

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

**TUESDAY, 22 FEBRUARY 2011
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, chair
John Cluver
Shawn Evans
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Lorna Katz-Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
I.C. Wang, UCI Architects
Fon Wang, UCI Architects
L.S. Taub, Ed.D., Head of School, Pennsylvania School for the Deaf
Y. DiFederico, Pennsylvania School for the Deaf
Cindy Hamilton, Heritage Consulting
Jack Paruta, Gensler
Ken Reynolds, Kimpton Hotels & Restaurants
Robert Brownholtz
Brent Waterman
Da'Ron M. Ravnell, Unique Metal Concepts, LLC
Richard Maimone, Kieran Timberlake
Marilia Rodrigues, Kieran Timberlake
Andrew Scott, Urban Engineers
Susan Weiler, Olin Studio
Richard Roark, Olin Studio
Nancy Goldenberg, Center City District
Paul Levy, Center City District
Kazi Hassan, Pennoni
Jeremy Colello, Pennoni
Chris Bergerson, Philadelphia Water Department
Jessica Brooks, Philadelphia Water Department
James Campbell, Campbell Thomas Architects
Theresa Stuhlman, Department of Parks & Recreation

Joe Jancuska, j2a Architects
Audrey Johnson-Thornton, American Women's Heritage Society
Frank Reis, Walnut Tree, Inc.
Maria Van Wollen
Paul Steinke, Reading Terminal Market
Tony Bracali, Friday Architects

CALL TO ORDER

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

100-52 W SCHOOL HOUSE LA

Project: Construct rear addition

Type of Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Pennsylvania School for the Deaf

Applicant: Fon S. Wang, UCI Architects, Inc.

History: 1760, Jacob Knor, master builder, Germantown Academy (Pennsylvania School for the Deaf)

Individual Designation: 6/26/1956

District Designation: None

OVERVIEW: Overview: This application proposes an in-concept review of a rear façade addition at the main building of the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf. The applicant presented an in-concept application at the Commission's December 2010 meeting. The Historical Commission approved the addition's location and massing during its December meeting. The applicant now proposes in-concept approval of the design. The location and massing have been conceptually approved.

The original school building was constructed in the 1760s and then added to at the rear in 1880 and again in 1904. The original eighteenth-century structure is one of the most historically significant buildings in the city. The proposed addition would connect to the 1904 wing, not the eighteenth-century portion of the building. All three sections of the building are finished in Wissahickon Schist and both the 1880 and 1904 additions were designed in a Colonial Revival style to complement the original Georgian building. The proposed addition would necessitate the removal of a portion of the rear façade of the 1904 wing. The existing Wissahickon Schist cladding stone would be salvaged and reuse in the new construction. The proposed addition is made of two components, one main addition that would connect to the rear façade of the 1904 wing and a second addition that would connect to the rear façade of a 1980s connector piece. The applicant proposes a design that directly responds to the comments received during the Architectural Committee and Commission meetings. The original design was specifically criticized for the design of the fenestration, the ratio of solid versus void and the choice of cladding materials. The applicant has addressed all three elements in the new application. The current design places the addition recessed from the corners of the 1904 wing. These setbacks preserve the original massing of the wing. The addition now presents a more solid appearance and it reserves the salvaged Wissahickon stone to a water table only. The rest of the elevation would be clad in stucco. The windows have been made more complementary to the originals, although they are clearly of contemporary design and scale. The addition to the 1980s connector to the northeast continues the same one-story massing as the main addition. The

applicant eliminated the hip roof as originally proposed and now proposes a shed roof that matches the one over the main addition. The proposed design has been simplified overall and made much more sympathetic to the scale and massing of the 1904 wing as well as the 1980s connector piece. The staff notes that the applicant has successfully integrated the Committee's comments and guidance received during its earlier review.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in-concept, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Commissions in-concept approval for the addition's massing and location of 10 December 2010.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Fon and Ignatius Wang and Head of School Larry Taub represented the application.

Mr. Danta presented a photograph that showed that the proposed addition would not be visible from Greene Street. He distributed it to the Committee members. Ms. Hawkins acknowledged the letter received from the Philadelphia Archeological Forum. She stated that the letter indicates that the Forum recommends a Phase I archeological investigation for this site. Mr. Danta gave a copy of the letter to the applicant.

