

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

**26 SEPTEMBER 2006  
ROOM 578, CITY HALL  
VINCENT RIVERA, CHAIR**

**PRESENT**

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair  
Suzanne Pentz  
Robert Thomas, AIA  
Rudy D'Alessandro  
Daniel McCoubrey

Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director  
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist  
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner  
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner  
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

**ALSO PRESENT**

Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance  
Davis Searles, Dagit Saylor Architects  
Peter Saylor, Dagit Saylor Architects  
Heather Lutzker, Graboyes Windows  
Lynn Blahusch, CB Development Services  
Jeff Barr, JRB Historic Restoration  
John Clausen, Betzwood Associates  
Jeff Thomas, Betzwood Associates  
Grady Jones, Betzwood Associates  
Zana Wolf, URS Corp.  
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison, Harvey, Branzburg & Ellers  
Paul Commito, Toll Brothers  
Brian D'Andrea, Toll Brothers  
Jay Tackett, Tackett & Company  
Allison Fritch, Tackett & Company  
Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association  
Chris Cosgrove, Naval Square  
Walter Bayer, Old City Place  
Christy Williams, Chancellor Properties  
Nathan Best, Old City Place  
Mark Ueland, UVMN Architects  
Vincent Mueller, Friends Center  
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance

**CALL TO ORDER**

Vincent Rivera, the Chair of the Architectural Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Messrs. D'Alessandro and McCoubrey joined Mr. Rivera on the Committee.

### **1906 SPRUCE STREET**

Owner: 1906 Spruce Street L.P., Wayne Spilove

Applicant: Robert Thomas, architect

History: c. 1865, façade altered c. 1955. Contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler District

Project: Reconstruct altered ground floor with modifications

**OVERVIEW:** The Historical Commission reviewed an application for this property in May 2006. The applicant proposed to reconstruct the ground floor based on the historic design known through photographs. At that time the design proposed elongating the door surround to sidewalk level and excluding the reconstruction of the grand stair that originally dominated the façade. The elimination of the stair was based on the 1955 alteration, which dropped the interior floor to grade level. The Historical Commission voted to approve the application.

The applicant now proposes to deviate even further from a restoration. The previous application retained the pedimented door surround at its historic location and extended the pilasters to meet the sidewalk. The current application proposes to drop the pedimented entrance surround to better respond to the existing height and proportions of the ground floor. It also proposes to maintain the windows at their historic height but with widened surrounds. Remnants of the brownstone façade survived underneath the modern granite façade and show the original location of the windows and doors. The proposed design for the ground floor would present a historical composition with a more proportionally pleasing arrangement but one that never existed on this building.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Architect Robert Thomas represented the application.

Mr. Thomas explained that he had obtained better historic photographs since the Committee reviewed an earlier permutation of this project. He stated that the photographs showed that the first-floor windows were one-over-one, not two-over-two, windows. They also showed that the windows surrounds were more ornate than originally thought; Mr. Thomas would restore them as closely to the originals as possible. Mr. Thomas also displayed interior photographs of the current conditions. The photographs show that a newly-discovered steel structure is located where an original window was once located. Mr. Thomas offered to restore the original window with a change to an interior wall.

Mr. Thomas turned to the question of the doorway. He explained that the lobby and the elevator were dropped to the ground level when the front façade was altered from the historic configuration in the 1950s. He asserted that the lobby and elevator could not be restored to their historic locations. Therefore, he could not restore the grand stairs at the front entrance.

Mr. Thomas stated that the new door opening at grade would not be wide enough for a legal double-leaf door, the historic configuration; therefore, he needed to install a non-historic, single-leaf door with sidelights. The original door opened in; owing to the building code, the new door must open out. Mr. Thomas reported that a historic brownstone bed at the doorway, which is now missing, would be rebuilt. It would protect pedestrians from the new, out-swinging door.

