

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

**TUESDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2008
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DAVID AMBURN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

David Amburn, Chair
John Cluver
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

Lyle Suess, Reed Axelrod Architects
Sara Forster
Sabra Smith, Preservation Alliance
Nancy Gibbs, Arch Street Meeting House
Carol Quigley, Frens & Frens Architect
Dale Frens, Frens & Frens Architects
Larry Wind, H & W Apartments
Craig Mosmen, Couch Tomato
John Darling-Wolf
Naomi Ohayon, Masada Custom Builders
Isaac Ohayon, Masada Custom Builders
Ryan Drummond, Cecil Baker & Partners Architects
Gary Martin, Wm. Proud Masonry
Newton H. Smith, Newton H. Smith, Architects
Nicholas Blum
Steve Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Emily Gilvery, Hudson Beach Glass
Sean Gilvey, Hudson Beach Glass

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Amburn called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Messrs. Cluver and McCoubrey joined him.
Ms. Pentz joined them during the meeting.

2408 DELANCEY PLACE

Owner: Sara & Dieter Forster

Applicant: Lyle Suess

History: Contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District, 2/1995

Project: Cut new window openings and install Dryvit on party wall, replace windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install Dryvit, a proprietary Exterior Insulation and Finishing System (EIFS), for extra insulation on the exposed party-wall of this nineteenth-century row house. On this same elevation the applicant proposes to create three new openings and install two-over-two wood windows. On the front façade along Delancey, the applicant proposes to replace six windows with two-over-two windows and install a new transom over the main entrance. No shop drawings have been submitted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of windows and transom, pursuant to Standard 6. The staff is concerned that the Dryvit may trap moisture in the house, leading to long-term deterioration, but does not have enough experience with the material to proffer a recommendation.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Sara Forster and architect Lyle Seuss represented the application.

Mr. Seuss displayed photographs of the property. He noted that the property is comprised of two adjacent houses. He stated that the owners are seeking additional insulation from the Dryvit and additional light from the new windows. He described the Dryvit system and showed samples of the color and finish to the Committee. He asserted that the system would be completely sealed and would not degrade from moisture. He stated that the windows would be two-over-two, true-divided-light windows.

Mr. Danta asked whether the applicants propose to replace the sash alone or the windows with frames on the front façade. Mr. Suess replied that only the sash would be replaced. Mr. Danta asked if the replacement sash would require a sub-frame. Mr. Suess stated that they would not; only sash liners would be installed. Mr. Cluver asked if the Commission typically approved jamb liners. Mr. Danta stated that it did typically approve them if they were not conspicuous. Mr. Danta also noted the staff had no objections to the new party wall window openings. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Suess if he had considered storm windows to preserve the extant windows. Mr. Suess replied that the extant windows are not original, but are replacements, and are therefore not worth saving.

Mr. Cluver stated that he thought that the spacing of the proposed windows on the party wall was awkward and should be revised. He asserted that one window is too close to the front façade and the two first-floor windows are too close to one another. Mr. Suess responded that the window locations are dictated by interior requirements. He noted, however, that he may need to revise the window locations to accommodate a vestibule. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the two first-floor windows could be coupled into a single paired window.

Mr. Cluver stated that he considered the Dryvit acceptable, but he suggested that the flashing details needed improvement. Mr. Amburn observed that, in the past, the problem with Dryvit has been with the lack of weeping systems. He noted that the architect in this case appears to have solved the weeping problems. He also noted that the problems were typically seen in wood-framed buildings. This is a masonry building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the new windows are appropriately spaced, with the staff to review details.

