

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

**TUESDAY, 24 MAY 2011
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, Chair
John Cluver
Rudy D'Alessandro
Shawn Evans
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

Nick Gregory, Kimpton Hotels
Jack Paruta, Gensler & Associates
Ed Barnhart, Always by Design
A. McKelvey
Herbert Victor, VDM LLP
Greg Laska, Grayboyes
Jim Tevebaugh, Tevebaugh Associates
Frank Lauria, Continental Windows & Doors
Jamie Fiel, J & M Windows
Rolf Andeer, Bookhaven
Paul Steinke, Reading Terminal Market
Charles Gensloff, Reading Terminal Market
George Baker, George Baker Architect
James Iovine, Reading Terminal Market
Vincent Iovine, Reading Terminal Market
John Weckerly, Boxwood Architect
Salvador Guerrero, Boxwood Architect
Samantha Giuliano
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Hing Lui
Sheri Young
James Wiesenhutter, C. Erickson & Sons, Inc.

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mes. Gutterman and Pentz and Messrs. Cluver, D'Alessandro, Evans, and McCoubrey joined her.

ADDRESS: 305-19 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Chemical Heritage Foundation

Applicant: Edward Barnhart, Always by Design

History: 2001, Chemical Heritage Foundation

Individual Designation: 11/6/1980

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of an addition at the rear of the building. The addition would not be visible from Chestnut Street, but it would be visible across a parking lot from Second Street. It would also be visible from Franklin Court. The addition would be finished in materials already found at the rear of the existing building. These materials are gray metal panels, brick, and earth-tone stucco. The portion of the addition that would be visible from Franklin Court would be finished in stucco.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Edward Barnhart represented the application.

Mr. Barnhart presented an overview of the project. He noted that they are not proposing to build to the maximum allowable height. He stated that the addition would be located behind the existing building on Chestnut Street, to the east of Franklin Court. It would be visible from 3rd Street across a parking lot. The Chemical Heritage Foundation will likely construct a new building on this parking lot at some point in the future, blocking views of the addition from 3rd Street. He noted that of the addition would not front onto Franklin Court; a building would stand between the Court and the addition. He described the proposed materials as blond brick for the base and stucco above, which would be match the side of the Chemical Heritage Foundation building that fronts on Chestnut. Mr. McCoubrey asked if control joint lines in the stucco would be visible from Franklin Court. Mr. Barnhart stated that some control joints are needed and would be visible. The Committee members discussed the project and determined that it satisfies the Standards.

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

ADDRESS: 433-41 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Install HVAC equipment and signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: KHP II Chestnut, LLC

Applicant: Jack Paruta, Gensler & Associates

History: 1907, James H. & John T. Windrim, architects, Lafayette Building

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Significant, 12/12/2003

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of roof-top HVAC units on several locations on this 12-story building. The units would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. Some units may be slightly visible at a great distance, usually one block or more away. The application also proposes the temporary installation of a banner at the corner of 5th and Chestnut. The banner would wrap around the corner of the building and be roughly 48' or four stories in height. The Commission approved the installation of significantly smaller banners that do not wrap around the corner of the building for a period not to exceed 18 months at its April 2011 meeting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of roof-top HVAC units, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of banners, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jack Paruta and hotel developer Nick Gregory represented the application.

Mr. Paruta described the project. He pointed out the proposed locations for the heating and cooling units on the roof. He noted that he had avoided locating units near the rooftop lounge. Mr. Paruta introduced several photographs of the area from street level to show that the units would be inconspicuous to the public.

Mr. Paruta then spoke about the temporary banner, which would wrap the corner of the building at 5th and Chestnut Streets. He stated that the banner would be in place during the construction, approximately one year, until early next summer. He stated that the Mayor's Office is expected to participate in a public relations event for the unveiling of the project, which would be tied into this banner.

Mr. Cluver asked about the previously approved signage for the building. Ms. Hawkins informed the Committee members that the applicants had proposed two permanent banners, at 5th and Ranstead and at 5th and Chestnut, to be installed at the completion of construction. They would have been three stories tall and would not have wrapped the corners. The Commission considered the proposal and compromised with two temporary two-story banners for 18 months. Mr. Paruta stated that the intent of those banners is different than the banner currently proposed. He clarified that the earlier banners were intended to be permanent, while the proposed banner would be temporary, during construction only. He stated that the Art Commission had approved the construction banner with no objections to the design. Mr. Cluver asked about the attachments details of the banner. Mr. Paruta answered that the banner would not have a framework, and would be anchored directly to the facade at the mortar joints. Ms. Hawkins stated her strong opposition to the attaching a banner directly to the building, even a temporary banner. Mr. Gregory stated that the banner would identify the hotel before it opens. Ms. Hawkins opined that there are better places available for such signs, for example scaffolding, construction fencing, or other temporary structures, which would not involve

attaching to the historic façade. Ms. Gutterman stated that the location and size of the banner is problematic. Mr. Evans agreed. Mr. Cluver stated he would be more inclined to accept the banner if it complied with the Commission's earlier approval.

Ms. Gutterman questioned how noisy the HVAC units would be on the roof. Mr. Paruta stated that rooftop terrace will be 12 to 14 feet away from the nearest unit. He stated that he did not expect any noise to disturb the patrons.