Mr. Thomas explained to the Committee that he would rebuild the missing historic doorway exactly, but would install the entire pedimented door surround at grade, not at its historic location at the top of the grand stairs. Mr. Thomas offered to install interpretive signage to explain the differences between the original and restored building, especially the relocated doorway. Mr. D'Alessandro asked for clarification. Mr. Thomas explained again that the rehabilitated doorway would match the original, historic doorway, but would be installed at grade. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that it would be more appropriate to install the doorway pediment in its historical location and add an additional transom to fill the gap between the pediment and the door located at grade. Mr. Thomas conceded that neither solution was perfect. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the surviving piece of the doorway pediment could be saved as an archaeological element. Mr. Baron stated that removing the pediment fragment would result in a loss of historic evidence. Lowering the doorway would also result in a loss of grandeur. Mr. McCoubrey noted that retaining the doorway height would maintain the continuity of doorway heights up and down the street. He also stated that retaining the original doorway height would be consistent with the Standards.

Mr. Baron asked Mr. Thomas about his plans for the basement windows. Mr. Thomas stated that he may have an original grill and would remake the grills from it. He would also restore the windows with the staff's advice.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, provided the pediment is situated in its historic location, the doorway is elongated, and a second transom is added. One member dissented and recommended approval of the proposal as submitted.

Ms. Pentz and Mr. Thomas joined the Committee. Neither had participated in the first review because of their firms are involved in the project.

### **315 CHESTNUT STREET**

Owner: Miriam Schaefer

Applicant: David Searles AIA, Dagit, Saylor Architects

History:

315 Chestnut: Designed by John McArthur Jr. in 1865-67, rear addition by John T. Windrim in 1912, original entrance altered in 1953, further altered in 1959.

Individually designated in 1970. Significant in Old City Historic District

313 Chestnut: 1953, new façade, 1997. Non-contributing in Old City Historic District.

Project: Alter historic rear openings, replace windows

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to replace several windows along Oriana Street. The replacement windows would be wood with true-divided-light muntins. These units would replicate the original configurations. The applicant proposes to alter two windows to accommodate louvers for mechanical system. These louvers would retain the profile of the window. Along Chestnut Street, the applicant proposes to install interior storm windows and restore the existing wood windows. At the rear of the property, the applicant proposes to alter two historic openings, which are currently blocked. The alteration will require the removal of the jack arches and the enlargement of the

openings to accommodate a double picture window and an enlarged window. The side and rear of the building are highly visible from Orianna Street and Franklin Court.

The application also proposes the addition of a vestibule and awning to the modern annex, which is listed as non-contributing in the Old City Historic District.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the reopening of the infilled rear window openings facing Franklin Court, but denial of the altering and enlarging these window openings, pursuant to Standard 9. Approval of the remainder of the proposal, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. D'Alessandro recused owing to his firm's involvement in the project. Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Architects David Searles and Peter Saylor represented the application.

Mr. Saylor presented the proposal. He stated that, over time, many of the windows had been infilled and that they proposed to restore some of them. He noted that their intent was to restore the windows to their original configurations.

The discussion turned to the windows facing Franklin Court. Mr. Saylor stated that his original proposal included cutting the windows down to the floor and removing the segmental arches, but after further consideration and conversations with the foundation's staff, he decided to present two alternatives.

He presented two alternatives, both of which included the creation of a new opening that would not disturb the existing openings. Alternative One would maintain the segmental arches and elongate the openings down to floor. Alternative Two would reopen the historic openings. Mr. Saylor stated that he had met with the National Park Service staff and that they were supportive.

Mr. Thomas stated that Alternative One could be considered appropriate owing to the changes that had taken place over time. He stated that this alternative would address both the owner's wishes and the preservation of historical elements.

Mr. Baron inquired if the building code would require a railing for windows extending down to floor level. Mr. Saylor stated that he would comply with all code requirements.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, provided the Franklin Court windows are treated according to Alternative One without brick sills, with the staff to review shop drawings for the windows.