Ms. Wang presented the project to the Committee. She stated that the current conceptual design incorporates the comments from the earlier Committee and Commission reviews. She noted that the most important comment received during the earlier review was that the original design overwhelmed the historic building. She stated that the revised design tries to be very respectful of the historic building and to limit its impact. She elaborated on specific design features such as the window patterns, which are taken from the 1980s addition. She pointed out the setbacks at the corners of the 1904 wing. Ms. Wang stated that the setbacks were a very positive change that addressed the earlier criticisms of the massing, which some thought overwhelmed the historic building.

Ms. Hawkins requested clarification on the proposed materials for the addition. Ms. Wang stated that the watertable would be Wissahickon Schist with stucco above it; the roof would be standing seam metal, and the windows would be aluminum. Ms. Hawkins inquired about the materials for the entryway. Ms. Wang explained that the entryway would be framed in limestone panels. Mr. Evans asked if the pediment above the door would also be limestone. Ms. Wang answered positively. Mr. Evans asked if the sides of the roof over the addition would be standing seam metal as well. Ms. Wang answered positively.

Mr. Evans asked if the gable roof over the addition would extend to the wall of the 1904 addition, which would necessitate noticeable step flashing. Ms. Wang answered that the gable would only be located in the front portion of the addition and the rest of the roof would be flat. Mr. Evans noted that such a detail would create a valley in the middle of the roof.

Ms. Hawkins inquired if the owner anticipated conducting an archeological investigation as advised by the Philadelphia Archeological Forum. Ms. Wang answered that they had not anticipated such an investigation.

Mr. Evans stated that the limestone around the entrance door seems awkward. Ms. Gutterman agreed and encouraged further studies for this element. Mr. McCoubrey found the entranceway oddly scaled. He suggested that the entrance way should not go beyond the line of the roof. He suggested that the entranceway be more squat and have a lower profile. Mr. McCoubrey inquired if a full gable rather than the gable/flat roof combination currently presented had been

considered. Ms. Wang stated that the original design showed a full gable, but the Committee found it to compete with and overwhelm the 1904 wing. Ms. Hawkins stated that the combination of the two roofs would create drainage issues. She encouraged the applicant to study the details carefully. Ms. Hawkins agreed with Mr. McCoubrey's comments regarding the entranceway. She encouraged an entranceway with a lower profile.

Mr. Taub stated that the Committee's comments were very welcomed by the School. He stated that the School must have a prominent entrance on this side of the campus. He stated that this area of the campus does not currently have a clear entrance and the proposed addition with its gabled entranceway would provide the visitor with a clear entry point. Mr. Taub explained the height of the entranceway also derived from the specific requirements of the School regarding glare and the use of natural light into the space. He noted that the design was not just architectural but also functional. Mr. McCoubrey clarified that he was suggesting widening the entranceway, not eliminating it. He explained that by widening it the entranceway would be more complementary to the proposed massing and still have the visual focal point desired by the School. The other Committee members agreed with Mr. McCoubrey's comments.

Mr. Cluver opined that the roof over the addition would be more elegant if the sides were terminated in hips, rather than the flat and abrupt break currently proposed.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance concurred with all the Committee's comments. He stated that the design is completely acceptable for conceptual review and approval. Mr. Gallery inquired about an inaccuracy in the drawing. He asked if the entranceway would protrude beyond the plane of the wall. He stated that the stone watertable seemed unusually high. He encouraged the architect to lower the watertable.

Mr. Culver agreed with Mr. Gallery's comment regarding the height of the watertable. He added that the weathervane over the door is an odd choice. Weathervanes are usually located at the peaks of buildings, where they encounter unobstructed wind currents. He encouraged a revision of this element.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend in-concept approval, provided the height of the entranceway is lowered and a Phase 1A archeological study is conducted.

433-41 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Construct rooftop addition

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: KHP II Chestnut, LLC

Applicant: Jack Paruta, Gensler & Associates

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

Individual Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a roof-top addition. The Lafayette Building was recently sold to Kimpton Hotels, which will rehabilitate the building for hotel use. The rehabilitation of the building has been divided into three phases. Phase One proposed the rehabilitation of the interior, the restoration of the exterior masonry, and the replacement of all windows from the second-floor and up. Phase One was reviewed and approved by the staff.

Phase Two proposes the construction of a roof-top addition. Phase Three will propose the rehabilitation of the ground-floor of the building. Phase Three will be submitted at some point in the future and it is not currently under consideration.