Ms. Pentz asked about the illuminated Hotel Monaco sign at the pediment. Mr. Paruta stated that the illuminated sign was part of the earlier submission and was not included in this application. He acknowledged that it was a drafting oversight and requested that the Committee members ignore the sign.

Mr. Evans opined that the photographs presented to show visibility were strategically positioned and that there would likely be some visibility of the rooftop units. Mr. Paruta stated that he had walked the area in the park and reiterated that there would not be much visibility. The units would be inconspicuous.

Mr. Paruto again lobbied for the banner, which he insisted would not detract from the appearance or character of the building, but would instead enhance it.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of roof-top HVAC units, pursuant to Standard 9; and denial of banner, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 227 N CAMAC ST

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lin Hua

Applicant: Sherry Young

History: 1840

Individual Designation: 4/25/1974

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a rear addition to a mid nineteenth-century rowhouse. The rear of the property retains some original fabric, but it has been greatly altered from its original configuration. The proposed addition would extend the rear ell. The addition would be kept at the level of the rear cornice and it would not alter the roof over the main block. The addition would be slightly visible from 12th Street across a large parking lot northeast of the property. The drawings do not depict the roof of the property accurately. The roof is shown on the drawings as a flat roof, but in reality the roof is pitched.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Designer Hing Lui and expediter Sheri Young represented the application.

Mr. Danta explained that the roof on the main block of this building is pitched, not flat as depicted incorrectly on the drawings.

Mr. Lui explained that the building has been vacant for many years and has suffered from deterioration. He stated that the roof in the rear of the property has deteriorated and partially collapsed. He stated that this project would bring this building back to use.

Ms. Pentz asked for a clarification on the structural details of the new construction. Mr. Lui stated that the new construction will tie into the existing structure.

Mr. Danta presented a photograph depicting the rear of the property. He explained that the addition would extend from the existing rear ell towards the rear of the lot. He noted that the addition would stay at the line of the roof and would not extend higher than the existing small elevator penthouse. Mr. Lui assured the Committee members the application did not involve any work to the front façade.

Mr. Evans asked if there was a structural engineer's report that explained the collapse. Ms. Pentz again asked for a clarification on the location of the collapse. Mr. Lui pointed out the collapsed area on a plan. He noted that the load-bearing walls of the rear ell were stable. He clarified that the collapsed members were floor joists and roof joists; they had failed owing to rot caused by water infiltration. The outer masonry shell of the rear ell was stable. Ms. Pentz asked about the age of the rear ell and its addition. Mr. Danta explained that the rear ell was partially original, but greatly altered and enlarged. He also pointed out that there would be limited visibility of this portion of the building. He stated that the addition would be visible but inconspicuous across a large parking lot.

Mr. Cluver asked about the cladding materials. Mr. Lui said the wall and party wall would be finished in stucco or a brick veneer, if the Architectural Committee preferred. He stated that the balcony on the back is not essential as and could be deleted if the Architectural Committee does not like it. Ms. Hawkins stated that there are great inconsistencies between the plan drawings and the elevation drawings. She asserted that the drawings do not specify the materials of the cladding, windows, or door. Mr. Farnham reminded the Committee that the alterations are limited to the already-altered rear, the building is not in an historic district, is surrounded by non-historic buildings, and its rear is barely visible across a large parking lot. Alterations on this façade will have no impact on any historic streetscape. The primary public appreciation of this resource is from the front façade. Mr. Farnham contended that the details are not significant. Mr. Danta added that the Historical Commission has recently approved several similar applications for large rear additions in Chinatown.

Ms. Hawkins assured the Architectural Committee members that she would review any revisions at the Historical Commission meeting. Mr. McCoubrey stated that, given the lack of information, the applicant should work with the staff. Mr. Danta suggested that the applicant provide a finalized drawing that includes an accurate representation of the roof over the main block. Ms. Hawkins agreed that the applicant should revise the drawings to show the actual intent. Mr. Evans stated that, if the applicant does not provide the requested final details, the application should not be approved.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided requisite details are presented at the Historical Commission meeting, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 1531-33 LOCUST ST

Project: Legalize sign

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: VDM LLP

Applicant: Herbert Victor

History: 1928, Zantzinger & Borie, architects, E.W. Clark & Company Bank

Individual Designation: 4/18/1990

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of new plastic faces on two existing internally-illuminated box signs. One sign is located over the main entrance to the building along Locust Street and the other sign is located over what had been an ATM on 15th Street. The Historical Commission staff met the contractor during the initial review of this application. At that time the staff informed the contractor that the Commission would have to review any applications for plastic face signs at its monthly meeting. The staff does not have the authority to approve such plastic face signs. The staff worked with the contractor to approve temporary banners over the existing boxes to allow the tenant to have some signage at the opening of their business. The staff understood at the time that the contractor or the tenant would submit an application shortly after for the approval of the permanent plastic face signs. The banners were never installed and the plastic face signs, as originally proposed to the staff, were installed instead.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Herbert Victor, sign contractor Brett Brand, and business owner John Reydler represented the application.

