

**THE MINUTES OF THE 560<sup>TH</sup> STATED MEETING OF THE  
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**9 APRIL 2009  
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET  
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

**PRESENT**

Sam Sherman, Chair  
David Amburn, AIA  
Leslie Benoliel  
Duane Bumb, Senior Deputy Director of Commerce  
Della Clark  
Richardson Dilworth, Ph.D.  
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President  
John Mattioni, Esq.  
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections  
David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission  
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property  
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

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 II

Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor

**ALSO PRESENT**

Sabra Smith, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Gail Harrity, Philadelphia Museum of Art  
Paul Pincus, Philadelphia Museum of Art  
Nancy O'Donnell, Philadelphia Horticultural Society  
Susan Weiler, The Olin Studio  
Viki Sand, Atwater Kent Museum  
Daniel Klein, Ewing Cole  
John Milner, John Milner Architects  
Doris Fanelli, Independence National Historical Park  
Amanda Jones, National Park Service  
Charles Tonetti, Independence National Historical Park  
Charles Murray, Undine Barge Club  
Stan Free, Undine Barge Club  
James Paulo, Undine Barge Club  
Robert McAuliffe, PE, Undine Barge Club  
Myles Pettengill, Archway Builders  
Ed Fink, Fink & Stange Architects  
Gibbs Connors  
Kevin Rasmussen, Rasmussen/Su Architects  
Michael Loonstyn

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Amburn, Benoliel, Clark, Dilworth, Mattioni, Leonard, Quinn, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, and Wilds joined him. Duane Bumb represented Commerce Director Andrew Altman for designee Sara Merriman, who was unavailable.

### **MINUTES OF THE 559<sup>TH</sup> STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**ACTION:** Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the minutes of the 559<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 March 2009. Ms. Clark seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 MARCH 2009**

David Amburn, Chair

#### **2201-09 BENJAMIN FRANKLIN PARKWAY, RODIN MUSEUM**

Owner: Philadelphia Museum of Art

Applicant: Paul Pincus, Officer for Planning and Special Projects, Philadelphia Museum of Art

History: 1926-29, Paul P. Cret and Jacques Greber; individually designated, 6/21/1971

Project: Restore gardens, install ADA ramp to lower terrace

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 3, 9, and 10.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to restore the gardens of the Rodin Museum. This project is part of a much larger project to improve the landscape of this section of the Benjamin Franklin Parkway, which is bounded by 21<sup>st</sup>, 22<sup>nd</sup>, and Hamilton Streets, and the Parkway. The Commission has jurisdiction over the Rodin Museum garden restoration, but not the larger project. The work includes the restoration of the historic garden features, plantings, and the addition of an ADA ramp to the lower terrace. The lower terrace of the garden is currently only accessible by steps, as designed by Jacques Greber in 1929. The applicant proposes to install a ramp on the southeast corner of the garden that would not require handrails. The ramp would not be perceived from the Meudon Gate, but would be visible from other vantage points as visitors move through the garden. The application includes the creation of two new entry points along a non-historic fence. These entrances would connect the garden to the new circulation paths in the park that occupies the remainder of the block. The applicant also proposes general restoration and/or replacement of paving materials, spalled and broken stone elements, and lighting. Much of this work can be considered restoration and reviewed and approved at the staff level. The staff has recently approved restoration work to the Meudon Gate, which is the entry point to the garden and the museum. That work includes the restoration of the front steps as well as restoration of the stone gate and its wrought iron elements.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Gail Harrity and Paul Pincus of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, Nancy O'Donnell of the Philadelphia Horticultural Society, and landscape architect Susan Weiler represented the application.

Ms. Harrity provided an overview of the project. Mr. Danta distributed revised plans that incorporated the comments offered by the Architectural Committee during its review. Mr. Mattioni requested clarification on the changes to the ramp. Ms. Weiler explained that the proposed ramp had been shortened and that the curb along the ramp would no longer extend beyond the ramp, but would be terminated at the end of the ramp. The Commissioners

congratulated the applicants on the project, which will preserve historic resources and improve this important site.