125 S. 22ND STREET

Owner: Teacher Associates LP

Applicant: Frens & Frens LLP

History: c. 1889, Hewitt Brothers; individually designated, 5/1982; significant to the Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District

Project: Partial restoration of front façade

OVERVIEW: This application proposes remedial work to the brownstone front façade of this significant building in the Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District. The façade is in poor condition. The carvings in the brownstone are very elaborate, but the many of surfaces are extremely eroded. This application only proposes Phase I of a two phase brownstone repair project. The application proposes to remove loose, delaminating, and unsound brownstone from the façade. It also proposes to repair areas of the brownstone where water might collect using a cementitious material. It does not propose general repairs or restoration to the brownstone. The applicant proposes to make molds of some carved elements for a future restoration, but does not propose to use them to restore the brownstone as part of current project. The brownstone restoration using the molds would be undertaken in Phase II. No information about Phase II and no timetable for the phases have been provided. As part of Phase I, the application also proposes the replacement of the built-in gutter and the application of sealant around the windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to incompleteness. A complete restoration plan including Phases I and II should be submitted simultaneously for review.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Architects Dale Frens and Carol Quigley represented the application.

Mr. Frens explained that there is an urgent need to remove all loose stone from the façade to stabilize it. He stated that they are in a "triage state." He claimed that five and ten-pound pieces of the stone cladding are falling onto the sidewalk, risking the safety of the public. He stated that he is applying for approval to remove material that would fall anyway. He objected to the staff recommendation and reported that the building is currently vacant and not generating any income. He asserted that the owner would not be able to fund the complete plan the staff is requesting. He contended that the owner would eventually patch and/or replace missing and damaged stone in the future with cementitious patches and cast stone replacement pieces. Mr. Frens concluded that he is seeking an approval to remove material that will fall, gather information for the later restoration, seal gaps that allow water in, and rebuilding the gutters.

Mr. Baron agreed that some pieces of the façade cladding must be removed because they are about to fall, but he contended that the façade should be restored at the same time it is made sound. He noted that the Rules & Regulations allow the staff to approve the abatement of unsafe conditions as long as any removed materials are restored within one year. He added that the applicants could seek an extension of the one-year time frame from the Commission if necessary. Mr. Cluver stated that the applicant should clearly state his intentions for the restoration before the Commission approves the removal of any material. Mr. Frens stated that his client had not specified a date for the restoration owing to his need to find a tenant for the

space, but he added that the one-year time frame may be acceptable. Mr. Frens explained that the removals are not proposed for the area's with delicate carvings; the failing, falling stone would be removed from ashlar and rusticated sections, which were designed poorly and could be repaired relatively easily.

Mr. Frens reported that the work would be executed on a Sunday to avoid vehicular traffic. A high lift would be used and he would supervise all work. Molds would be taken for replication and documentation. Stone remnants would be retained for profiles and color matching.

Mr. Farnham suggested that, if the façade really poses a danger to the public, the applicants avail themselves of the provision in the Rules & Regulations that allow the staff to immediately approve the abatement of dangerous conditions, provided the removed material is restored within one year. He stated that the Commission always privileges safety over historic fabric and asked the applicants to act swiftly if the building threatens the public. He stated that the Commission does not want to share in the liability with the property owner. Mr. Farnham also suggested that the Department of Licenses & Inspections inspect the façade. The Committee members determined that they would recommend approval of the application, which includes removing loose, delaminating, and unsound brownstone, repairing areas of the brownstone where water might collect using a cementitious material, making molds of carved elements for a future restoration, replacing the built-in gutter, and applying sealant around the windows, only if the full restoration of the façade is completed within one year of the start of the stabilization work.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided the full restoration of the façade is completed within one year of the start of the stabilization work, with the staff to review details.

320 ARCH STREET

Owner: Philadelphia Yearly Meeting

Applicant: Ferns & Ferns LLP

History: c. 1810; individually designated 6/1956; significant in Old City Historic District, 12/2003

Project: Install ADA ramp

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install an ADA ramp on the west elevation of this historic meeting house. It would provide access to an interior space that is not currently accessible from the other ADA entrances to the building. A cover letter notes that interior ramps were considered to provide access from the accessible to inaccessible portions of the building, but they all proved infeasible. The short exterior ramp would run from grade to a historic entrance on the west facade. The existing King of Prussia marble landing at the entrance would be preserved beneath a new slab of marble. The ramp would be clad in schist and brick. It would partially block a basement window. Simple railings would be installed along the ramp and at the entrance landing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the applicant demonstrates that an interior ramp is infeasible, pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline:

Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the disabled person to the highest degree practicable, while preserving significant historic features.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz joined the meeting. Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Dale Frens and Carol Quigley and Nancy Gibbs, the executive director of the Friends Meeting House, represented the application.