Ms. Pentz asked how long the box signs had been on the building. Mr. Victor answered that the box signs were present when he purchased the building in 2006. Mr. Danta noted that the box signs dated to the mid 1980s and that the Historical Commission had approved refacing them with new facings for Nova Bank in the mid 1990s. He clarified that the violation related to the new illegal facings, not the actual boxes, which are grandfathered. Ms. Hawkins asked if the signs were internally illuminated. Mr. Reydler answered that the signs are internally illuminated and that he would like to illuminate them at night. Ms. Gutterman asked why the temporary banners, as approved by the staff, were not installed. Mr. Brand stated that there had been an internal misunderstanding and that the installers proceeded with the installation of the plastic face signs rather than the temporary banners as approved by the staff. He noted that he was unavailable the day of the installation to supervise the installers. Ms. Hawkins asked why the temporary banners were approved, but not the plastic faces. Mr. Danta explained that the staff approved temporary banners, which meet the Standards, to allow the tenant to have some street presence upon the opening of the new business. Mr. Danta clarified that the applicant had agreed to submit an application for the review of the final plastic face signs. Mr. Danta noted that he told Mr. Brand that they should consider different color options for the final signs. He stated that the staff thought the white background was too conspicuous and detracted from the historic façade. Mr. Cluver concurred with Mr. Danta's observation regarding the white background. Ms. Pentz questioned the need for a sign over the ATM niche. Mr. Cluver asked if the sign over the ATM could be removed. Mr. Brand stated that removing it could incur more damage than leaving it in place. Ms. Gutterman noted that the ATM sign did not appear to be attached to the building. Mr. Brand clarified that the signs are attached to the masonry of the

building. Mr. Cluver proposed the removal of the sign over the main entrance in exchange for the legalization of the ATM sign. Mr. Victor did not agree to such a compromise.

Mr. Evans stated that this legalization application should be denied. He noted that, once such box signs are installed on the façades of buildings, they seldom come down. He stated that this was the Commission's opportunity to have these inappropriate signs removed.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the box signs are grandfathered; they could not require the owner to remove them. She stated that the Commission does have full jurisdiction over the new faces. She suggested that the Committee could recommend approval, provided the signs are not illuminated. Ms. Gutterman contended that the applicants should look at signage alternatives. She expressed her disapproval of the box signs, especially with the white background. Mr. Evans stated that the signage does not meet the Standards. He asserted that the building owner should consider removing them altogether. An alternative solution should be found. He noted that, given the illegal installation of the plastic faces, the Commission has grounds for revisiting the appropriateness of the signs in their entirety. Mr. Victor asked for a clarification of Mr. Evan's comments. Mr. Victor stated that the box signs are grandfathered. He asserted that, if the boxes are grandfathered, then the lighting would be as well. Ms. Hawkins explained that the Commission must accept the boxes, but is not bound to approve new faces for them. She suggested a compromise on the lighting in return for an approval of faces. Mr. Victor suggested that the brightness of the white background could be diminished so that it does not appear like a searchlight. Ms. Hawkins stated that the boxes are the most disturbing to her. If the Commission is stuck with them, then it should seek ways to reduce their impacts such as illumination.

Mr. Brand stated that he had reviewed the Commission's file on this property and found that large illuminated box signs had been present on the building since the 1970s. He noted that the building had illuminated box signs even before the Nova Bank signs. Ms. Hawkins stated that there had been great advances in signage technology in the last ten years. The antiquated, inappropriate signs should be replaced.

Mr. Reydler said that the business is a childcare center. Mr. Evans stated that he has two children in daycare and asserted that no one chooses a daycare for its signage. He described the illegal signs as a low-quality, cheap plastic signs that detract from the historic building and district. Ms. Hawkins reiterated that the signs could be illuminated with being internally illuminated.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee is not in favor of the signs that were installed without an approval or permit. Mr. Cluver stated that the temporary banners do not seem vastly different from the plastic faces that were installed. He suggested that the illegal plastic faces be allowed to remain until November, as was initially approved for the plastic banners. Mr. Danta clarified that the applicant already has an approval for temporary banners and that the signs have an outstanding violation. Mr. Danta explained that such a motion would recommend legalization to the Commission. If the owner does not undo the illegal work in November, then the Commission would have to re-request a violation and start from scratch. Mr. Danta advised the Committee that this was not a proper solution; it makes no sense procedurally.

Mr. Brand stated that the signs as installed and the approved temporary banners are identical designs. Mr. Danta acknowledged that this was the case, but reiterated that the staff had approved the temporary banner to allow the tenant some signage, given that the staff did not have the authority to approve the plastic faces. He stated that the conversation regarding the design and the color choices should have taken place before the sign was installed, not after the

fact. Mr. Reydlar stated that they do not have the approval to open with the signage as installed, because the Department of Licenses & Inspections will not issue a certificate of occupancy with an outstanding violation. Mr. Danta suggested that the problem would be solved quickly and appropriately if the applicants removed the plastic faces, curing the violation, and then wrapped the boxes with the approved temporary banners until November. In the interim, they could devise appropriate signage that could be approved at the staff level. The illegal signs, not the Commission, are preventing the business from opening.

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

ADDRESS: 259 AND 261 S. 17TH STREET

Project: Alter storefront and rear, replace windows, add canopies and signs, construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: LMT Associates

Applicant: Carl Massara, Carl Massara & Associates

History: 1860; first floor at 259 refaced in marble in 1920 by Stewardson & Page; 261 was refaced, new brick, cornice removed, c. 1960

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes exterior alterations to two adjoining buildings.