**ACTION:** Mr. Schaaf moved to approve the application with the revised detail for the ramp curb, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 3, 9, and 10. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **13-17 S. 7<sup>TH</sup> STREET, ATWATER KENT MUSEUM**

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Walter L. Crimm, AIA

History: 1824-26, John Haviland; individually designated, 6/26/1956

Project: Install glass doors, signage, rear alterations, and HVAC equipment

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the signage owing to incompleteness; approval of the exterior alterations, provided that the front glass doors are frameless with minimal hardware and no transom bar, that all rear windows are replaced to match the historic windows, and that the rear doorway includes a better proportioned transom, with the staff to review details. The Committee suggests that the museum retain the interior columns as artifacts.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes several alterations to the front, rear, and side façades. This very significant Greek Revival building was designed by John Haviland to house the original Franklin Institute and constructed in 1824-26. The front façade retains its original appearance.

A set of glass doors would be installed in front of the extant, historic, wood front doors. The existing wood doors would remain in place in an open position. The applicant proposes to install the glass doors to make the institution more welcoming and less forbidding from the street. The glass doors would also help maintain a climate controlled environment in the museum. The existing wood doors are more than 10' in height. The proposed glass doors would only be 8'-6" tall; the remaining area would be infilled with a transom. The glass doors can not be as tall as the historic wood doors owing to the structural limitations of an aluminum and glass door system. The doors would be installed within the wood jamb and there would be no penetrations to the stone door surround. Although the proposed alteration would help the institution present a more welcoming face to the street, it would adversely affect the historic integrity of this landmark building. The proportions and vertical thrust so clearly visible in the front doors would be adversely affected by the installation of a glass door with transom. The introduction of a horizontal transom bar in what is otherwise an unobstructed vertical paneled door would disrupt the proportions of the wood doors.

The application proposes the installation of two signs flanking the front steps along 7<sup>th</sup> Street. The application does not include any details for the signage and, therefore, this portion of the application should be considered incomplete.

The rear elevation would be altered by the removal of two non-historic four-over-four windows, and a paneled door. A glass door would replace the existing wood door. This change stems from the desire to make the rear access to the institution more inviting. Four new louvers would be cut into the rear masonry wall for the climate control system. These cuts would be located above infilled historic openings. A louver would also be installed in the north elevation, which faces a small alley. Mechanical equipment would be located at grade behind a screen at the southeast corner of the site. Although, originally the back of the lecture hall and of little

architectural significance this rear elevation is now treated as a main point of entry. The alterations proposed for this façade should relate better to the proportions established by the fenestration on the upper stories. The proposed entry glass door is out of scale with the rest of the façade.

The applicant proposes to install new windows in infilled openings as well as interior panels behind existing historic windows on the front façade. These windows would be vented through holes on the rails to prevent moisture accumulation.

The application also proposes to remove four decorative cast iron columns that stand in the main public space in the museum. The museum claims that the columns obstruct the space. Some claim that the columns are the oldest surviving cast-iron columns in the United States. The columns were installed by John Haviland, the architect of the building, about one year after the building was completed, when the second-floor tenant, the court system, complained that the building was not sound. Because they are in the interior, the Commission has no authority to deny the proposal to remove them. However, because the museum is owned and operated by the City of Philadelphia, the Commission could offer a recommendation on the removal of the columns to the Mayor and City Council. The historic preservation ordinance authorizes the Commission to:

Make recommendations to the Mayor and City Council concerning the use of grants, gifts and budgetary appropriations to promote the preservation of buildings, structures, site, objects or districts of historic importance to the City.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application. Museum director Viki Sand, architect Daniel Klein, and preservation consultant John Milner represented the application.

Ms. Sand provided an overview of the history and mission of the museum. She noted that the building was the first artifact in the museum's collection, but also the primary obstacle to the development of the museum. She explained that the museum embarked in a \$5.5 million campaign to adapt the building and reinterpret the collection in 2006. John Milner was hired at that time to write a historic structure's report on the building. Ms. Sand noted that the goals of the project are to enhance the features of Haviland's architectural masterpiece, while allowing the twenty-first century museum to flourish.