Phase Two is the only portion of the rehabilitation under consideration as part of this application. The roof-top addition would be located on the center of the roof of the building. The addition would be one-story. It would have associated outdoor space. The southwest and northwest corner pavilions would be rehabilitated for a lounge as part of this roof-top addition program. The rehabilitation of the corner pavilions would necessitate the removal of existing windows and masonry to create access points. The affected areas are not visible from any point at street-level. The pavilions, however, have elaborate terracotta cornices which should not be altered. The staff contends that even if the cornices at the pavilions cannot be appreciated by the public at street level they must be preserved owing to their character defining qualities and the building's classification as "Significance" in the Old City Historic District inventory. The architect should submit more detailed information on the alterations to the masonry of the corner pavilions.

The building has four corner pavilions and a massive parapet. The parapet and pavilions would make the addition nearly invisible. The applicant has submitted sight line studies to show that the addition would be invisible from more than a block away. The staff contends that, even if the addition is somewhat visible, the impact would be negligible. The addition would not be visible from Independence Hall.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the terracotta cornices on the corner pavilions are not removed or altered, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Preservation consultant Cindy Hamilton, architect Jack Paruta, and hotel representative Ken Reynolds represented the application.

Mr. Paruta presented the proposal to the Committee. Mr. Paruta stated that the roof would be lowered and the proposed deck would sit lower than the existing roof. The pavilions would be rehabilitated as lounges for the outdoor bar. Ms. Hawkins asked if the elevator shafts would be extended to service the roof. Mr. Paruta explained that they would not; instead a new elevator would be installed. The new elevator would run between the 10th floor and the roof to take visitors to the roof.

Ms. Hawkins asked of the sight-line studies represented the top of the addition or the elevator towers. Mr. Paruta answered that the studies show the highest point, which would be the addition.

Mr. Danta asked the applicant to elaborate on how the new addition would engage with the existing pavilions. Mr. Paruta answered that the addition would not attach to the pavilions. The roof over the addition would not impact the highly decorative cornices on the pavilions. The new roof would come close to the cornices on the pavilions, but not touch them.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the users of the new rooftop space would be able to view the city. Mr. Paruta answered that the parapet would not allow views onto the city. However, some views would be available from the corner pavilions. Mr. Evans categorized the scheme as "crazy." He could not comprehend why the applicant would not take advantage of this location and provide

the users of the rooftop lounge with spectacular views of the city. He stated that the Commission is often concerned with minimizing the impact of rooftop additions on historic buildings, but he thought this was a wonderful opportunity to create a very contemporary rooftop addition that engaged with the city. He asked if the architectural team had considered other more conspicuous options. Mr. Paruta answered that they had certainly considered others options, but had decided that any addition that would provide views of the city would also be visible from the city. He explained that they sought to create an inconspicuous addition to comply with preservation standards. Ms. Gutterman asked if a two-level terrace had been considered. Mr. Paruta answered that one had not been considered. Mr. Evans thought this project would be a missed opportunity if it does not provide views. Ms. Hawkins and Gutterman agreed with Mr. Evan. Mr. Paruta noted that they had considered but rejected cutting down the windows in the pavilions to allow for better views. This option would interrupt the horizontality of the cornice and alter the original design of the building. He concluded that they elected to be respectful of the historic building.

Ms. Hawkins asked if all air condensing units would be located towards the eastern portion of the roof. Mr. Paruta answered that they would be located towards the east. He stated that he did not anticipate any visibility issues with the mechanical equipment. He added that, if they were forced to add more units, then they would not be located on the rooftop addition and would not be visible.

Mr. Cluver asked if the fireplace would have a chimney stack. Mr. Paruta answered that the fireplace would be a ventless gas fireplace and would not require a chimney. Mr. Cluver asked about the pitch of the flat roof on the addition. Mr. Paruta answered that the roof would pitch towards the east. The highest point shown on the sight-line study would be the highest point of the roof and the pitch would slope down from that point.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the materials for the addition. Mr. Paruta answered that the addition would be clad in metal panels. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the panels be lighter to match the existing light-colored terracotta around it. Mr. Paruta stated that they would like to have a contrasting color. He noted that the addition would not be visible from the public right-of-way.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance encouraged the Committee to recommend final approval as submitted. He stated that raising the deck to allow the users to view the skyline would have an adverse effect on this significant building. He noted that, although it is true that the addition would not be visible from a block away, the addition would be visible from many blocks around the city. He stated that this building has a very prominent cornice accentuated by corner pavilions and it is visible from several blocks to the west of Independence Mall. He added that the visibility would be minimal owing to the careful design the applicant is proposing. Mr. Gallery asked if the machine room on the roof would be altered with new windows. Mr. Paruta answered that the machine room would not be altered and no windows would be created at this location. It would remain as is. Mr. Gallery praised the project and its compliance with the Standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the metal panels cladding the addition are a lighter color, with the staff to review details.