A new storefront is proposed on the first-story façade of 261 S. 17th Street. The existing façade is non-historic and was refaced with brick in the 1960s. The storefront would be a glass and wood frame, four-panel folding partition system with a four-lite transom and seven-foot canopy. The applicant proposes two options for the canopy. The desired option is a glass canopy to allow light into the restaurant space. The alternate option is a retractable cloth canopy that would block sunlight. A sign and menu box are also proposed on the façade. However, no material or attachment details have been provided. This application proposes six-over-six windows, cast stone around the storefront, and a cornice to match the neighboring building. However, no material or design details have been provided. A steel gate and metal pergola are proposed over the side alley and entrance to the rear yard. Decorative flower boxes, to match the existing flower box on 259 S. 17th Street, are proposed for the second and third-story windows on the facades of both buildings. The staff suggests the boxes are installed within mortar joints.

This application proposes fourth-story additions on the rears of both buildings. The addition on 259 S. 17th Street would not be visible. The party wall side of the addition on 261 S. 17th Street would be minimally visible from 17th Street and set back two feet from the rear edge of the 3rd-story. The rear elevations are not visible from the public right-of-way. Balconies with French doors are proposed in the additions. Other rear alterations for first-story glass doors, balcony, bay, and cast stone balustrade were previously approved by the staff.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application. Architect Carl Massara represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked the applicant about the heights of the Juliet balcony railings. Mr. Massara replied that the railings would be 42" tall. Mr. Cluver asked if the doors at the balconies would be operable. Mr. Massara stated that they would be operable. Ms. Pentz asked the applicant if the new additions would block windows of the adjacent building. Mr. Massara replied that they would not. Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant about HVAC equipment, which is not shown on the drawings. Mr. Massara replied that the existing condensers would be removed and a split system would be installed. Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant if the owner plans to reface the façade of the 261 building, which has an inappropriate non-historic facade. Mr. Massara replied that, although it would be ideal, refacing is not proposed at this time for financial reasons. Mr. Evans noted vinyl siding on the side elevation and asked the applicant if it would be removed. Ms. Massara replied that it would be taken off. Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant if there is enough room for the proposed canopy in the side alley. Mr. Massara confirmed that there is sufficient room. Ms. Gutterman asked if new lintel above the storefront window. Mr. Massara responded that there would be a lintel installed. Mr. Cluver asked the applicant about future plans for signage. Mr. Massara stated that there should have been more detail on the drawings, but signage is proposed over the door. Ms. Pentz asked the applicant if the additions would be constructed of brick. Mr. Massara replied that they would be clad with stucco on metal studs. He added that he has the engineering design details for their construction, but did not bring it to the meeting. He explained that the addition setback of 1'-6" was suggested by Commission staff member Randal Baron to make the additions appear as though they are new and not part of the original structure. Mr. Evans asked if the storefront window on 261 would be enlarged. Mr. Massara stated that its height would be increased. Mr. Evans asked if he would be widening the other masonry openings in 261. Mr. Massara stated that he would like to match the window sizes of 259. Mr. Evans stated that he has concerns about what the final result would look like if the building at 261 were not refaced. Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant how the cast stone would be applied to the façade. Mr. Massara stated that he would remove one wythe of brick, insert the stone, and unify the two buildings with the cornice across the storefront and top of the building.

Ms. Hawkins stated that many details are missing. Ms. Sell stated that such details would be reviewed by the staff before any final approval of construction drawings. Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant to discuss the canopy proposals. Mr. Massara explained that he proposes two options for the canopy. He stated that he and the owner prefer the glass to allow for translucency and better coverage than the existing canopy. Ms. Sell clarified that the existing entry vestibule and canopy were not approved by the Historical Commission. Ms. Hawkins again stated that she is not comfortable with the lack of detail in the application. Mr. Massara explained that it has been his experience working with the Commission that proposals to the Architectural Committee did not need all of the details that the staff and Department of Licenses & Inspections would require for a final sign-off. Ms. Gutterman stated that she would like to see the anchoring details for the canopy. Others noted that the canopy would anchor to non-historic material. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the signage portion of the proposal is not complete. Mr. Farnham responded that the details of the signage could be reviewed by the staff prior to any final sign-off. If the proposed signage exceeded the staff's authority to review, the staff would refer it to the Architectural Committee and Commission. Mr. Cluver stated that the Committee can approve a sign in that location and the details can be review by the staff. Mr. Cluver asked the Committee member to precisely identify any details that were missing. Ms. Gutterman noted lack of detail in the cornice, coping, lintels, and canopy portions of the proposal. Mr. Farnham stated that the staff could verify whether the profiles and other details were appropriate. He asked the Committee to concentrate its review on the preservation issues, not construction and other issues which have no bearing on preservation. Ms. Gutterman stated that she views them as preservation issues and has concerns about duplicating the details of a historic façade. Mr.