Mr. Klein presented the project and the revisions that had been made since the Architectural Committee meeting. He stated that the proposed glass doors at the front had been revised. The revisions include a thinner frame to make the doors nearly frameless as well as more minimal hardware with a bronze finish to match the hardware of the historic door. He noted that no revisions were made to the side elevation. He explained the revisions to the rear elevation. He noted that the rear entry door had been revised to give it more harmonious proportions. This had been achieved by the introduction of a transom. The doors were also revised to be wood in a Greek Revival paneled style.

Mr. Wilds inquired about the operation of the front wood doors and the glass door. Mr. Klein explained that the wood doors open inwards while the glass doors would open outwards over the steps to the museum. Mr. Wilds requested further clarification of the claim that the glass doors would be frameless. He claimed that the proposal shows a minimal frame. Mr. Amburn clarified that frameless means that the frame only supports weather stripping; it does not have any structural capabilities as it would be expected of a traditional frame. Mr. Wilds concluded that the doors are not frameless. Mr. Schaaf asked about the reason for the solid wood doors in the rear and noted that this entry is the main ADA entrance to the museum. Ms. Sand stated

that the solid doors were chosen for security reasons. Mr. Schaaf noted that the solid wood doors create an unwelcoming entrance for people with disabilities when compared to the welcoming front entrance with the proposed glass doors. Mr. Wilds asked if interior vestibules could be created at both front and rear entrances. Mr. Klein explained that interior air-locks would be necessary in order to maintain a museum-quality, climate-controlled environment. He explained that the space would not allow for the introduction of an air-lock without disrupting the flow of the interior floor plan and confusing visitors, especially for ticketing and souvenir purchases. Both activities currently take place adjacent to the entrance door and would remain in place. Mr. Wilds inquired about the signage. Mr. Klein noted that the signs are not designed and that she would submit an additional application to the Commission for the signs at a later date.

The Commission turned its attention to the eight cast-iron columns in the interior. He noted that, although the Historical Commission does not have jurisdiction over the interior, it can offer advice to the Mayor and City Council because the building is City-owned. Mr. Danta drew the attention of the Commissioners to supplemental information and photographs related to the columns. Mr. Mattioni inquired if the columns were structural. Mr. Danta explained that the interior was originally designed as a vaulted space; the columns were added one year after the building was completed. Mr. Klein added that the columns serve a structural purpose; if they were removed without reinforcement of the structure, the building would collapse. Mr. Milner explained that Haviland originally intended the space to be supported by sweeping vaults. The vaults were too ambitious and the columns were introduced to strengthen the underperforming structure. He noted that Haviland had added columns at Independence Hall. Mr. Wilds asked how the structure would be strengthened if the columns were removed. Mr. Klein explained that the original structure would be strengthened with the addition of beams that would encapsulate the original trusses and be tied back to the bearing masonry walls. Mr. Milner added that the columns have historical significance as artifacts, but are not significant to the space. He added that the museum should retain them as part of its collection.

Mr. Schaaf asked if the museum would be willing to compromise and move the columns out, closer to the walls, reducing their obstructive impact but maintaining them in their original setting. Ms. Sand answered that the columns were not appropriate for the use of the space and the museum program. She noted that they obstructed the free use of the space.

Mr. Sherman asked how the museum would interpret the columns if it removed but retained them as part of its collection. Ms. Sand answered that the columns would be put in storage until an appropriate use arose, perhaps in a garden pavilion. She reiterated the museum's commitment to the building, referring to it as the collection's first artifact. Mr. Schaaf stated that the columns were designed for interior use and it would not be appropriate to locate them in an exterior setting. Ms. Sand stated that this space was one of the first secular interior spaces in the city where Philadelphians could congregate. She noted that many famous speakers such as abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison spoke in this room when it was an auditorium. The museum is seeking to restore the space to Haviland's original design. Mr. Wilds noted that although the columns were not part of Haviland's original design, they were present when Garrison spoke and when innumerable other important historical events took place in the space.

Mr. Mattioni agreed that the columns are important, but asserted that they need not be retained in their current locations to be preserved. He contended that the importance of the museum's mission and the use of the space override the importance of the columns. Mr. Dilworth asked if the space would qualify for designation as a historic interior space if the Commission had the authority to designate such spaces. Mr. Farnham answered that the space would likely qualify

for designation as an interior. He added that the columns would also likely qualify for designation as objects by themselves. Mr. Dilworth asked which of the two was more important the columns or the space. Mr. Farnham answered that both the space with the columns and the columns themselves has significance.

