

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

**TUESDAY, 24 JUNE 2008
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DAVID AMBURN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

David Amburn, Chair
Shawn Evans
Dominique Hawkins
Daniel 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 I
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

ALSO PRESENT

Linda Carafiello
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
David Schultz
Susan Nathan
Jean McCoubrey, Runyan & Associates
John P. Szrakra, Christ Ascension
Robert Torres, Studio Torres
Julia Scott, Reku Design
David Blum
Peter Knight
Louis Acciavatti
Kenneth Jacobs
Robert Powers, Powers & Company
Robert Snow, ALA
Lawrence Gilbert Architect
Randy Cotton, Preservation Alliance

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Amburn called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Hawkins and Pentz and Messrs. Evans and McCoubrey joined him.

2535 S. 19TH STREET

Owner/Applicant: Matthew & Linda Carrafiello

History: 1909, John Windrim, architect, contributing to Girard Estate district

Project: demolish fence, install parking

OVERVIEW: This application in concept proposes to add parking to this corner property. The owners propose to remove the existing hairpin fence and create a curb cut and parking space. The Commission has denied similar applications in the past.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Linda Carafiello represented the application.

Ms. Carrafiello explained that, as she and her husband age, they seek the safety and convenience of a parking space adjacent to their house. She said that other people in the historic district have off-street parking.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that it might be possible to get a dedicated disabled parking space in front of the house. Ms. Carrafiello said that other people would park in the spot causing neighborhood rancor and she would not want to be dishonest and claim to be handicapped when she and her husband are not.

Several Committee members noted that the installation of a driveway would result in fewer parking spaces on the street. They also noted that the Commission has previously rejected similar applications in the historic district. The introduction of a parking space would benefit the very few, but result in a detriment to many. Ms. Pentz noted the negative precedent that would be set by such an approval. Mr. McCoubrey noted the negative impact on the historic fence, backyard space, and streetscape.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

102 RECTOR STREET

Owner/Applicant: Craig Mosmen

History: c.1840, altered c. 1905

Project: Demolish rear shed, construct three-story addition, replace front windows and door

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to expand the restaurant in this double house into the second and third stories. The rear shed would be demolished and a three story addition would be attached at the rear. The rear addition would be taller than the existing building and would be visible from the side, as this is a corner building. On the rear façade, windows would be closed and ductwork would run up the rear wall. On the front façade, the applicant proposes to install a new door and single sash rectangular windows. The historic windows would be two-over-two segmental arch sash.

The staff suggests that the rear addition should be revised to sit below the existing rear cornice and set in about a foot from the side wall, to allow the original building shape to be read. The additional height for the stair could be accomplished with a rear dormer.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to the Manayunk ordinance PM 704.2.

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

Mr. Baron informed the Committee that the proposed front façade windows are inappropriate because they are square casements where there should be arch head double hung sash. Mr. Baron reported that he met with the property owner, who explained that he would be amenable to revising the plans. However, the architect is away for the summer and he cannot have the plans updated in the near future. Mr. Amburn opined that the proposed skylight is excessively tall. Mr. Baron noted that aerial photographs show that there is some access to the open court in the rear; however, it is not public space. Mr. Baron opined that the demolition of the shed was acceptable. Mr. McCoubrey thought that shifting the addition away from the alley would make it less visible. He stated the exposed ductwork is problematic and suggested relocating it inside the building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to the Manayunk ordinance PM 704.2.

715 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: WCC 717 Associates LP

Applicant: Anthony Ciocca

History: Paul Cret, architect, built 1923 for Integrity Trust Company

Project: façade alterations

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the conversion of this former bank turned jewelry store into a restaurant. The application proposes installing a new door and transom as well as first-floor windows based on an historic photograph. The doors have been designed with vertical rather than horizontal handles and the windows are shown as a single sash rather than as double hung. The step at the door would be cut down to allow handicap access to an interior ramp. A plastic canopy/sign would project from the doorway with pin-on lettering. Light pylons would stand clear of the building and light the newly restored masonry. A thirty-foot-long banner would hang from the existing flagpole.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the windows are two-over-two double-hung windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Brett Feldman, architect Dave Schultz, and architectural intern Susan Nathan represented the application.

Mr. Feldman described the building and noted this was formerly the Jack Kelmer Jewelry Store, which opened in 1965. At that time, the jewelry store owner installed a decorative marble cladding on the first-floor, front façade. In an effort to return the building back to its original state, the current owner removed the marble. Mr. Feldman described his client's proposal to create a four-story restaurant with private dining on the third and fourth floors. He added that his client proposes to install the two-over-two windows recommended by the staff. Mr. Schultz stated that there is an extant rooftop flag pole, from which they propose to hang a banner for the restaurant.