Massara summarized his proposal and stated that the alterations will be improvements to a non-historic façade. He added that he believes that the staff is qualified to review the details. He added that, if the review of the project takes too long, the owner will abandon the proposal and live with the extant building.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she would be in favor of approving the application in concept. Mr. Farnham pointed out that the applicant has applied for final approval. He explained that, unless the applicant is willing to revise his application from one for final approval to one for approval in concept, the Commission must act on the application before it. He advised the Committee to ask the applicant if he was willing to downgrade his application to in concept from final. He claimed that, if the Commission approved the application in concept without the applicant's agreement, then it would be as if the Commission had not acted at all on the application for final approval and that final approval application would be deemed approved in 60 days. He advised that, if the applicant refuses to downgrade his application to in concept, then the Committee should recommend approval or denial of the final approval application, not approval of a non-existent in concept application. Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant if he would amend his application to in concept. Mr. Massara asserted that the owner would withdraw the application if the process takes much longer. He refused to downgrade his application. He added that he did not realize the Committee would want all of the construction details; he asserted that the Committee had not requested such detail in the past.

Mr. Cluver argued that, if the details for 261 are intended to match those of 259, then he is confident that the staff can review the details on that basis. He stated that he would recommend adoption of the staff recommendation without the signage. He clarified that he accepts the concept of a sign in the proposed location, but would like to see more information. Mr. McCoubrey observed that the proposed canopy is 7'-6" wide and stated that he would prefer it to be more like 6'-6" wide. Mr. Massara stated that it is intended to cover patrons while they dine. He stated that, if there is not ample coverage for the patrons, the alternative canopy proposal is cloth.

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

ADDRESS: 22-42 S 23RD ST

Project: Repair and/or replace windows, enlarge elevator tower

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: First Troop Philadelphia City Cavalry

Applicant: Jim Wiesenhutter, C. Erickson & Sons, Inc.

History: 1900, Henry Gillette Woodman, architect, First City Troop Armory

Individual Designation: 1/3/1985

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate this building and repair damage caused by a fire that occurred early last year. In addition to several interior renovations, this application proposes the demolition and reconstruction of an elevator shaft that no longer meets code. The shaft will be expanded three feet in width. The existing penthouse for the shaft is minimally visible from the side.

This application also proposes the replacement of windows in the head house. However, no material or design details have been provided. The cover letter states that the windows will be replaced in kind.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details and window shop drawings, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Construction manager James Wiesenhutter represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant if the existing windows are wood. Mr. Wiesenhutter replied that they are wood and original to the building. He added that the replacement windows would match the original window in kind. He noted that the building suffered a fire. He explained that he commissioned Architectural Millwork to conduct a survey of all the windows in the buildings, noting which were scorched or burnt. He stated they included the survey in the submission. He asserted that the millwork company has expertise in period restoration. Ms. Gutterman asked which part of the building is called the headhouse. Mr. Wiesenhutter responded that it was the multi-story front section of the building. Mr. Wiesenhutter explained that, to make the existing elevator shaft code-compliant, they must widen it by three feet. He stated that they will match the existing mortar and masonry. He added that it is their goal to bring the entire building up to code while retaining its historic appearance.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details and window shop drawings, pursuant to Standard 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 1601 JOHN F KENNEDY BLV

Project: Install windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: One Penn Associates LP

Applicant: Patrick Rennison, Continental Windows and Doors

History: 1930; Graham, Anderson, Probst & White, architects; Suburban Station

Individual Designation: 6/14/2000

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace one-over-one windows throughout Suburban Station, the high-rise office building at 16th Street and John F. Kennedy Boulevard. The submission includes shop drawings of one existing window type and one proposed window type. However, it lacks several pieces of requisite information. The building is 21 stories high, 42 bays in length, and 11 bays wide. No information has been provided regarding which windows are proposed for replacement, the number of window types, and the various dimensions of those types. The drawings also lack information regarding setback from the masonry opening. Also, the proposed replacement window dimension is five inches larger than the masonry opening.

In a meeting with the staff, the applicant indicated that they propose to retain the existing frames, but that the panning and window installation changes would reduce the glazing proportions by at least 3 inches. The staff asked the applicant to provide detailed photographs

of sample window types and interior of the frames with a measuring tape to document existing conditions. These photographs have not been provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application. Owner's representative Mark Lieberman and window manufacturers Panish Patel and Frank Lauria represented the application.