413 S 09TH ST

Project: Legalize windows

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Candace Lane, LLC

Applicant: Bob Brownholtz, Candace Lane LLC

History: 1850

Individual Designation: 1/31/1961

District Designation: None

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize metal (aluminum) windows that were illegally installed in the front façade of this multi-family building. The staff approved metal windows in the rear of the property, which has very limited visibility from the public-right-of-way. The staff met the property owner on site and walked the property and discussed the scope of alterations the staff could approve as an administrative approval. The staff specifically discussed the replacement of the windows in the front façade with the property owner and his business partner during that site visit. The staff informed the property owner at that time that metal windows in the front façade would have to be reviewed for approval by the Commission. The metal windows have internal snap-on muntins. The original windows for this mid nineteenth-century building would have been wood windows. The existing illegal metal windows do not replicate the appearance, proportions and details of the original wood windows.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developers Robert Brownholtz and Brent Waterman represented the application.

Mr. Brownholtz stated that he had met Mr. Danta on site. He acknowledged that he had misunderstood the requirements. He stated that the windows for the front façade were ordered at the same time as the windows for the rear façade. He stated that they never intended to circumvent the Commission at any point during the project. He noted that it would have made no sense to follow the Commission's guidelines at the rear and not at the front façade. He reiterated that the windows had been ordered and installed owing to a misunderstanding. Mr. Brownholtz stated that they could remove the sashes and install exterior applied muntins and reinstall the sashes. He noted that this would be a much more cost-effective solution. He stated that removing and replacing all windows on the front façade result in a financial hardship.

Mr. Waterman acknowledged the misunderstanding regarding the regulations. He stated that they were trying to follow the guidelines. Ms. Hawkins explained that the Committee's charge is advisory and very limited. She stated that the windows in the front façade of a designated building should meet the Standards.

Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Danta why the windows did not replicate the original proportions. Mr. Danta explained that, because the windows are extruded metal, the rails and stiles have several extra steps which would not be found in wood windows. He also noted that the muntins are flat and located in the interior. Mr. Danta also explained that the original frames and brick molds had been retained and that the replacement windows were inserted into the existing historic frames, thus creating a more noticeable step. Mr. Brownholtz clarified that the old sash were removed and new metal units were inserted into the existing frames in the wall.

Mr. Brownholtz asked about the appropriateness of metal clad windows. Mr. Danta explained that metal clad windows can replicate the proportions of the original wood windows. He also stated that the Commission had approved metal clad windows for front facades in several instances, and that clad windows would probably be approved by the Commission for this building.

Mr. Waterman stated that several buildings around the area had aluminum windows in the front façade. Mr. Danta explained that the area is not designated as a historic district; instead, individual buildings are designated as historic. One cannot assume that every building in the area is designated and under the Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Waterman clarified that the buildings he was referring to are designated as historic. Mr. Danta stated that the staff would look into his claims if he provided the addresses. Mr. Waterman stated that seeing aluminum windows in those buildings also led them to believe that they were acceptable for this building.

Ms. Pentz stated that the Commission has a financial hardship process if the applicants claim that it would impose a hardship to replace the windows. Mr. Danta explained that hardship applications require financial information related to the property and the property owner. Mr. Cluver stated that, in this case, such a claim would not prove successful because the hardship had been self-imposed. The applicants brought the hardship on themselves when they did not follow the law. Mr. Cluver advised the applicants to take their case to the Commission.

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

1538 GREEN ST

Project: Construct residential building

Type of Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Vadim Shklovsky

Applicant: Vadim Shklovsky

History: undeveloped site

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

OVERVIEW: This application was submitted for review and comment as it proposes to construct a new building on an undeveloped site. The building would be a three-story, single-family, semi-detached dwelling. Decks are proposed for the rear at the second and third floor, as well as on the roof along with a pilot house. Bay windows and an interior garage are proposed for the side elevation. The building would be clad in brick veneer. The window and door surrounds will be cast stone or marble, cost depending. The cornice and bays would have a faux wood finish and the entrance and garage doors would have a mahogany finish. An arched opening with balcony is proposed for the second-floor front façade. Please note that the floor plans do not match the elevation drawings for the front façade.