Mr. Frens explained that most of the historic building was in 1804 by Owen Biddle. However, the Meeting ran out of money and the west room, where this ramp would be constructed, was not completed until 1811. The main floor level in the 1811 room is three feet below the main floor level in the earlier portion of the building. An addition was constructed in 1968; it provides ADA access to all of the building except the lower 1811 section at the west. The Meeting is hosting a major conference in January 2009 and would like to provide ADA access to the west room in time for that event. Mr. Frens explained that it would be possible to construct a ramp in the interior without extensive modifications to the original, historic galleries in the west room. He contended that this is one of the most historically significant interior spaces in city and it should not be altered for the ramp. He claimed that an exterior ramp would be much less invasive.

Ms. Quigley explained that the exterior ramp must climb 17 inches. She stated that the ramp slope would slightly exceed that allowable by law, but that they would seek a variance to avoid disrupting a nearby bulkhead with a longer ramp. She described the proposed ramp, reporting that it would be brick with a marble coping and would be set on a base of schist, which would match the schist foundation of the meeting house. Mr. Frens assured the Committee that the ramp would be entirely reversible. A new match marble slab would be placed atop the historic marble stoop; it could be removed at a later date without impact the original marble. Mr. McCoubrey asked why they would block the historic step with a railing. Ms. Quigley explained that the new riser created by the addition of the new marble would exceed the allowable height. Mr. Cluver asked if there was any way to reconfigure the design to allow the steps to remain open. Ms. Quigley stated that there was not. The historic stoop is not wide enough to set the new marble back to allow for another step. Mr. Frens noted that the door will not need any modifications. It is wide enough and swings appropriately for the new entrance. He also noted that they would not alter the basement window behind the ramp. Mr. Cluver asked if this exit is required to meet egress codes. Mr. Frens stated that it is not. It is currently used about three times annually. The Committee members all agreed that the design was appropriate.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline.

2211-2213 GREEN STREET

Owner: Phil Harvey

Applicant: Larry Wind

History: c. 1890; individually designated 2/28/1967; significant in Spring Garden Historic District 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize column removal and install columns

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the removal of an original brownstone Composite column that supports a pedimented brownstone portico. The column was removed illegally without the approval of the Historical Commission or a building permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections.

This application also proposes to remove the remaining original brownstone Composite column and install two new columns. The new columns would be made of Endura-stone and have

Corinthian capitals. The capitals and columns do not match the original brownstone columns in materials or design.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Lawrence Wind represented the application.

Mr. Wind explained that his structural engineer, Bob Becker, advised him to replace the columns, which he claimed could not be repaired. He claimed that he was unaware that he needed the Commission's approval or a building permit for the work. Mr. Baron stated that he had met with Mr. Becker, the engineer, and informed him of the need to obtain the Commission's approval and a building permit before the initiation of this structural work to this multi-family dwelling. Mr. Baron noted that Mr. Becker had stated that he had informed the owner about the permitting process. Mr. Becker had reported to Mr. Baron that his contract for the work with the owner clearly states that the owner is responsible for obtaining all permits and approvals. Mr. Wind stated that he did not have a written contract with Mr. Becker. He stated that he undertook the structural repair project because of safety concerns.