Mr. Lauria distributed revised window drawings to the Committee members. He explained that the revised drawings contained more details and information than the drawings originally submitted. Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants if the proposed window profile had changed. Mr. Lauria stated it had not. Ms. Hawkins explained that the proposed profile does not match the original profile; in kind replacement is the goal. Ms. Gutterman added that the glazing proportions should not be reduced. Mr. Lauria stated the glazing will only be reduced by $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Ms. Hawkins argued that all of the new supplemental details are too much to consider at this time. Mr. Cluver stated that he briefly reviewed the new drawings and found that they are identical to those originally submitted. Mr. Cluver asked the applicant how the existing masonry opening is shown at 55" wide but the proposed is 60" wide. Mr. Lauria responded that after the panning on the existing window is removed it will allow for additional space. Mr. Cluver stated that that should be clearly depicted and annotated on the drawings. Ms. Hawkins explained that the Committee members need these details in advance. She stated that the diagrams should show the dimensions from masonry to masonry for existing and proposed, a head condition next to a head condition to demonstrate profile differences, dimensions from the existing masonry wall to the old and new glazing, dimensions of all window parts demonstrating that they are similar to the original, and all components of the head, meeting rail, and sill in detail. The existing and proposed drawings must be easy to compare.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked the applicants if there is a need to replace the windows or if sash repair is a better option. Ms. Lauria explained that they are seeking energy efficiency. Mr. Cluver suggested that the applicants perform an energy analysis between an interior storm and full window replacement. He stated that his energy models have shown that the differences in energy savings are minimal. Mr. Lieberman stated that an interior storm is undesirable because it would not be aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Cluver suggested the applicants look at all of the options before concluding that full replacement is necessary. He stated that there are several options and it is important to find one that meets their goals and the Secretary of the Interior Standards. Ms. Hawkins added that there should be good documentation performed on the various existing and proposed windows types. Mr. Patel noted that there are 2,300 windows proposed for replacement. Mr. Lieberman stated that, if the Committee determines that the application materials are insufficient, then they will not be going forward with the project. Mr. Cluver asked the applicant if they determined the color. Mr. Lauria stated that they have not. Mr. Cluver explained that the Committee needs those details. He explained that they also need a scope of work showing the specific levels and their various window types. Mr. Lieberman argued that they would like the windows to be operable and that interior storms are inoperable. Ms. Hawkins asserted that historic windows can be made operable and interior storms are operable. She suggested he broaden his approach. Mr. Evans added that the Committee needs drawings of the whole building, different window types, their various sizes and dimensions, masonry versus non-masonry conditions, and glass sizes.

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

ADDRESS: 323 S SMEDLEY ST

Project: Install windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Barbara Schmidt

Applicant: John May, J&M Windows, Inc.

History: 1840; wood lintels and sills, pressed metal cornices, c. 1890

Individual Designation: 5/27/1969

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the removal of wood, true-divided-light windows and their replacement with new composite windows. The proposed windows would have subframes that would reduce the sizes of the glass areas. The panes of glass would substantially differ in size from the existing. The meeting rail would be a different size as well. The drawings do not show the retention of the existing brickmold. However, the staff has been advised that the brickmold will be retained. No muntin profile is provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application. Window distributor Jamie Fiel represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the proposed windows do not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. She stated that the Committee cannot recommend approval of windows for front elevations that do not meet the Standards. Mr. Fiel responded that he needed to perform his due diligence for the customer. He argued that there is some wood in the proposed window, the unit is paintable like wood, and that other buildings on the block have vinyl windows. Ms. Hawkins suggested that he make his argument to the Commission. Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant if the glazing proportions would be reduced. Mr. Fiel stated that there is a subframe that will shrink the pane size. Mr. Cluver stated that size and material are both issues. He added that nearby buildings may have non-historic windows that are legal. They may have been installed before the district was designated and are therefore grandfathered. One cannot tell simply by looking at a building whether the windows are legal or not. Ms. Hawkins summarized that the window material, glazing proportions, and frame proportions do not match the historic window. She noted that the proposed model is a high quality replacement window, but does not meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

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

ADDRESS: 2202 FAIRMOUNT AVE

Project: Reopen historic window openings, install windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rolf Andeer

Applicant: Rolf Andeer

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the second and third-floor windows in the front façade of this rowhouse. The window openings would be enlarged to their original sizes and aluminum-clad one-over-one windows and frames would be installed. The proposed brickmolds are inappropriate. The original windows would have been two-over-two with ogee brickmolds.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application. Property owner Rolf Andeer represented the application.

Mr. Andeer stated the building does not retain its historic integrity. It is covered in cement PermaStone. He stated the existing windows are metal within wood frames. The sizes of the window openings have been reduced. Ms. Pentz noted that the building is within the Spring Garden Historic District. Mr. Andeer stated that the proposed window will be set slightly behind the cement opening and would require minor patching of the cement cladding. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee cannot recommend approval of windows that do not meet the Standards.

Mr. Cluver stated that the Committee can support enlarging the window to match the original size. He asked if there is historic evidence to determine muntin pattern. Ms. Sell explained that two-over-two windows would be the appropriate window type for a building of this age and architectural style. The applicant stated that he does not want wood two-over-two windows, which will have to be painted and will not provide the desired efficiency. Mr. Evans argued that the façade was dramatically altered prior to designation. Requiring an historic window in what is essentially a non-historic façade may not make sense, he asserted.

Mr. Evans noted that it is not clear how the stucco wraps around the existing window. One may need to remove some stucco to understand the conditions. The applicant stated that he would have to saw the edges of the existing opening to match the original window size.

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

ADDRESS: 1126-36 ARCH ST

Project: Construct beer garden

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Iovine Brothers Bar & Grill Inc.

Applicant: Marianne Baker

History: 1893; Wilson Brothers, architects; Reading Terminal Market

Individual Designation: 2/5/1981

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing a new restaurant in the current location of the beer garden in the Reading Terminal Market. The existing non-historic fittings, equipment, signage, and partitions would be removed and replaced with new fittings, equipment, signage, and partitions. A 1994 covenant grants the Historical Commission jurisdiction over interior alterations at the market.

The market is composed of a grid of aisles, with numbered avenues running east-west and lettered avenues running north-south. Some sections of the aisles are paved in gray bricks. The current beer garden is bounded on the south by Avenue 4, on the north by Avenue 6, and straddles Avenue 5. The current beer garden has entrances at its east and west ends on axis with Avenue 5. The proposed restaurant would likewise straddle Avenue 5 and have entrances at the east, west, and north sides. The entrance at the east would have swinging gates. A bar that currently sits in the middle of Avenue 5 would be removed and a new bar constructed in a different location, perpendicular to the current bar. Like the old bar, the new bar would encroach on Avenue 5. New partitions would reduce the width of the entrance at the west.