### **1701 LOCUST STREET**

Owner: CDF, Philadelphia Holding, LP

Applicant: Martin Jay Tackett

History: Designed by Frank Hahn and Brian Baylinson, built 1923-1925. listed as a Significant resource within the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District.

Project: Alter ground floor commercial space and replace windows on floors 14-21.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to install aluminum multi-pane café windows and door in a commercial space on the east and north sides of the Warwick Hotel. The commercial space, currently used as a restaurant, faces 17<sup>th</sup> and Chancellor Streets. It does not retain its historic storefront windows, but the original window configuration is known through surviving photographs. The same window type is proposed for the two infilled openings along Chancellor Street. In addition, the applicant proposes to install a fabric banner, awnings, and metal lettering directly onto the limestone façade of the building.

This application also proposes the replacement of all windows at floors 14 to 21. The current windows are one-over-one metal units within original wood frames, which are covered by metal panning. The applicant proposes to replace them with one-over-one metal units. However, one-over-one is not the original window configuration. The building originally had eight-over-one wood units.

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

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Jay Tackett and Lynn Blahusch of CB Development Services represented the application.

Mr. Tackett displayed a photograph that confirmed that the storefront windows in question historically had tripartite divisions. He stated that he would propose to his client to replicate the historic storefront windows shown in the old photograph.

Mr. Tackett addressed the upper-floor windows. He stated that two separate parties, the hotel below the 14<sup>th</sup> floor and the residential condominium owners at and above the 14<sup>th</sup> floor, own the building. His client only controls the condominium windows, not those below. The hotel owners do not intend to replace their windows. To maintain the unity of the facades, Mr. Tackett would like to replace the one-over-one non-historic windows in the condominium zone with metal one-over-one non-historic windows. Mr. Thomas asserted that, to comply with the Standards, windows with the appropriate historic eight-over-one configuration should be installed, even if they do not match the non-historic windows below. He noted that, eventually, the hotel will replace its windows and the facades will be unified again. Ms. Pentz agreed and remarked that a restoration at the upper floors may, in fact, encourage the owners of the lower floors to restore their windows. Mr. Tackett explained that they sought to replace the windows because the gaskets are leaking and the windows are clouding. Ms. Blahusch stated that the hotel owners had decided to replace the glass and gaskets only, not the windows themselves. She also noted her desire to make the building more energy efficient. Ms. Blahusch stated that they had not found any remains of the wood windows or frames under the panning; the sketch submitted by Mr. Tackett showing the wood is inaccurate. Mr. Thomas replied that the Commission has routinely approved substitute materials for upper windows in large buildings. He stated that he would recommend the aluminum substitute material because these windows are above the 13<sup>th</sup> floor, but would insist on

the historic pane configuration. Messrs. D'Alessandro and McCoubrey agreed. Mr. Thomas noted that their window suppliers, Graham and Graboyes, could create the appropriate extrusions to easily replicate the historic wood windows in metal.

Ms. Pentz asked the applicant about the storefront portion of his application. Mr. Tackett responded that he was willing to replicate the historic windows, but would design them to be operable. He stated that they would have heavy mullions and no muntins. He would work with the staff to develop the details.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. The Committee stated that it would, if presented with the appropriate plans, recommend approval of the replication of the historic eight-over-one windows in aluminum at the upper floors and the replication of the historic storefront windows with operability, with the staff to review details.

**8609-8611 GERMANTOWN AVENUE**

Owner: Chestnut Hill Real Estate

Applicant: John Clausen

History: Designated 5/28/1957

Project: Install cellular antennas on extended chimney with associated equipment cabinets on the ground

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to install three cellular antennas on an extended chimney with the associated equipment on the ground. The chimney would be extended 5' 6" with brick and the antennas, measuring 53" by 12.9" by 3.1", would be mounted on the exterior front and side elevations of the extended portion of the chimney. The antennas would be concealed with stealth screen covers. The three associated equipment cabinets would be located at the rear of the property, along the side of the rear ell. An eight-foot wood board-on-board fence would enclose the cabinets. Shrubbery around the fence is proposed as a planting screen.