Mr. Sherman proposed a compromise. He asked if the museum would be willing to remove but retain and interpret the columns. Ms. Sand answered that she would consider that option. She added that the museum plans to develop an exhibit on the history of the building and that the columns could play a part of that exhibition.

Ms. Schlotterbeck stated that she had met Ms. Sand on site and toured the space. She stated at the time she believed the removal of the columns made sense for the museum's program. She stated that, given the new information regarding their age and significance of the columns, she felt hesitant to recommend their removal. Mr. Dilworth said that their removal was outside the Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Wilds clarified that it was not, owing to the fact that the City owns the building; the Commission had the authority to make recommendations to the Mayor and City Council on the proposed changes. He noted City Hall that the Commission has advised the City on alterations in the interior of City Hall.

**ACTION:** Mr. Mattioni moved to deny the signage owing to incompleteness, but to approve all other exterior alterations as revised and presented to the Commission at its meeting of 9 April 2009, with the staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ACTION:** Mr. Mattioni moved that the Commission resolve not to oppose the removal of the columns provided that the museum retains them as part of its collection and displays and interprets them. Ms. Clark seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6 to 5. Commissioners Bumb, Leonard, Quinn, Schlotterbeck, and Wilds dissented.

### **500-36 CHESTNUT STREET, INDEPENDENCE HALL**

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: National Park Service

History: 1729-34, Edmund Wooley & Andrew Hamilton, architects; tower, 1753 and 1828 individually designated, 1956; World Heritage Site, 1979

Project: In concept: restore tower, repair masonry, replace metalwork and roofing

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend tabling the application for a period not to exceed six months to allow for additional investigation.

**OVERVIEW:** This in-concept application requests comment on several alternative methods of repair for the tower of Independence Hall. Famed architect William Strickland reconstructed the tower in 1828. The City of Philadelphia owns Independence Hall, but agreed to allow the federal government to maintain, curate, and interpret the building in 1950. The agreement dictates that "Any work of restoration or any major alterations or repairs to any of the buildings [including Independence Hall] shall not be undertaken until the plans for such work shall have been mutually agreed upon [by the Secretary of the Interior and the City of Philadelphia]." The Historical Commission has two tasks in this review. First, it must perform its regulatory responsibilities under §14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code. Second, it must advise the City on appropriate preservation methods for Independence Hall. Before the National Park Service may

commence its work on the tower, it must have both the final approval of the Historical Commission and the agreement of the City of Philadelphia.

The wood-clad section of the tower, where the clock is located, was constructed using a novel technique. The section of the tower has a wood frame clad with very thick horizontal boards stacked on top of one other and fastened together with iron rods running vertically through them. In several cases, water has penetrated the boards and rusted the iron rods, causing them to expand and damage the boards. Possible treatments include:

1. Wholesale removal and replacement of the siding in kind.
2. Disassembly, replacement of the deteriorated boards, reassembly.
3. Repair of existing siding in place and treatment with borate to inhibit rot.
4. Protection of the existing siding with a covering of wood or metal sheeting.

The applicant has included sections of a Historic Structures Report that examines the advantages and disadvantages of the approaches. The applicant recognizes that the best approach may be a combination of several alternatives. The applicant requests that the development of a protocol to allow for Commission oversight during the process of disassembly.

The application also proposes replacing wood shingle roofs with metal roofs, replacing wood elements in a balustrade in fiberglass copies, and brick repointing. The building has been pointed in myriad ways and the applicant is seeking to identify the most appropriate pointing method and mortar mix. The applicant would also like to install “emplacements” or permanent brackets for hanging scaffolding that would allow for less expensive and more timely maintenance in the future. No details for the “emplacements” have been provided.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Doris Fanelli, Amanda Jones, and Charles Tonetti of the National Park Service represented the application.