The covenant that grants the Commission authority to review applications for interior alterations states that new establishments “shall continue to be arranged in the current format of a grid-like pattern, with common aisles for access and egress, which aisles separate rows of business establishments.” Like the current beer garden, the proposed restaurant would appear to violate that standard. Also, Standard 9 advises that “new additions ... or related new construction” should not “destroy historic ... spatial relationships.” To satisfy the covenant and the Standards, the bar and any other encroachments on Avenue 5 should be avoided to restore the original spatial characteristics of the aisle.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the bar and other features are relocated to avoid encroaching on Avenue 5, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect George Baker, restaurant developers Charles Gensloff, James Iovine, and Vincent Iovine, and Paul Steinke, the manager of the Reading Terminal Market, represented the application.

Mr. Danta introduced the project. Mr. Baker clarified that the stone pavers found throughout the hallways are not found in the space occupied by the beer garden. He noted that pavers are found at the entrance and back of the space, but that they do not continue for the entire length of the space.

James Iovine presented an overview. He stated that the bar is currently located in the center of the space. They propose to move the bar to make the space more open and allow for greater visibility. He noted that the new walls that demarcate the space will be lowered to create a

greater sense of openness. He noted that the location of the bar is integral to the business model and the layout of the space.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the plans submitted did not have an orientation marked and that they were difficult to read. Other commented that they were easy to read.

Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Steinke if the special configuration of the beer garden space was found in other areas of the Market. Mr. Steinke answered that there are three other locations where the vendors span aisles. The most prominent one is along the southern boundary of the Market, closest to Filbert Street. He explained that, over time, the merchants subsumed 1st Avenue, which no longer exists. He noted two other spaces, one at the end of 9th Avenue and one on 12th Avenue, also span the aisles. Mr. Steinke explained that he encouraged the applicants to open up the northern edge of the Beer Garden, which is now blocked. He stated that the Market management thought it would be beneficial to the life of the market to open it up to circulation and views. He advocated for the approval of the project as submitted.

Mr. Cluver asked if any other aisles would be filled in to create new, larger leasable spaces. Mr. Steinke answered that the policy is not to allow new spaces to encroach on aisles and undo the grid of the Market. He acknowledged that when such spaces are preexisting they are allowed to remain. He noted that the beer garden is one of those spaces.

Ms. Gutterman advised the applicant to be aware of any new painting in the interior. She noted that the structural columns may be painted with a fire-retardant paint that cannot be covered.

Mr. Evans asked if the new kitchen would require new exhaust vents or hoods. Mr. Baker answered that the new ductwork would vent to the outside at the east. It would be like other ductwork already at the Market.

Mr. Evans stated that he understood the staff's concerns with the retention of the grid. He acknowledged, however, that the applicant had done a very good job overall to maintain the character and feel of the Market. He felt that the openness and the improved visibility of the proposed space integrated very well into the fabric of the Market in a way that is not detrimental to its historic character. He noted that encroachment is an existing condition and that, given its preexisting nature, was acceptable.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that it would have been helpful if the architect had included the table seating arrangement and layout of the space. He said it was difficult to read the plans without such details. Mr. Evans said that such details would not interfere with the proposal's adherence to the Standards. Mr. Cluver stated that revised drawings would benefit the Commission.

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

ADDRESS: 802 S HANCOCK ST

Project: Construct two-story side addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Paul Palladino

Applicant: Sal Guerro, Boxwood Architects

History: 1810

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a two-story addition to the side façade of this freestanding house. The side façade is visible from the public right-of-way. The house is a rare example of a half-gable structure with the gable end as the street façade. It is even rarer because it is a wood-framed and clad building, not a masonry building. Several years ago, it was restored with the Historical Commission's approval. The applicants have proposed two options for the addition: one clad in clapboard with a pitched roof and a second clad in board and batten siding with a flat roof.

The Architectural Committee reviewed an application proposing a larger addition to this building at its April 2011 meeting. The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10. The application was withdrawn before it was reviewed by the Commission.

Although the proposed additions are smaller than that proposed last month, either would still result in the substantial demolition of historic fabric, partially encase the long side façade of the house, and alter the massing and shape of the structure. The property has a small rear yard, which may be an appropriate place for an addition.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architects John Weckerly and Sal Guerrero and property owner Samantha Giuliano represented the application.

Mr. Weckerly stated that some Committee members expressed strong opposition to three elements of the design during the first review. He said that they objected to the proximity of the addition to the front façade of the historic building, the loss of the main door to the historic building, and the three-story height of the proposed addition. He reminded the Committee that there had been a suggestion that they construct an addition in the rear courtyard rather than in the side yard. He explained that he discussed that option with the homeowners and they determined that building at the rear in the courtyard was not viable for several reasons. He also reminded the Committee that there had been a suggestion that they construct a smaller side addition, away from the front façade of the building. He stated that they decided to follow that approach. They are now proposing a two-story addition at the rear of the side façade.