The chimney that would be extended is highly visible from Germantown Avenue. The chimney straddles the party wall between the eighteenth-century building to the south and the nineteenth-century building to the north. It appears that the chimney was originally part of the older building. The two buildings and their lots have been consolidated into one parcel and have one address.

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

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. John Clausen, Jeff Thomas, and Grady Jones of Betzwood Associates and Zana Wolf, historic preservation consultant of URS Corporation, represented the application.

Mr. Clausen submitted a photomontage of the proposal. Ms. Pentz asked about the chimney and the buildings. The staff explained that the chimney is now part of the party wall, but was originally part of the older building at 8609 Germantown Avenue. Mr. Thomas expressed his concerns about extending the chimney. He opined that the extension and the stealth covering are inappropriate for the buildings. Mr. Rivera asked if the applicant could install the equipment inside the chimney. Mr. Thomas and Mr.

McCoubrey asked if the applicant could rebuild the chimney in the stealth material with the equipment in it, without altering its original appearance. Mr. Clausen stated that the engineers require the extra height that the chimney extension provides. He also stated that the antennas must be as close to the street as possible. Mr. Jones inquired if the Committee would approve a false, mirroring chimney on the opposite side of the taller building. Mr. Thomas remarked that such an addition would be falsely historic. He asked rhetorically if adding an exact replica of one of his eyes in the middle of his forehead would look appropriate.

Mr. Rivera asked about moving the antenna to another location, perhaps back further on the roof of the taller building. Mr. Clausen explained that they would need to increase the height of the antennas if they moved them back on the building. His colleagues noted that they would also need to add structural members on the roof, steel beams spanning from party wall to party wall.

Mr. Thomas stated that he agreed with the staff recommendation of denial. He noted his opposition to building on the historic chimney and to adding a copy of the chimney at the opposite party wall. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the proposal and alternates do not comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He advised the applicants to develop a new scheme with minimal visibility from the Avenue.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance declared that telecommunications equipment should never be installed on historically designated buildings unless no other sites are available. He noted that Chestnut Hill is not a locally designated district and asked if the applicants had considered other, non-historic sites in the area. Mr. Thomas agreed generally with Mr. Gallery, but observed that in some instances a subtle installation on an historic building might be better than a large tower next to an historic building.

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

**100 MARKET STREET, A.K.A. 2 S. FRONT STREET**

Owner: ESK Ventures

Applicant: Allison Fritch

History: Built in 1882 by owners George and Albert Ulrich as a cigar manufactory and store; Designated individually in 10/07/1976 and as contributing to the Old City Historic District 12/12/2003

Project: Replace windows on first floor

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to replace four large storefront windows on the Market Street façade and two large storefront windows on the Front Street façade. The proposed windows, while utilizing the existing wood frame and sill, would be wood bi-fold windows with four, tall, vertical, double-glazed panels. To open, these windows would fold, accordion style, to one side.

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

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Architects Allison Fritch and Jay Tackett represented the application.

Mr. Tackett explained that the first and second floor would be converted for restaurant use; the restaurateur would like to be able to open the windows. Ms. Cote stated that the staff was not opposed to operable windows, but was opposed to the configuration; the tall, vertical window panels are not visually compatible with the historic storefront. She suggested dividing the historic storefront windows into two, not four, panes. Mr. Tackett stated that he could accomplish this with out-swinging casements.

Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association also objected to the proposed window configuration and suggested offset pivot windows with fewer divisions. He noted that any window modifications would be easily reversible if the openings were not changed.

Mr. Tackett asked for the Committee's opinion on the transoms; the Committee members suggested that he should retain the historic transoms.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, pursuant to Standard 9, but approval of the replacement of each large storefront window with two casement or pivot windows, provided the historic transoms are retained, with the staff to review details.