Mr. Cluver stated that it is possible to create columns that match the design and material of the original columns. He asserted that the original columns should be replicated. He also contended that the capitals should be salvaged and reused. Mr. Baron suggested that the original capitals could be pinned to new columns. Mr. Cluver stated that he might accept the use of a substitute material for the brownstone because the soft stone deteriorates. Mr. Baron observed that the deterioration had occurred over more than one hundred years. He reported that new Nova Scotia brownstone had been carved for a recent restoration at the Union League. Ms. Pentz, who is a structural engineer, stated that she accepted the engineer's report that encouraged replacement instead of repair. She contended, however, that the columns could be replaced in brownstone and then stained if necessary to attain the original color. The Committee members suggested exploring options to repair the remaining column to avoid replacement. If the existing column needs replacement, the Committee suggested replacement with Nova Scotia or German brownstone. If acquiring brownstone is infeasible, the Committee suggested proposing an alternate material to replicate the size, shape, and appearance of the existing column and reusing the existing capitals.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9.

2215 GREEN STREET

Owner: H & W Apartments

Applicant: Larry Wind

History: c. 1886; individually designated, 2/28/1967; significant in Spring Garden Historic District 10/11/2000

Project: Install deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a deck with vinyl railings on the rear ell of this building. It would replace a wood deck that currently exists on the rear ell and is being removed to repair the roof.

No information has been provided regarding the roof plan, elevations, or supporting structure. There is also limited information regarding visibility from Green Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Lawrence Wind represented the application.

Ms. Sell distributed architectural drawings provided by the applicant after the deadline. Ms. Sell stated that the staff is concerned about the visibility of the deck and vinyl railing from Green Street. Mr. Amburn agreed and suggested that a metal, instead of vinyl, railing would be more transparent and therefore more appropriate. Mr. Amburn noted that the photographs show that the deck sits on concrete blocks on the roof. He asserted that this is not an appropriate means of supporting the deck. Mr. Wind replied that the blocks are extant and would be reused.

Ms. Pentz asked about the spacing of the decking and drainage. Mr. Wind responded that he was uncertain of the exact spacing. He commented that the decking was in such poor repair that some boards broke when he walked on them. He closed the deck to the tenants until it is repaired. Mr. Cluver asked if the Commission had approved the original deck. Ms. Sell stated that the Commission has no record of its approval or a designation photograph of the rear ell. The building was individually designated in 1967.

Ms. Sell addressed the applicant regarding a matter unrelated to this application, but related to this property. She stated that the staff had observed several new windows stored at the site and, apparently, awaiting installation. She asked Mr. Wind if the windows had been installed. Mr. Wind replied that the windows were installed recently. Ms. Sell noted for the record that she had advised Mr. Wind before the windows were installed that all alterations to the exterior of the building require the review for approval by the Commission. She stated that the Commission should have reviewed the proposed windows before installation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the railing is metal, not vinyl and the applicant submits documentation verifying that the building can support the deck, with the staff to review details.

102 RECTOR STREET

Owner/Applicant: Craig Mosmen

History: c. 1840, altered c. 1905, Manayunk Historic District, 12/14/1983

Project: Demolish rear shed, construct three-story addition

OVERVIEW: An earlier version of this application was presented to the Commission in July 2008. That application proposed to demolish a rear shed and construct a three-story, rear addition to expand a restaurant. The proposed rear addition would have been taller than the existing building and minimally visible from the side, as this is a corner building. On the rear façade, windows would have been closed and ductwork run up the rear wall. On the front façade, the applicant proposed to install a new door and single-light rectangular windows. The historic windows were two-over-two, segmental-arched sash. The staff suggested that the rear addition should be revised to sit below the existing rear cornice and set back from the side wall, to allow the original building shape to be read from the public right-of-way. The Commission denied the July 2008 application; the applicant claimed he would make the suggested revisions.

The current application proposes a revised plan to demolish the rear shed and construct a three-story rear addition. The addition would be recessed one foot from the edge of the existing building and would cover the cornice. Ductwork is proposed to run up the rear wall. This application incorporates the Commission's suggestions offered during the review of the July 2008 application, with the exception of the ductwork. The windows shown on the current plan are incorrect, but the applicant has agreed to work with the staff to correct the design.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the front façade windows, pursuant to PM 704.2 of the Philadelphia Code. Approval of the rear demolition, addition, and ventilation, pursuant to PM 704.2 of the Philadelphia Code.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Contractor David White, architect John Darlington-Wolf, and business owner Craig Mosmen represented the application.