Mr. Baron asked the applicant to describe the materials of the canopy. Mr. Schultz replied they had thought of using glass, but, owing to the weight, opted for a different material. He stated that they intend to use an internally-lit acrylic material that would have a subtle glow.

Mr. Cluver thought the alignment of the openings was unsettling, but Mr. Schultz replied the masonry openings are original and would not change. Mr. Evans suggested that the drawings be revised to reflect that the heads of the windows and door align to ensure that the masonry openings will not be enlarged.

Mr. Cluver noted that the color of the acrylic material in the canopy is critical. The Committee members suggested an amber tint for it. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the color-changing LED lighting. Mr. Schultz replied stated that his client wants to control the color of the lighting. Mr. McCoubrey thought that the lighting should be one uniform color. The Committee concurred.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the finish of the door, which is proposed as brushed nickel. Mr. Schultz replied that it is the same as the finish used throughout the project. Mr. McCoubrey objected to the nickel finish.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided a bronze finish is substituted for the nickel, the

canopy lighting is off-white and does not change color, the first-floor windows are double-hung two-over-two windows as shown in the 10 June 2008 drawing, the masonry door opening is not altered, and the flagpole does not penetrate the facade of the building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6.

832-36 LOMBARD STREET

Owner: Masada Custom Builders

Applicant: Isaac Ohayon

History: 1846-8, William Johnston, architect built for Central Presbyterian Church

Project: restore fence/create two car parking

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the reconstruction of the front fence based on historic photographs and the installation of gates and a two-car parking area. The front yard will be landscaped. The Commission approved a telescoping gate and single-car parking for the building in September 2006. The staff contends that the parking should be limited to a single car in front of the side addition, not the historic building. Two-car parking would require parking in front of the historic church building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the proposal, provided the parking is limited to a single vehicle at the western edge of the lot, in front of the side addition, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Isaac Ohayon represented the application.

In 2006, the Commission approved plans which showed a telescoping gate with a single-car parking space in front of the side addition. Now the applicant seeks to park two cars in front of the building, but to restore the front fence and install a swinging double-leaf gate. Mr. Baron reported that the first pastor of the church was buried in the front courtyard and the grave had at one time been marked with an obelisk. He also noted that the granite base of the fence will be retained in most places but will be reflected in the skirt of the proposed gate where it will be removed.

Mr. Cluver asserted that the concept is acceptable with a few minor issues such as the height of the fence. Mr. Ohayon replied that he intends for the fence height to replicate the original fence height. He commented that he preferred a shorter fence to allow better views of the façade of the building.

Mr. Evans asked if the proposal was for one parking space or two. Mr. Ohayon replied that the gate opening and curb cut are the same size as the original approved proposal. Ms. Hawkins opined that, given the previous approval, the Historical Commission would gain a restored fence from this application.

Mr. McCoubrey found the posts square and plain and suggested they be consistent. He then questioned the planters and suggested planting beds behind the fence. The applicant stated that the planters are intended to be decorative. He stated that he would be willing to insert them into the ground.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant about the water fountain and wall behind it, which is now stuccoed. Mr. Ohayon replied he was unsure whether he would add the fountain. Mr. Evans commented not enough details for the fountain were provided. Mr. Cluver suggested that the paving pattern be consistent throughout. It would draw too much attention to the parking.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided planting beds are substituted for the planters, and the height of the fence lowered, and the fence has the same secondary posts throughout, with the staff to review details.

2 RECTOR STREET

Owner: Main Street Properties LLC

Applicant: James C. Campbell, AIA

History: Designated: Manayunk Historic District 12/14/1983

Project: Deck, ADA ramp, signage, and widow alterations

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a deck that will cantilever over the tow path of the Manayunk Canal. A concrete ramp is proposed to run along the Rector Street façade to access the deck. It would close down two basement openings. Also, two windows would be cut down on the canal façade for access from the restaurant to the deck. These doors would have transoms reflective of the original window. Lastly, this application proposes to relocate the restaurant sign two bays closer to Main Street on the Rector Street façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval provided the ramp is open underneath and does not close up the basement windows, pursuant to the Manayunk ordinance PM 704.2.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect James Campbell represented the application.

Ms. Cote introduced the revisions submitted by the applicant showing that the ramp cannot be constructed in the interior.

