended that the Fossil proposal is a very restrained signage package for a national retailer. She asserted they are working within the guidelines to be sure there is no loss of historic fabric or character. She opined that the vertical decoration is only visible from across the street. She contended that having a business in the space is important for the ongoing vitality of the building and the shopping district. She added that the modest door is difficult to pick out in the 24-story building. She reiterated that the building was totally restored by the owners, who want to maintain the historic appearance.

Mr. Farnham offered to put the staff's recommendation in perspective and provide some information about the meeting the staff had with the attorneys and property owner last week. He explained that the staff's primary concern about the application as it was originally submitted was that it obscured or blocked views of the decorative transom bar across the window. One suggestion from last week, he explained, was to pull the brow away from the transom bar to allow for views up to the mullion. He stated that that revision has been made. He observed that the staff recommendation was based on the design as submitted, not as revised. He conceded that the proposed signage would slightly change the appearance of the storefront, but noted that any project proposing an awning or signage has the capacity to change the appearance of a facade. He noted that this proposed alteration would not destroy historic fabric. He explained that, at the meeting, the staff had asked if it was possible to move the Fossil sign over the door into the panel above the door and attach to the non-historic door frame, but the question was unable to be answered because the designer was not in attendance. Mr. Farnham stated that an argument could be made that a sign in the slot above doorway changes the understanding of the way the dramatic space rises up, creating verticality. He remarked that the other attorney present at the meeting had asked the staff if it was strident or not strident about its recommendation. He explained that the staff had confessed that it was not strident. He opined that the application proposes a minor modification to the building. He suggested that, if this minor change allows a very significant historic building to continue to be profitable and bring life to this section of Walnut Street, then it might be worth the minor drawbacks of the proposal. Mr. Gallery asked Mr. Farnham if the staff's statement that "The introduction of the horizontal bars across the openings would alter the historic appearance and disrupt the strong vertical orientation of the building" had been withdrawn. Mr. Farnham responded that the staff still supports the statement, but contends that the "disruption" would be very minor. He noted that the Commission routinely allows minor modifications that slightly alter historical appearances.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that he does not believe that the brow visually connects the window and door. He maintained that the brow is a major interruption to the frame, ornamentation, and mullions. Ms. Hawkins stated that adding the brow at the transom bar compels the Fossil sign to be located in an inappropriate spot. She added that the sign should be lowered to read visually as part of the door.

Mr. Cluver maintained that the application proposes a minor intervention that does not adversely impact the historic building. Ms. Pentz agreed.

Ms. Gutterman suggested eliminating the brow, lowering the Fossil sign to the spot above the door, and installing signage behind the glass.

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

**ADDRESS: 2038 SPRING GARDEN ST**

Project: Legalize mechanical equipment

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Artisides Pappas

Applicant: Artisides Pappas

History: 1875

Individual Designation: 5/1/1975

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to legalize the installation of HVAC condensers and conduit mounted to the first and second-story side wall of this building. The condensers are highly visible as the side of the building stands on 21<sup>st</sup> Street.

In August 2011, the staff observed the HVAC units installed without the approval of the Historical Commission or a permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. A violation was subsequently issued.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

The Committee members agreed that the installation of the HVAC units and associated wiring on the street facades of this historic building in a historic district were extremely inappropriate.

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:45 a.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 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.