Mr. White stated that, after a meeting with the staff, he adopted the earlier advice and differentiated the new from the old, lowered the roof to the soffit, and inset the addition behind the plane of the historic side façade.

Mr. Amburn commented that the roof had been lowered to a 7'-8" ceiling height and acknowledged that it appears as though it could not be lowered any further. Ms. Sell concurred.

Mr. Wolf stated that the first alternative design is closer to the profile of the initial submission, in which the roof is a couple of feet higher than the existing roof, providing for better drainage. The second alternative is a flat rubber roof that diverts water to the original downspout. He stated that the first alternative with a higher parapet is better for drainage. Mr. Wolf stated, however, that he could accept the staff's recommendation for the lower roofline in the second alternative.

Mr. Amburn agreed with the staff recommendation that the Committee should recommend denial of the windows, which do not replicate the historic windows. Ms. Sell stated that the applicant agreed to install the correct windows; the staff has the authority to review a window replication application.

Ms. Pentz inquired about the visibility of the ductwork. Mr. Amburn stated that it is not at all visible from the street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the design documented on sheet A-23, but denial of the windows, pursuant to PM 704.2 of the Philadelphia Code.

524 N. MARSHALL STREET, AKA 611 SPRINGGARDEN STREET

Owner: German Society of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Martin Knappe

History: 1888, architect William Gette; individually designated 9/12/1974

Project: Modify basement windows and wells

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for modifying the basement windows and window wells of this institutional building. The current basement window wells hold water and debris. The applicant proposes to remove the lower sash of the double hung windows, modify the top sash, and fill in the window wells up to grade to prevent water infiltration.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the any stone well curbs are retained in place, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect Martin Knappe, a member and officer of the German Society, represented the application.

Mr. Baron noted that the basement windows are currently hidden behind plywood. This project will reveal the upper, visible portions of the windows. Ms. Pentz asked about the composition of the window wells. Mr. Knappe responded that they are brick with stone caps at grade. He claimed that the stone caps are tripping hazards. Mr. Baron noted that the proposed work would not render the caps more of a hazard than they are now. Mr. Knappe noted that the curbs are missing at two windows. Mr. Baron stated that he was not suggesting that missing caps be replaced, but only that the extant caps be retained.

Ms. Pentz questioned the appropriateness of the placement of the new sill in front of the sash. She claimed that it would lead to deterioration. Mr. Knappe agreed and stated that he would correct the design. Mr. Cluver asserted that water should not be collecting in the wells; they should have drains. Mr. Knappe replied that they had drains at one time, but that the drains no longer work. Mr. Cluver suggested that the appropriate course would be to repair the drains, not fill the wells. Mr. Knappe explained that they are seeking to provide more light into the basement. Mr. Cluver countered that retaining the wells would maximize the light. Mr. Knappe stated that cats frequent the well. Also, debris and water collect in them. The bottom sash are rotting from the moisture.

Mr. Cluver asked if Mr. Knappe if he was proposing security grills for the windows. Mr. Knappe stated that he was. He explained that the design has not been determined yet, but the grills would have arched tops to correspond to the shape of the window openings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the stone curbs are retained and the color of the cast stone sills matches the surrounding stone, with the staff to review details including the grill design.

832-836 LOMBARD STREET

Owner/Applicant: Isaac Ohayon, Masada Custom Builders

History: 1846, William Johnston, architect, Central Presbyterian Church
Individually designated, 7/23/1963

Project: Exhume human remains, infill brick vault

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to exhume the human remains of two bodies from this site on Lombard Street and re-inter them at a nearby cemetery. The brick vault would be left in place and infilled and covered with dirt. The building on the site was constructed in 1846 for the Central Presbyterian Church, an early and important African American congregation. The congregation relocated many years ago and, in recent years, the church building has stood vacant. A new property owner is converting the former church for residential use. During landscaping work in the small front yard, which was approved by the Commission, a construction crew discovered the tomb of the founder of the church and his wife when their crypt cover collapsed. Historic photographs show that the couple was buried beneath a large memorial obelisk that once stood in the small yard in front of this church. The obelisk was lost before designation.