Mr. Campbell expressed his hopes to enliven the Manayunk Canal and Trail. His client, Bourbon Blue, proposes to cantilever a deck overlook and provide access to the trail. He stated that his firm has negotiated with Fairmount Park for an air rights agreement. The project is still pending Art Commission and Zoning reviews.

Mr. Campbell described the proposed deck as a steel structure with columns, brackets, and beams with wood supporting members and recycled synthetic decking. He described the proposed railing as a wrought iron in appearance.

Mr. Baron suggested a metal decking for the ramp rather than concrete. He stated concrete would block the view of the basement windows. A metal deck would be in keeping with the industrial history of the building while also allowing visibility to the basement window level. Mr. Campbell stated that he could create a metal ramp and continue the wrought iron rail from the main deck onto the ramp.

Mr. Cluver expressed concern over the loss of outdoor seating due to the installation of a ramp. He opined that the sidewalk seating calls attention to the restaurant from down the street.

Mr. Evans asked the applicant if he had considered installing a lift inside the building and cutting down the front door. Mr. Campbell answered that this option would be cost-prohibitive.

Mr. Evans expressed concern that the overhang of the deck was intrusive onto public space and found it problematic. Mr. Campbell stated that the Fairmount Park Commission posited that it would encourage pedestrian traffic and be beneficial to the trail. He assured the Committee that the agreements with the Fairmount Park Commission are in place. Ms. Cote advised the Committee of her conversation with Theresa Stuhlman of the Fairmount Park Commission, who confirmed that the Fairmount Park Commission had approved the project.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the ramp is open and metal to expose the basement windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

8300 GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Owner: Christ Ascension Lutheran Church

Applicant: Jean McCoubrey

History: church c.1870, parish house 1907, individually designated 8/2/1973

Project: Install ADA ramp

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to cut a door for ADA access at the rear of the church building. Also, a ramp is proposed for the parish house. This ramp will be clad in Wissahickon schist and will have a metal railing. Lastly, a single-leaf door that replicates the original double-leaf door of the parish house is proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the parish house door hardware is salvaged and reused on the new door, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. McCoubrey recused owing to his wife's involvement in the project. Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Architect Jean McCoubrey and Pastor John Saraka represented the application.

The applicant stated that there were some technical challenges regarding the reuse of the existing door hardware. To allow for handicapped access, the double-door must be combined into one leaf and thickened. Therefore, the existing hardware will not be strong enough to support the new door.

Mr. Evans suggested a push-button operation on the door for the accessibility. Ms. McCoubrey stated they would further research that option.

Ms. McCoubrey stated that the existing stone steps could be left in place while the ramp is constructed over them with a concrete landing; however, she is concerned about this encapsulation. Ms. Cote commented on the importance of keeping the historic fabric; the ramp may be removed in the future. Messrs. Evans and Amburn did not object to removal and reuse of the existing steps.

Mr. Evans inquired if the ramp would cover a window. Ms. McCoubrey confirmed that the window is currently blocked on the inside with plywood and glass block. The ramp would cover this feature entirely. Mr. Evans expressed concern for the downspout over the ramp. Ms. McCoubrey stated she would look into some options to manage the drainage issue.

The Committee agreed that more information was needed for the door cut proposed for the church building. Mr. Cluver suggested that a landscaped earthen ramp to the front door may be more appropriate for ADA access to the church.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the door to the church, owing to incompleteness; approval of the ramp for the parish house with the option of reusing the existing steps, provided the existing doors and hardware are used with push-button operation, the ramp is widened to allow for the door swing, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

106-108 AND 110 GRAPE STREET

Owner: Maximum Properties

Applicant: A. Robert Torres

History: 110 Grape Street is contributing, 106-108 Grape Street is an intrusion in the Main Street Manayunk National Historic District

Project: Demolish two buildings and construct a four-story building

OVERVIEW: The structure at 106-108 Grape Street is an early twentieth-century, one-story brick garage with gabled parapet. It is listed as an intrusion in the National Register Historic District. The building at 110 Grape Street is a three-story row house, constructed in the 1830s, and listed as contributing within the district. The house retains its cornice and storefront moldings at the first story, chimney, and original window frames and sills. The Manayunk ordinance requires the preservation of contributing buildings.

An earlier iteration of this application proposed the demolition of two buildings within the Manayunk Historic District. The application proposed the construction of a four-story building. The building would be constructed of brick with a center two-story bay and two-over-two windows. The first-story would have commercial storefronts. In April 2008, the Commission denied the application, but approved in-concept the demolition of the non-contributing, three-bay garage at 106-108 Grape Street.