Mr. Tonetti displayed a Powerpoint presentation that provided an overview of the conditions at the tower of Independence Hall. He noted in particular the water infiltration and resulting deterioration. Water enters at the 6<sup>th</sup> level and runs down to the 4<sup>th</sup> level, causing damage. He explained that the tower has very thick, horizontal, wood, shiplap siding. The horizontal siding is held together by original, vertical, iron rods, which have rusted in sections. As the rods have corroded, they have expanded and degraded some of the surrounding wood. Mr. Tonetti explained that the Park’s consultants had documented the damage to the wood cladding using radiography on the south and west elevations. Mr. Tonetti explained that they have not conclusively determined why architect William Strickland employed the unusual construction method with the shiplap siding and rods. He may have used it for ease of assembly or for structural reasons. He may have borrowed the technology from the barge construction industry. Mr. Tonetti stated that the rust from the rods is eating away at the wood. Displaying a diagram of the tower, he explained that the 4<sup>th</sup> level is in the best condition, the 5<sup>th</sup> level exhibits some deterioration, but the 6<sup>th</sup> level is in the worst condition. In some places, the wood is completely breaking down. He said that the condition is akin to “spike death” seen where spikes cause decay in railroad ties. Water attacks the iron, which, in turn, attacks the wood, causing decomposition. At the 6<sup>th</sup> level, the siding retains early and mid nineteenth-century graffiti, which is historically significant and should be preserved even if the siding is replaced.

Mr. Tonetti explained that they would like to modify the roof at the 6<sup>th</sup> level for better drainage. The roof cannot be seen from the ground. The roof currently allows moisture to penetrate and travel to the lower levels. A bucket test was undertaken to examine the flow. Historic photographs show that the roof was metal at one time.

Mr. Tonetti reported that the weather vane spindle is also deteriorating. The internal plate that supports the spindle is showing signs of rust, but the full extent of the damage is not yet known. Mr. Tonetti suggested replacing it with a maintenance-free stainless steel rod. Also, the brass ball on the weather vane has split, allowing water to infiltrate. He proposed repairing the ball.

Mr. Tonetti explained that it would cost \$500,000 to scaffold the tower. Owing to the high cost, the Park would like to fix the problems in a way that would last well into the future. He also explained that the Park would like to install “outriggers” on the tower to make maintenance simpler and cheaper in the future. He stated that the best solution may be to disassemble the wood siding, replace the rods with stainless steel rods, and reuse the wood siding where possible. Any siding with graffiti that could not be reinstalled would be retained and displayed.

Mr. Tonetti and Ms. Fanelli suggested that the Commission table the application to allow time for the Commission and Architectural Committee members to visit the tower and view the deterioration. They also suggested that the Commission remand the application back to the Committee to allow it to discuss the information garnered during the site visit.

**ACTION:** Mr. Dilworth moved to table the application for a period not to exceed six months to allow for additional investigation and to remand the application back to the Architecture Committee for a review with the additional information. Ms Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

#### **4414 RIDGE AVENUE, CASTLE RINGSTETTEN OF UNDINE BARGE CLUB**

Owner: Undine Barge Club

Applicant: Myles Pettengill, Archway Builders

History: 1875, Furness & Hewitt

Project: Reroof in copper and rolled roofing

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of an unpainted copper roof, but approval of a red metal roof, provided it replicates the appearance of the original roof, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, and 6.

**OVERVIEW:** The applicant proposes to reroof Castle Ringstetten of the Undine Barge Club. It is currently roofed with a standing seam tin roof. The club would like to use copper in place of the tin because it would not necessitate painting. A copper roof would present a very different appearance than a tin roof painted red. Historically, red is the most common color for tin roofs; green is also common. Copper was historically used for roofing for very high style buildings constructed later than this 1875 building.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. No one represented the application.

The Commission reviewed the application and deemed the Committee’s recommendation appropriate.

**ACTION:** Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the unpainted copper roof, but approve a red metal roof, provided it replicates the appearance of the original roof, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, and 6. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **1831 DIAMOND STREET**

Owner: Brian Shaffer

Applicant: Edward Fink

History: c. 1890, Angus Wade, contributing to Diamond Street Historic District, 1995  
declared Imminently Dangerous by L&I and demolished, 1999

Project: Reconstruct demolished historic building

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of both alternatives, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Reconstruction Standards 1, 4, and 5.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to reconstruct the historic building that once stood on this site. The historic building was declared Imminently Dangerous by the Department of Licenses & Inspections and then demolished in 1999. The Commission reviewed and approved an in-concept application for this project at its March 2009 meeting.