The property owner, who is rehabilitating the building for residential use, has discussed the exhumation and re-interment of the remains with the congregation that once occupied the building as well the congregation at Old Pine Street Church, a nearby Presbyterian church. The parties have all agreed that the best resolution is to exhume the bodies from the now-profane site and re-inter them in the sacred burial ground at Old Pine Street Church. Although that cemetery has long been closed to new burials, the congregation has agreed to open it for this historically significant church leader and his wife and to mark the new burial plot with an appropriate marker.

Douglas Mooney, a professional archaeologist, the president of the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum, and a member of the Historical Commission's Committee on Designation, is overseeing the investigation of the crypt and the relocation of the remains.

The Commission individually designated this site in 1963, many years before it began to require nomination forms. Therefore, the reasons for the designation are not documented; nonetheless, the Commission has a vested interest in protecting archaeological resources at the site. The staff refers the application to the Architectural Committee and Commission because the Rules & Regulations do not authorize it to approve (or even contemplate) applications of this nature. The application highlights the Commission's dearth of policies on archaeological resources.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided copies of any documents produced during the investigation and relocation are deposited in the Historical Commission's archives, pursuant to Building Site Guideline of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, which states:

Recommended: Protecting, e.g. preserving in place important archaeological resources.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Amburn recused owing to his earlier involvement with this rehabilitation project. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developers Isaac and Naomi Ohayon of Masada Builders represented the application.

Ms. Pentz asked about the plan for the vault after the bodies are exhumed. Mr. Ohayon stated that he intends to leave the vault in place and fill and cover it with soil. The remains will be relocated to Old Pine Cemetery. The church will place a new marker on the grave. Ms. Pentz asked if the vault have been surveyed and recorded by an archaeologist. Mr. Ohayon replied that the structure should be filled to avoid water drainage and vermin infiltration problems. Ms. Ohayon stated that an archaeologist had investigated the vault, but she was unsure what documentation he produced. Mr. Cluver thought that the vault should be completely documented and then filled. Mr. Ohayon agreed to survey, measure, and photograph the vault before filling and covering it.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided copies of any documents produced during the investigation and relocation are deposited in the Historical Commission's archives, pursuant to Building Site Guideline of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards: Recommended: Protecting, e.g. preserving in place important archaeological resources.

218 S. 8TH STREET

Owner: Michael DePaulo

Applicant: William Proud

History: c. 1805, storefront c. 1890

Project: Install header beam at storefront

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for the installation of a header beam to shore up the sagging beam over the storefront. The plans show the replacement of much of the wood storefront, however the details are incorrect or lacking. The new beam will reduce the size of the window opening but will allow for the retention and repair of the brick façade at the upper floors.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Ryan Drummond and mason Gary Martin represented the application.

Mr. Baron introduced revised plans provided by the applicants. Ms. Pentz objected to the proposed solution. She asserted that, rather than inserting a new steel beam under the rotting wood beam, the wood beam should be completely replaced with a steel beam. She contended that this would be a better solution structurally and architecturally. The original appearance of the historic storefront could be retained if the new beam replaced the old beam rather than supplementing it. Mr. Cluver suggested that retaining the rotted wood beam above the new steel would allow for additional sagging over time as the wood beam continued to deteriorate. Mr. Baron asked how one installs a new, true, steel beam under a highly deflected wood beam. Ms. Pentz explained that the gaps could be filled with dry packing. Mr. Baron explained that the applicants have applied for a second permit approval to repair the historic brick façade above the storefront. He noted that that application could be approved at the staff level. After asking several questions about the existing conditions at the storefront, Mr. Cluver remarked that there are several inconsistencies between the architectural and engineering drawings. He contended that both include inaccuracies. Ms. Pentz stated that the primary objective should be to install the new steel lintel at the same elevation as the existing wood lintel to avoid altering the historic storefront. Mr. Baron added that the staff could approve the installation of the steel lintel if it did not require any alterations to the appearance of the exterior. Mr. Cluver stated that he was not comfortable recommending approval with the conflicts and mistakes in the drawings.