The applicant now returns with a proposal to demolish 106-108 and 110 Grape Street and to construct a four-story building. The building would be constructed of brick with a center two-story bay and 2-over-2 windows. The first-story would have commercial storefronts. The fourth-story would be setback about five-and-one-half feet from the front façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Manayunk Ordinance, Section PM-704.2 of the Philadelphia Code.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application. Architect Robert Torres represented the application.

Mr. Torres stated that the revisions to the design were based on comments received by the Manayunk Neighborhood Council. He explained that the community had requested the fourth-floor to be set back, and the massing to be slightly diminished. He also added that the Council supports the design as revised.

Mr. Baron stated that this application to demolish both buildings had been denied by the Commission, and that the Committee had twice recommended denial. He added that the issue of the design of the new building would be appropriate for comment only if the contributing building had been approved for demolition. However, the Commission has already indicated that it should be retained, not demolished.

Mr. Clover opined that the three-story building is not as significant as other buildings in the district. Ms. Hawkins corrected her colleague and stated that the Architectural Committee is not charged with considering designation matters such as the appropriateness of the contributing classification of the building; the Committee is charged with reviewing proposed alterations to designated historic resources. Mr. Baron added that the building is in character with the residential portion of the district. It should not be viewed in the context of the larger commercial buildings on Main Street, but rather in the context of the residential buildings in the district.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Manayunk Ordinance, Section PM-704.2 of the Philadelphia Code.

1534 MOUNT VERNON STREET

Owner: Monique DeLapenha

Applicant: Monique DeLapenha

History: 1859; contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize window installation and brick pointing

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of one-over-one vinyl windows on the façade and destructive brick pointing on the west elevation. The April 2001 designation photograph shows two-over-two windows in all window openings but one. The appropriate windows are two-over-two, wood, true-divided-light, double-hung sash. The vinyl windows were installed after designation without the Commission's approval or a building permit.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 7, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application. No one represented the application.

The Committee members agreed that the windows and pointing are inappropriate.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 7, and 9.

1732 MOUNT VERNON STREET

Owner: Monique DeLapenha

Applicant: Monique DeLapenha

History: 1859; contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize window installation

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of one-over-one vinyl windows on the façade. The February 2001 designation photograph shows one-over-one windows on the first story and four-over-four windows on the second and third stories. The appropriate windows are four-over-four, wood, true-divided-light, double-hung sash. The vinyl windows were installed after designation without the Commission's approval or a building permit.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application. No one represented the application.

The Committee members agreed that the windows are inappropriate.

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

1734 MOUNT VERNON STREET

Owner: Monique DeLapenha

Applicant: Monique DeLapenha

History: 1859; Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000, contributing.

Project: Legalize window installation

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of one-over-one vinyl windows in the bay on the façade. The February 2001 designation photograph shows one-over-one windows on the first story and two-story bay and four-over-four windows on the second and third stories. The appropriate windows are four-over-four, wood, true-divided-light, double-hung sash. The bay would have had one-over-one, wood, double-hung sash. The vinyl windows were installed after designation without the Commission's approval or a building permit.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application. No one represented the application.

The Committee members agreed that the windows are inappropriate.

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

610 ADDISON STREET

Owner: David Blunt and Mark Woodland

Applicant: Julia L. Scott

History: 1995, contributing to the Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/99

Project: Enclose roof deck and alter window opening

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to enclose an existing rear roof deck, raise the rear chimney height, and change the oculus on the front façade into a square window for emergency egress.

This building is one in a row of four identical post-modern twins constructed within the Society Hill Historic District. Currently, the chimney height is three stories. Enclosing the third-story deck would require the chimney height to be raised one story. 604-606 Addison Street currently have four-story chimneys, whereas 608-610 have three-story chimneys. Enclosing the rear deck would also require the alteration of the oculus window as a means of emergency egress.

The facades of this row were designed as mirroring twins. Altering the oculus would disrupt the congruency of the row and have an adverse effect on the streetscape.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the rear deck enclosure and chimney extension, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of the window alteration, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Amburn recused owing to his relationship with the applicant. Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. Property owner David Blunt and architect Julia Scott represented the application.

Mr. Blunt described the property as one of four built approximately 12 years ago. His intention is to create additional living space, which he deems critical to house their au pair. Ms. Scott stated that, although the actual bedroom will have its emergency egress to the rear, they would like to have emergency egress for the sitting room at the front as well. She stated that the round portal window is not large enough to meet code for emergency egress. The proposed square window would allow for easier evacuation even though an egress route it is not required for this space. Ms. Hawkins suggested a pop-out sash if the code does not have egress requirements for this room.