In addressing the contention that the first proposed addition was too close to the front façade, Mr. Weckerly stated that that revised addition has been pulled back from the front façade to allow the retention of approximately 40% of the existing south or side wall. The offending third-floor of the addition has been eliminated. He explained that they are proposing two possible roof lines for the addition. One would be flat and would project out from below the cornice of the side façade. The other would continue the slope of the main roof.

Ms. Pentz remarked that the revised proposal is greatly improved over the previous submission. Mr. Weckerly noted that they are now proposing to retain the main entrance door to the historic house, as the Committee had suggested. He also stated that they would restore a missing window in the historic house. Ms. Pentz noted that, despite the improvements to the design, the house is an extraordinarily rare type and that the area where the addition would be constructed is a visible finished façade. She stated that the proposed addition, although better, was not appropriate.

Mr. Evans stated that he deemed the proposal appropriate. He noted that the house is very small and must be made viable. He opined that it would disrupt the spatial relationships of the neighborhood and block common air and light to construct an addition at the rear of the property, as some have recommended. He contended that the side yard, not the rear, is the appropriate location for an addition. He asserted that the addition would not adversely impact the character-defining features of the house. He contended that, if this addition were constructed, one will still appreciate the historic character of this rare house. Mr. Evans stated that he prefers Option B, with the flat roof. He stated that it would be better if the house could be used without an addition, but he stated that he understood the necessity for it. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Mr. Evans. Mr. Culver stated that these small inner city houses have a history of evolving over time; he asserted that this house should not be frozen in time. He also preferred Option B. He asserted that the addition would not detract from the character-defining features of this house. He observed that this house could still be comprehended and appreciated by the public after the addition as it is today. He advocated for approval of Option B. Mr. McCoubrey also objected to an addition at the rear, as some Committee members proposed.

Ms. Gutterman agreed with Ms. Pentz's earlier comments. She stated that the house is unique and should not be changed.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance agreed with Ms. Pentz and Gutterman. He asked that those Committee members who had voiced their support of the addition to explain their support based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He stated that the addition does not meet the Standards and reminded the Committee that they are obligated to follow them. He noted that 60% of the historic side façade would be removed. He called attention to Standard 3, which cautions against creating a false sense of historical development; he asserted that additions such as the one proposed are not found on houses of this type. Mr. Gallery paraphrased the Standards, asserting that distinctive features that characterize a property should be retained, and that new additions should be undertaken in a manner that when removed in the future the historic structure will retain its integrity. He asserted that the proposed addition does not meet the Standards. Mr. Gallery acknowledged that the house is small, but he contended that its occupants do not need two and one-half baths. He stated that the program is forcing an inappropriate addition onto the small house. He suggested relocating the addition back further onto the lot because there are already large non-historic openings in that area of the side facade. He noted that placing the addition in the rear would minimize the loss of historic fabric and would also address the massing and spatial relation issues. He reiterated that the program for the addition is excessive. He stated that, if the additional bathroom is removed from the program, the addition could be made smaller and more respectful of the historic house and more in compliance with the Standards. He asserted that the occupants do not need private baths; one and one-half baths is enough for the occupants. Mr. Gallery claimed that an addition at the rear would remove more historic fabric from the building; he objected to a rear addition. He suggested the compromise of a smaller side addition that would require the removal of less historic fabric.

Mr. Weckerly objected to the terms of the discussion. He stated that the Committee should not be determining how many bathrooms is or is not appropriate. He contended that the Committee should focus on the appropriateness of the addition from the exterior. He stated that he accepted the Committee's charge to protect historic fabric, but he contended that the owners must be able to make their home livable. He explained that the addition had been designed to meet myriad requirements including the current interior layout. Ms. Giuliano stated that she bought the house 11 years ago, not anticipating that she would live in it this long. She stated that she now needs to upgrade it to meet her growing family's space requirements. She claimed that moving from this house would force her to move out of the neighborhood, which offers no affordable options.

Mr. Evans responded to Mr. Gallery's comments. He conceded that there would be a removal of historic fabric, but it would be limited to a small section of the façade at the second-floor rear. He disagreed with Mr. Gallery and contended that this small section of lost historic fabric does not characterize the property. He also disagreed with Mr. Gallery, contended that this addition would not create a false sense of history. It would clearly read as a new addition. He agreed that it would be better to push the addition back further onto the lot, but contended that, even as presented, Option B satisfies the Standards.

Mr. Cluver stated that the pure volume of the addition is a positive aspect. If the addition were more complex, for example set back at the second floor, it would become more fragmented and difficult to read. He reiterated his approval of Option B as submitted.

Mr. McCoubrey again stated that he supports the application. He acknowledged that the construction of the proposed addition would involve the removal of some historic fabric, but he contended that that fabric does not characterize the property because it is minimal and located at the rear of the side façade, away from the primary public portion of the building.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the wood clapboard siding proposed for the addition would satisfy the building code. Mr. Weckerly explained that the party wall of the addition would be constructed of CMU, which would not be visible. He noted that materials like Hardie Board would meet the code.

Messrs. Cluver, Evans, and McCoubrey voted for a motion to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 9, and 10. Mses. Hawkins, Gutterman, and Pentz voted against the motion. The Committee members agreed that they were deadlocked and decided that they would be unable to reach a consensus. They agreed to allow the application to move on to the Commission without a recommendation.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:59 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 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.