Mr. Amburn stated that he could accept the slight eclipsing of the storefront by the new beam. Mr. Cluver disagreed and claimed that the change would significantly and negatively alter the proportions and spatial relationships of the storefront.

Ms. Pentz advocated for a recommendation of denial. She asserted that the deteriorated lintel should be completely removed and replaced. She also stated that the architectural and engineering drawings should be integrated into one master set of drawings to avoid conflicts and ambiguity. Mr. McCoubrey agreed, noting that there are errors in the current drawings. Ms. Pentz also suggested that the applicants provide information on the sequencing of the work, which will need to be done carefully to avoid additional damage to the brick façade above.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to the flawed documentation and pursuant to Standard 6.

708 S. WASHINGTON SQUARE STREET

Owner: Nick Blum

Applicant: Maggie Persofsky

History: c. 1819; individually designated 11/28/1961; contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Exterior alterations and addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations at the front of the building and an addition at the rear.

At the front, it proposes changes at the basement windows and at the planters at the sidewalk. Currently, the basement windows have non-historic horizontal metal grates at grade over window wells and non-historic vertical metal grates in front of the windows. The horizontal grates would be upgraded and the vertical grates would be removed and replaced with "bulletproof glass." The current basement windows are to be one-over-one double-hung sash. The basement windows in the designation photograph were six-over-six. The Commission did not approve their replacement. This application proposes to construct 8-inch-tall stone planting walls in front of the building and the neighboring building to the west. The wall at the west appears to be on the neighboring property; however, the application provides no indication that the neighbor has approved of the construction.

The application proposes an addition at the rear. The piazza area would be enclosed for an elevator. A second-floor window opening would be enlarged to install a Juliet balcony with French doors. In addition, two schemes are proposed for the treatment of the rear. Scheme 1 proposes cutting a garage door in the rear ell, and adding a bay window at the second floor and a double-leaf swinging gate at the side yard. Scheme 2 proposes to retain the existing garage, add a trellis above the existing garage door, replace the back door with a French door, and cut a window on the rear facade. Please note that the designation photograph shows six-over-six windows in the rear ell; the current photographs show one-over-one windows. The Commission did not approve the window change. The plans and elevations are not entirely consistent; some changes shown in plan are not shown in elevation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the horizontal grate replacement and approval of the vertical grate removal, provided the marble is patched; denial of the bulletproof glass windows; approval of the planting wall on this property, provided it is brick or marble and no additional dirt will be placed against the building; denial of any alterations to neighboring properties without the property owner's written consent; approval of the addition and Juliet balcony; approval of Scheme 2 without the French door or window cut, provided the illegal windows are replaced with the appropriate windows, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Newton Smith, the project architect, and Nicholas Blum, the property owner, represented the application.

Mr. Smith introduced photographs and revised drawings. He stated that the windows at the rear are Pella windows and appear to have been in place for a long time. He offered to put grills in the windows.

Mr. Baron asserted that the rear of this property retains its historic character. The rear is not only visible from 7th Street, but also faces directly onto a block of Manning Street that includes fronts of buildings.

Mr. Smith described the adjoining buildings, which have garages and gates. He noted the need for ADA access for this property. Owing to the narrowness of current parking space at the rear of this building, disabled persons cannot get in and out of an automobile. Scheme 1 proposes a new garage that would provide access to an elevator. Scheme 2 would retain the existing parking. Disabled persons would enter and exit the automobile in the street. Mr. Smith described the elevator as a small hydraulic unit. Mr. Cluver asked for confirmation there would be no penetrations through the roof. Mr. Smith stated that it would not penetrate the roof.