Since the approval in concept, the design has been revised. It includes two alternatives. Alternative A3a proposes reconstructing the front facade with brown cast stone. Alternative A3b proposes reconstructing the front façade using a scribed stucco with an elastomeric finish. The design has also been revised to include windows in the party wall.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Edward Fink represented the application.

Mr. Dilworth asked Mr. Baron to explain why the Commission would approve a replication of this building, but not others. Mr. Baron responded that the historic building was lost to neglect. He stated that the historic preservation ordinance sanctions reconstruction in cases of neglect. He also noted that the applicant proposed a reconstruction.

**ACTION:** Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve both alternatives, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Reconstruction Standards 1, 4, and 5. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **1112 LOCUST STREET**

Owner: Gibbs Connors

Applicant: Gibbs Connors

History: c. 1815

Project: Construct three-story addition

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted 3 to 2 to recommend denial of the application.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a three-story addition to the west elevation of 1112 Locust Street. The building at 1112 Locust Street is the only survivor of a row of four houses constructed circa 1815. The building at 1110 Locust Street was demolished between 1917 and 1936. The buildings at 1114 and 1116 Locust Street were demolished in the 1970s by the Redevelopment Authority. Their designations were subsequently rescinded in April 2005.

The proposed addition would stand on the lot at 1114 Locust Street, but would connect to the historic building at 1112 Locust Street. It would be modern in design and would employ a glass and steel storefront system with metal infill panels at the façade and rear elevations. The west

elevation would be comprised primarily of brick with intersecting bands of glass and metal panels above the first story. The historic fenestration pattern of the existing building is carried over to the proposed addition in its storefront fenestration and panel configuration, creating a compatible rhythm.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Architect Kevin Rasmussen and property owner Gibbs Connors represented the application.

Ms. Sell explained that the applicant, Mr. Rasmussen, had advised the staff that a section of the Architectural Committee minute for his project was incorrect. He contended that the section that states that the Washington West Civic Association reviewed and approved of his project was in error. He asked the Commission to direct the staff to delete it from the minute. The Commission agreed and directed the staff to delete it.

Mr. Rasmussen introduced the project stating that 1112 Locust Street is the last remaining of four or five original row homes on the south side of 1100 Locust Street. He explained that the east side of the building is bordered by a 1970s one-story garage. The west side is bound by a ten-foot area owned by the client; and to the west of that is a community garden. He stated that the block does not retain its historic character; the historic building at 1112 Locust Street is isolated by modern construction.

Mr. Rasmussen explained that when he appeared before the Architectural Committee, the discussion was focused on the differentiation and compatibility of the new construction with historic building. He argued that his goal as the architect was to design an addition differentiated from, yet also compatibility with the historic building. He explained that his proposal was designed for a unique site that is only ten feet wide. A standard row home is fourteen feet wide. He argued it would not be appropriate to recreate a two-bay front façade and he did not want the addition to look like a third bay added to the two-bay historic rowhouse. He explained that he wanted the structure to stand by itself as much as possible. He therefore proposed a front façade that would be compatible but also differentiated. He stated that he wanted to make the new structure look lighter than the historic building because he has a very different structural system than the historic building. It would not make sense to design a building with a contemporary structural system that looked like a historic building. Buildings are built differently today than they were in the 1830s.