Mr. Evans stated that the proposal was acceptable, owing its relatively recent construction date. Mr. Cluver argued that, regardless of its age, the house was still deemed contributing to the district. He stated that he finds the proposed alteration problematic. Ms. Sell told the Committee that the staff felt that the change to the window would disrupt the continuity of the design of the streetscape and was therefore unacceptable, even though the building is not as old as most in the district. Mr. Baron explained that many of the newer buildings in Society Hill were built as part of the redevelopment process, which is noted as important in the district's Statement of Significance. Contributing buildings are reviewed using the Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines.

Mr. Blunt answered Ms. Pentz's question regarding the architect, stating that it was Stephen Goldner. He said several facades in the area have undergone significant alterations. Ms. Scott argued the change of the window had a minimal impact on the streetscape. She showed photographs of flower boxes on some buildings. Mr. Cluver opined that he would like to see an evolution in these types of buildings, but the Committee has a responsibility to follow the Standards; therefore a denial is necessary. Ms. Pentz agreed with the evaluation, but

contended that the Committee should have some discretion in this area. Mr. McCoubrey was not in favor of this change unless mandated by code. He also suggested that other options be explored. Ms. Hawkins suggested researching the pop-out sash.

Messrs McCoubrey and Cluver and Ms. Hawkins stated that they would recommend denying the window alteration; Ms. Pentz and Mr. Evans stated that they would recommend approval of it.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the rear addition and chimney modifications, but denial of the alteration to the front window, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

100 LOMBARD STREET

Owner / Applicant: Anh Thai & Peter Knight

History: Built c. 1970, contributing to the Society Hill Historic District.

Project: Install front door.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a front door in an original open vestibule. Most of the buildings in the row have security gates. The applicant proposes to remove his existing security gate and install a solid wood door with three glazed porthole windows.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Property owner Peter Knight represented the application.

Mr. Danta displayed a sample of the proposed veneer for the door to the members. He introduced colored photographs of the subject property and the neighboring homes. Mr. Knight told the Committee that he has spoken with the Society Hill Civic Association and it supports his application. The applicant stated that he intends to remove the inside door and eliminate the vestibule, which he likened to the closed in area to a prison with no room to close one door without opening the other. He stated that the doorway is 37.5" wide and has a gate that swings out. He observed that the design is from the 1970s, when this part of the city was not a safe place. Mr. Knight stated that he wants the appearance to be more welcoming. Mr. Knight said that the current door is not original. He said it currently has eight panels with a plastic stained glass effect.

Mr. McCoubrey and Ms Hawkins suggested a vertical single light rather than portholes for glazing the door. Mr. Knight thought that a vertical light would not be appropriate. Mr. Cluver thought that it was important to keep the original deep opening.

Three Committee members stated that they would recommend approval. One Committee member advocated for denial. Two Committee members suggested approval in concept, but denial of the door design.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval.

1837-55 N. BROAD STREET

Owner: Temple University

Applicant: Tom McCreesh

History: Built c. 1890

Project: Install louvers

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install two louvers on the exterior of the Baptist Temple. One louver would be located at the rear of the building in an arched window opening. The other louver would be located on the side of the building, and would require the removal of an original rose window.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the rear louver, but denial of the removal of the stained glass window and installation of the louver, pursuant to Standard 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Kevin Jacobs represented the application.

Mr. Jacobs described the rear louver, which is presently a piece of plexiglass. The window frame is missing. A new mechanical system will be installed in the attic and additional louvers are needed. The intake louver along a campus walkway will not be highly visible. He introduced a photograph with a view of the Baptist Temple with Barrack Hall that depicted a bridge connecting two buildings. Mr. Jacobs opined that the architectural photographer took the photograph from this vantage point because the building is meant to be seen in this way, especially the view of the north wall.

The applicant noted the deteriorating stained glass window along the side facade that has not been maintained. If it is to be retained, its restoration would be an extensive project for a secondary feature. The alternative to removing this window for a vent would be installing vent dormers. The president of the University has rejected that option. Mr. Cluver commented that the use of stained glass indicates the primacy of the feature. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the existing cupolas could be used for ventilation. Mr. Jacobs explained that those features could not handle the volume of air needed for this large theatre. The Committee members agreed that vented dormers were a preferable option. Mr. Jacobs reported that they had hoped to pull air in through the chimney, but it was found to be only 12 inches wide. Mr. Culver suggested further exploration. Mr. Jacobs suggested an alternative involving the removal of the stained glass from the window and installation of new louvers behind the existing tracery. The Committee members considered the stained glass too important a feature to sacrifice.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the rear louver, but denial of the removal of the stained glass window and installation of a louver, pursuant to Standard 2 and 9.