#### **2420 GRAY'S FERRY AVENUE, THE NAVAL ASYLUM OR HOME**

Owner: Toll Naval Associates

Applicant: Paul Commito, Toll Naval Associates

History: U.S. Naval Home, William Strickland, architect

complex begun in 1827; wall and guardhouse built in 1836

Project: Demolish guardhouse, rebuild and alter wall, construct residential building and guard house

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes the construction of a large residential building on the site of the U.S. Naval Asylum. The Commission has reviewed and approved a series of applications for this site including those for the rehabilitation of the historic buildings and the construction of several new buildings. The proposed building would be constructed on a vacant portion of the site and would be compatible in style, size, scale, massing, and materials with the other contemporary buildings on the site.

The application also proposes to rebuild a section of the wall that runs along the western boundary of the Naval Asylum at Schuylkill Avenue. The historic wall, which is collapsed at the north, has a stone base, stuccoed brick body, and masonry capping. In June 2004, the Commission reviewed a proposal to rebuild several sections of the collapsed brick wall that runs along the northern boundary of the Naval Asylum at Bainbridge Street. The Commission denied the applicant's proposal to replace the missing section of brick wall with brick piers and aluminum fence and instead required the "reconstruction of the missing sections of the Bainbridge Street perimeter wall with a new full-height masonry wall to match the historic wall."

The application also proposes to alter the historic entrance to the site at Schuylkill Avenue. To widen the opening and erect a new guardhouse, a surviving section of the original stone guardhouse and wall would be demolished. The opening in the wall would be widened, a decorative brick section and metal gates added, and a new guardhouse erected. The proposed guardhouse would stand on the site of the original guardhouse. Nationally significant architect William Strickland designed the original guardhouse as

well as the two matching, restored guardhouses on Gray's Ferry Avenue in the 1830s. Schuylkill Avenue, which was originally known as Sutherland Avenue, was opened in 1834.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the construction of the residential building, pursuant to Standard 9; approval of the rebuilding of the missing section of the wall in CMU with a stone base, smooth stucco facing, and masonry cap to match the adjacent sections of wall, pursuant to Standard 6; denial of the demolition of the guardhouse and construction of the entranceway, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, and 6. The staff suggests that the applicant revise his plan and reconfigure the Schuylkill Avenue entranceway in a manner that allows for the preservation and restoration of the Strickland guardhouse and other historic entranceway features, including the free and engaged brick piers with corbelled capitals.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Thomas and Ms. Pentz recused themselves owing to earlier and current involvements with the development. Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Committee. Attorney Brett Feldman along with Paul Commito and Brian D'Andrea of Toll Brothers represented the application.

Mr. Farnham pointed out the surviving section of the guardhouse, which was like the two restored guardhouses on Gray's Ferry Avenue. Architect William Strickland designed all three guardhouses in the 1830s. Mr. Farnham stated that the staff had no objections to an enlarged entrance on Schuylkill Avenue, but would advocate strenuously for the preservation of the section of the guardhouse that has survived and its incorporation into the wall and/or the new guardhouse.

Mr. Feldman reported that the State Historic Preservation Office, like the Commission's staff, had no objections to the new building.

Mr. Commito stated that he and his team had not recognized the ruin as a remnant of an original guardhouse. He explained that he had rebuilt several sections of the brick wall along Bainbridge Street with the Commission's approval. He also needed to rebuild sections of the wall along Schuylkill Avenue that had collapsed or were without adequate foundations. He disclosed that he had met with the state and federal officials, who hold covenants, and they had objected to the brick sections proposed for the stucco wall at the Schuylkill Avenue entrance.