Mr. Rasmussen explained that there were some concerns at the Architectural Committee meeting about compatibility. He claimed that he responded to those concerns in the revised plans, which he distributed to the Commission members. Mr. Rasmussen noted that the Architectural Committee members objected to the alignments across the facades of the historic building and the proposed addition in the earlier iteration. The revised plans show that he has addressed the alignments, specifically at the third story and cornice. He explained that some Committee members objected to the amount of glazing proposed in the earlier design. The amount of glazing on the upper floors has been reduced by half in the new design. The glass has been replaced by recessed metal panels.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance addressed the Commission and requested that they support the recommendation of the Committee to deny the application. He explained that the Preservation Alliance and Washington West Civic Association did not have an opportunity to review the revised plans prior to this meeting. He stated that the ten-foot side lot was formally part of the garden that is adjacent to the property and is currently leased by the Washington West Civic Association from the Redevelopment Authority. He stated that the Preservation

Alliance acquired the historic house from the Redevelopment Authority and facilitated its restoration. He explained that at that time it was viewed as necessary to have a side yard with access to the rear. He stated that, at the request of Councilman DiCiccio, the Washington West Civic Association agreed to donate the ten-foot strip of land to be legally added to the property at 1112 Locust Street. It therefore comes under the full jurisdiction of the Historical Commission.

Mr. Gallery stated that the Preservation Alliance does not object to the concept of an addition to the historic building. He claimed that the Washington West Civic Association does not support the proposal in its entirety. He stated that the Association reviewed a one-story addition, but indicated that a taller building might be appropriate. He stated that he is pleased that the architect and owner are willing to consider suggestions for revising the design, but insisted that the revised design must be remanded to the Architectural Committee for its review. He stated that time must be provided for the staff and interested parties to review the revised design.

Mr. Bumb asked the staff if the Commission could assert jurisdiction over the side lot even if it was not originally part of the designated lot. Mr. Farnham explained that the boundary of the designated 1112 Locust Street parcel had been enlarged to incorporate the ten-foot lot. He explained that the Commission has routinely asserted its jurisdiction over the entireties of lots that have grown owing to consolidation. He also noted that the ordinance defines a historic building as its site and site appurtenances. He finally noted that the application proposes alterations to the historic building itself, albeit at the party wall. He therefore suggested that the Commission assert jurisdiction over this application.

Mr. Bumb asked Mr. Farnham if the Commission has a practice of reviewing revisions executed after the Architectural Committee meeting if the revisions respond to the Committee's comments. Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission routinely accepts revisions that respond to the Committee's comments without remanding the revised design back to the Committee. He added that the staff recommended that approval of the original design, which it considered compatible with the historic building. He explained the Commission could consider the original as well as the revised design. He concluded that the application need not be remanded to the Committee. The Commission has the legal authority to act on it at this meeting.

Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Amburn if he believed that the revisions address the concerns of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Amburn stated that he was in the minority that favored the original submission. He asserted that the revised drawing does address the concern about lack of alignment of the windows at the third floor. He explained that other Committee members who voted in the majority favored punched window openings like other buildings in the area. Mr. Schaaf clarified that this building is not in a historic district.

**ACTION:** Mr. Schaaf moved to approve the application as revised and presented to the Commission at its meeting of 9 April 2009, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **605 AND 609 N. 18<sup>TH</sup> STREET**

Owner: Michael Loonstyn

Applicant: Michael Loonstyn

History: Undeveloped lots in Spring Garden Historic District

Project: Review and Comment: Construct building

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT:** The Architectural Committee commented that the windows and cornices of the new construction should align with their twins.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct two three-story, three-bay, brick buildings on vacant lots in the Spring Garden Historic District. This block of N. 18<sup>th</sup> Street was comprised of three-story, two-bay-wide twins. The drawings indicate that the door, windows, and cornice of the front façade would replicate those found on the historic buildings on the block.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. Developer Michael Loonstyn represented the applications.

Mr. Baron noted that Mr. Loonstyn had agreed to correct the design of the front doors to include arched top panels.

**ACTION:** Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the comments of the Architectural Committee and comment that the windows and cornices of the new construction should align with their twins. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Schaaf moved to adjourn at 11:42 a.m. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES**

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

Standard 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 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.

Reconstruction Standard 1: Reconstruction will be used to depict vanished or non-surviving portions of a property when documentary and physical evidence is available to permit accurate reconstruction with minimal conjecture, and such reconstruction is essential to the public understanding of the property.

Reconstruction Standard 4: Reconstruction will be based on the accurate duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by documentary or physical evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different features from other historic properties. A reconstructed property will re-create the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color, and texture.

Reconstruction Standard 5: A reconstruction will be clearly identified as a contemporary re-creation.