Steve Weixler represented the Society Hill Civic Association. He asked the Committee to consider not only the preservation of historic fabric, but also the preservation of the cultural history of Washington Square. Historically, several of the buildings were small printing houses. He contended that the existing bay window at the front, although not original, should be preserved because it documents the building's use when the neighborhood changed from a residential area to printing and publishing area. He objected to the proposed alterations at the rear because the rear is highly visible from the street and because it retains most of its historic character.

Mr. Amburn objected to the proposed installation of "bulletproof" glass in the front basement windows and Mr. Cluver concurred. Mr. Smith stated that the existing, non-historic windows have been in place for a long time. He stated that he would discuss amending this portion of the application with the owner. He stated that he was unsure what type of grill would be appropriate. Ms. Cote informed him that the windows in the designation photograph are six-over-six, double-hung windows, which likely had decorative grills. Mr. Smith noted that the space behind the basement windows is the kitchen and a living area and the aim is to get more light in this space. Mr. Amburn opined that the historic windows should be replicated and appropriate steel grates should be proposed.

Mr. Smith stated that he is proposing the low wall at the front because, currently, mulch flows onto the sidewalk every time it rains. He would like to construct a wall to match the wall at the neighboring building to the west. Mr. Amburn commented that he would accept the wall if faced in brick.

Mr. Baron suggested that the applicant consider modifying the side wall of the rear ell to allow more space for parking and access. Mr. Smith stated that that would negatively impact the interior lay out. Ms. Pentz stated that she preferred Scheme 2. Mr. Amburn stated that he would consider Scheme 1 without the bay and suggested placing a transom over the garage door. Mr. Cluver stated that any transom would need to be very large. Mr. McCoubrey did not object to the garage, but stated that the floors and sill heights are problematic; therefore, he preferred Scheme 2. Mr. Cluver preferred Scheme 2 because he did not like the design of the bay in proposed Scheme 1. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that a solid panel door, not a French door, should be proposed for the rear. The Committee members agreed that they would reconsider a garage in the rear ell, but not as it is currently proposed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the horizontal grate replacement and approval of the vertical grate removal, provided the marble is patched; denial of the bulletproof glass windows; approval of the planting wall on this property, provided it is brick and no additional dirt will be placed against the building; denial of any alterations to neighboring properties without the property owner's written consent; approval of the addition and Juliet balcony; approval of Scheme 2 without the French door or window cut, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

26 S. STRAWBERRY STREET

Owner: Emily Kimelman

Applicant: Emily Kimelman-Gilvey

History: c. 1910; contributing to the Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Replace front door and signage

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a new front door in the non-historic storefront. Two options are proposed: French doors and a paneled door with large panes. This application also proposes two signs. A flag-pole with a hanging banner sign would be mounted at the second-floor window sill. A large banner sign would be mounted to the stucco, side party wall. Three optional sizes are proposed for the large banner. The banner would project over the neighboring property. The owner of that property supports the application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the paneled door with large panes and signage with the 21' x 3' option for the side banner, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Emily Kimelman-Gilvey and Sean Gilvey, the property owners, represented the application.

Mr. Gilvey described the existing door as a large steel-plated door with a transom. Ms. Cote suggested that a door with larger panes of glass would be more compatible with the other door on the front façade. Ms. Pentz deemed the smaller panes acceptable. The applicants stated their preference for the smaller panes as a means to deter the vandalism that is common in the neighborhood as would be more difficult to acid etch small panes. Mr. Amburn stated that the door is an easily reversible change and that a new door would be an improvement. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the large paned door with wood panels at the bottom would be more appropriate. Mr. Cluver concurred, stating that the door would read more like a storefront.

All Committee members preferred the dimensions of the larger banner, stating it was appropriately sized for the building

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the paneled door with large panes and the signage with the 21' x 3' side banner, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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

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

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

Building Site Guideline: Recommended: Protecting, e.g. preserving in place important archaeological resources.

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