Mr. Rivera asked Mr. Commito why he could not rebuild the historic guardhouse. Mr. Commito replied that he could. He offered to incorporate the remnant of the guardhouse into the rebuilt wall. He noted that the new entrance would be north of the historic opening and therefore the historic guardhouse could not serve as the basis of the new guardhouse. Mr. D'Alessandro inquired about the use of the guardhouse. Mr. Commito stated it would be used as it is on Gray's Ferry Avenue; the guard would stop cars and pedestrians entering the site. Mr. Commito stated that he would preserve the stone base of the historic guardhouse. The Committee objected and stated that he should preserve and restore the entirety of the west or street wall of the historic guardhouse and incorporate it into the perimeter wall or new guardhouse. Mr. McCoubrey questioned if the brick piers at the entrance were original fabric. Mr. Farnham replied that they are visible in the 1949 photograph and, if not original, are at least old and may be considered historic. He suggested that, if the historic piers are not retained, the applicant base his new piers separating the pedestrian and vehicular entrances on the historic

piers. Mr. Commito asked about the gate design. Mr. Farnham stated that he had not discovered any evidence of the historic gate, but posited that, because the three guardhouses were virtually identical, the rear gate may have been similar to the front gates. Mr. Rivera commented that the gate should be a simplified version of the front gates unless additional historical evidence is discovered.

The discussion turned to the new construction. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asked why the site plan did not include all of the buildings to be erected during Phase II at the west side of the site. He stated that he could not evaluate the siting of the proposed building without knowing what would be built around it. Mr. Commito responded that, at this point in time, the plans for the adjacent areas have not been established. He stated that the proposed building would house amenities needed now for the residents of the occupied buildings. He would develop the plans for the other buildings at a later date based on market conditions. He stated that he would be disingenuous if he presented a site plan to the Commission that might never be implemented. He noted that the Commission would have an opportunity to review the additional buildings at a later date. Mr. Gallery responded that Mr. Commito had precluded options by locating this building without situating the others. Mr. Commito responded that he could not wait to construct this building. The residents and prospective buyers are demanding the amenities it will house.

Mr. Rivera objected to the colors shown in the renderings of the new building. Mr. Commito stated they were not accurate and explained that the colors of the new building would match those of the new buildings already erected.

Mr. Gallery objected to the chimneys protruding from the new building. He claimed that there were no fireplaces in the interiors to justify these chimneys. Mr. Commito disagreed, and pointed to the fireplaces on the plans. He noted that their market research indicated that buyers wanted fireplaces; therefore, they had added them to this building. Mr. Gallery asked if this proposal was presented in concept. Mr. Farnham stated that it was an application for final approval; he noted that the staff judged the proposed building to be compatible with the new construction already approved by the Commission. He observed that this building would have no impact on historic resources at the site. Mr. Rivera suggested that the chimneys be incorporated into the planes of the facades or, at a minimum, be faced with the same materials as the facades. Mr. Commito explained that the chimneys had been located outside the walls to avoid disrupting the interior spaces. Mr. Gallery opined that the fireplaces should project into the living spaces; people expect fireplaces to be prominent features.

Chris Cosgrove, a resident of Naval Square, asked Mr. Commito if he planned to remove the barbed wire on Bainbridge Street. Mr. Commito assured him that it would be removed.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend:

1. Approval of the construction of the residential building, provided the exterior chimneys are incorporated into the facades and do not project from them;
2. approval of the rebuilding of missing and unstable sections of the Schuylkill Avenue wall in CMU with a stone base, smooth stucco facing, and masonry cap to match the adjacent sections of wall, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6;

3. denial of the demolition of the surviving section of the guardhouse, but approval of its restoration and incorporation into the wall or new guardhouse, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, and 6.
4. denial of the proposed entrance, but approval of a new entrance based on the designs of the historic wall, piers, and guardhouse, with the staff to review details;
5. approval of new gates at the entrance that are simplified versions of the front gates, with the staff to review details.