1723 PORTER STREET

Owner: Louis & Maryann Acciavatti

Applicant: Liz Pisano

History: Built c. 1910, Girard Estate Historic District

Project: Legalize rear addition, and restore front façade.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a rear addition conditioned upon the restoration of the front façade. The current owner purchased the property in 2003. In November 2003, he submitted an application to the Commission for the construction of a two-story rear addition. The Commission approved it. However, the rear addition was not built as per plans. The applicant then submitted an application seeking to legalize the changes to the rear addition. These changes included the addition of a balcony, rear door, and other changes, however, it did not include a change in height. The Commission approved the changes in August 2004. Subsequently, the addition was constructed two feet higher than approved, making it higher than the historic building. The applicant submitted yet another application to legalize the height difference in February 2006. The Commission denied that application.

The owner now presents an application that seeks to legalize the addition as constructed, and in exchange he proposes to restore the front façade of the building. The façade restoration is based on historic photographs and surviving fabric on the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the legalization of the rear addition, provided the front façade is fully restored.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal. Property owner Louis Acciavatti and Lawrence Gilbert representing the proposal.

Mr. Amburn asked the applicant why the height of the addition as built differed from the height on the approved submission. Mr. Acciavatti stated that the height of the as built addition is the same as the height of the addition shown on the plans, but the plans themselves were inaccurate; they wrongly showed the height of the historic building and addition as identical. He stated that the ceiling in the bedroom would be too low if he had constructed the addition according to the plans. Mr. Baron explained that there was an inconsistency between drawing and the annotated height on the drawing. Mr. Amburn agreed that the legalization of the rear was an acceptable trade off for the restoration of the front façade. Mr. McCoubrey noting that the vinyl siding would be removed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the legalization of the rear addition, provided the front façade is fully restored, with the staff to review details.

1701-09 ARCH STREET

Owner / Applicant: 1701 Partners, LP

History: c. 1915, Ballinger & Perrot, architect/engineers

Project: Install storefronts

OVERVIEW: This application presents two proposals for the installation of storefronts. The original storefronts are only known through photographs, and it is difficult to assess whether the existing remnants are original or date to the expansion of the building. The applicant proposes two alternatives. Option One would be a glazed curtain wall system that closely matches the historic dimensions, and is able to incorporate a recreated bronze trim piece molding. Option Two is a thicker square post aluminum storefront system that would recreate neither the dimensions nor trim of the historic remnants found on the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the structurally glazed curtain wall system, pursuant to Standards 4, 5, and 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Preservation consultant Robert Powers and architect Robert Snow represented the application.

Mr. Snow introduced a revised plan to the Committee, which he called Option Three. This option would have a thicker internal structure behind the glass, with butt glazed corners and applied non-structural base trim to match the historic moldings. He noted that the owners were hesitant about this glazed curtain wall system. He added that the system was not designed for storefront installations.

Mr. Clover requested clarification on the corner detail for the curtain wall system. Mr. Snow explained that the corner was designed to be open. Ms. Hawkins suggested a rounded plain cap applied to the curtain wall system. Mr. Baron commented that the rounded plate corner cap is not of the same period as the historic storefront. He opined that the trim pieces should copy the bronze trim, not the aluminum piece. Mr. Snow explained that he had looked at many examples of storefronts from the same period along Chestnut and Walnut Streets, and that they all had a rounded cap similar to the remnant found on site. He also added that there were about seven storefront types in the building and none of them had the copper trim applied to the corner. Mr. Snow stated that the corner could also be channeled to appropriately shed water from the corner. He stated that this was the least preferred system owing to the complexities of its installation. He then proposed that they could cover the corner with a finishing strip to match the original storefront molding only wider owing to the thickness of the double glazing. Mr. Evans commented that the curtain wall system seems to be the best match, but that the corner must be capped. Mr. Snow did not object, but stated that it would be a tricky installation detail.

Randall Cotton of the Preservation Alliance supported Option Three, saying he understood the applicants' arguments about the expense and practicality.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of Option 3, the structural glazed curtain wall with an applied rounded corner cap, with the staff to review the details.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:45 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.

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.