**205-211 N. 4TH STREET, A.K.A. 329-337 RACE STREET**

Owner: Old City Place Condominium Association

Applicant: Jeff Barr

History: built c. 1850 and 1870, additions c. 1870

Project: New windows

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes the replacement of windows in wood at four buildings at the corner of 4<sup>th</sup> and Race Streets that have been combined into one condominium structure. The proposal calls for retaining frames on window types 2-4 and 13-20 excepting 16. The other types will undergo window and frame replacement. The building currently has deeply-set casement frames at windows 2-4 and 22-24 which have had double-hung windows installed in the 1980s. The building had casement sash in these locations at the time of designation. This proposal calls for removing the casement frames and installing new double-hung frames and sash, not the historic casements, at those locations.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the replacement of the original double-hung windows locations in kind, with the staff to review details, but denial of the installation of double-hung windows where the building historically had casements windows, pursuant to Standard 6.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Christy Williams, Nathan Best, and Walter Bayer of the condominium association, and consultant Jeff Barr represented the application.

Mr. Baron displaying a photograph of the property with casements windows; he believes they were added when the corner building in the complex was updated in the middle of the nineteenth century. He opined that the casements and the storefront were added at the same time and formed a complete ensemble. He stated that the top-floor windows in this section of the complex are double hung; the top floor is an addition. Mr. Baron explained that the openings that had casements still retain the casement frames, which are set back deeply into the masonry window openings. The non-historic double-hung windows were installed in the casement frames in the 1980s. The applicants would like to install new windows like the double-hung windows installed in the 1980s to create a consistent look across all of the buildings. Mr. Baron stated that the casements would be the historically appropriate window.

Mr. Barr noted that all of the windows in the complex date to the 1983 rehabilitation. They all single glazing and are not energy efficient. Mr. Barr explained that this collection of four buildings has been combined into a multi-unit condominium complex. The windows in the building on Race Street that has metal sash will not be replaced. The

corner building, which had a mix of double-hung and casement windows, presents the only significant preservation question. Mr. Barr stated that it was originally four stories and four bays wide and constructed in 1856. The fifth-floor addition and the four-bay expansion along Race Street were built between 1864 and 1875. He opined that, at that time, double-hungs were installed in the new portions and the casements were left in the existing openings. This building now appears as an 1875 building, not an earlier building. In 1983, it was rehabilitated with tax credits. The Commission approved the double-hung windows in all the openings at that time. Owing to the earlier approval, he is requesting that the Commission approve the historically-correct, wood, true-divided-light, double-hung windows with double glazing. Mr. Barr stated many of the original double-hung windows will be retained, but certain windows will need to have their deteriorated frames replaced. Mr. Barr remarked that there are approximately thirty different types of windows in the complex; he is seeking consistency. Mr. Baron stated that, initially, the staff was working with the window supplier to define the casements, but the building owners decided that they preferred the double-hung windows. Ms. Williams stated that her primary objection to the casements was cost. Mr. Barr remarked that the condominium owners wanted as little disturbance to the interiors as possible. Keeping the double-hung configuration would accomplish that goal. Mr. Smith remarked that returning to the casements would create inconsistency on the facades; some unit owners might replace their windows, but others might not. Mr. Baron noted the easement held by the Preservation Alliance and asked if the easement would preclude the restoration to the casements. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance answered that he had not yet explored the issue.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal as submitted, with the staff to review details.

**1515-1521 CHERRY STREET, 1500-20 RACE STREET, RACE STREET MEETING HOUSE**

Owner: Friends Center Corporation

Applicant: Mark Ueland

History: 1856

Project: Install fence

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes removing a three-foot temporary wire fence from the Cherry Street façade and installing a new five-foot metal fence in its place. The low brick retaining wall installed in the 1980s would be retained. New gates would be installed along the service alley and stairway from the east corner of the complex. Although the historic photos show a brick and metal fence along the front of the property, the site was changed with the addition of the office building and retaining wall in the 1980s, both which will be retained in this project.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro recused. Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Vincent Muller, the director of the Friends Center, and architect Mark Ueland represented the application.

Mr. Ueland described the project, which he asserted is necessary for security at the site.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal as submitted.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:30 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 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.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jonathan Farnham, Randal Baron, Jorge Danta, Erin McGinn-Cote