STAFF COMMENT: In general, the staff comments favorably. However, the staff comments that the front door should be coupled with the neighboring door as that is the pattern of the block. Full brick should be used instead of veneer brick. The arched opening on the second-floor front façade, which is not compatible with the historic district, should be redesigned.

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

Mr. Cluver noted that the floor plans have an older date than the elevations. This led him to believe that the applicant intends to build the house as shown in elevation, not in plan. He also stated that the window sills do not match the neighboring property. Mr. Evans stated that the details concerning the attachment of the cornice to the neighboring property should be designed carefully so as not to inflict any damage to the neighboring historic cornice. Mr. Cluver stated that the house that stood on this parcel likely matched the neighboring building. Mr. Evans stated that such a hypothesis is valid. However, he noted that the extant doorway in the neighboring building appears intact, which leads him to believe that the building could have been different. Mr. Evans opined that a simplified doorway as proposed is acceptable and in keeping with the Standards.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the pilothouse should be located to the east of the property, along the party wall. She stated that the pilot house should not be highly visible from 16th Street. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the front garden should match the neighboring garden wall to respect the integrity of this block.

Ms. Gutterman stated that the location of the entryway should be located to the east of the façade to preserve the character of the block and the typical historic pattern one finds in rows of this period.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Committee should give the applicant very precise comments to make them as helpful as possible, given that he was not present for this review.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee comments that the front door should be coupled with the neighboring door; the construction and attachments of the new entryway and cornice should not adversely impact the existing historic building; full bricks should be used instead of veneer bricks; compatible cladding materials such as cast stone to match marble should be used for lintels and sills; two windows should replace the proposed arched window with balcony at the second-floor front; the structural stability of the existing party wall should be taken into consideration.

613 PINE ST

Project: Convert walled parking area to carport

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Scott Levin

Applicant: Scott Levin

History: 1983, David Porter, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a steel and glass canopy over the rear yard. The canopy would be supported by the existing concrete-masonry brick garden walls that line the rear of the property and steel columns. The canopy primarily consists of structural steel I-beams that criss-cross each other, glazing on the sides and a metal roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Da’Ron Ravnell represented the application.

Mr. Ravnell stated that the owner would like to cover the backyard to prevent snow and water from accumulating in this area of the yard. He stated that the property owner parks collectible antique cars in this area and he wishes to protect them from the elements.

Mr. Ravnell stated that he had hired an engineer to design the structural elements. He stated that the existing walls are made of concrete block with brick veneer. Ms. Gutterman stated that the roof is not a canopy as presented in the overview, but a roof. The parking area would be turned into a garage.

Ms. Pentz asked if the roof would have a concrete bed beneath. Mr. Ravnell said that he would not do a concrete bed, but wanted to consider a green roof. Mr. Cluver stated that roof would then be much taller if a green roof is installed on it. Ms. Gutterman asked if a wall would enclose the garage from the back yard. Mr. Ravnell said that it would be open, but it could be enclosed depending on what the owner decides. Ms. Hawkins stated that the application would require a zoning review as well.

Mr. Ravnell stated that the existing garden walls are lower than the neighbors. He stated that the walls would be build up to match the existing neighboring wall. Ms. Gutterman asked about the configuration of the roof. Mr. Ravnell stated that the roof would be a hip roof with four corner gutters. Ms. Gutterman stated that the drawings do not show a hip roof and they also do not show gutters or downspouts. He stated that the roof portion of the project is not his responsibility and that he would only be involved in the construction of the structure. Ms. Hawkins expressed hesitation about reviewing drawings that do not show the roof structure accurately. She stated that the Committee could not accurately understand how the roof addition would look and what impact it would have on the designated building and the neighboring buildings.

Mr. Evans asked if the Commission had approved the construction of the garden wall. Mr. Danta stated that the date of the wall was not known, but that the house had been built in 1983.

Lorna Katz, representing Society Hill Civic Association, stated that this block has garages that face a public school.

Mr. Cluver agreed with Ms. Hawkin’s comments and noted that the drawings were missing key elements. He stated that the appearance of the garage and its impact on the neighboring buildings could not be discerned from the submitted drawings.

Ms. Katz stated that the property owner should present his proposal to the Zoning Committee of the Society Hill Civic Association.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness.

1400 JOHN F KENNEDY BLV

Project: Rehabilitate Dilworth Plaza

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Paul R Levy, Center City District

History: 1970, Vincent Kling, architect, City Hall, Dilworth Plaza

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

Interior Designation: 11/12/2010, City Council Chambers

District Designation: None

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to Dilworth Plaza, the open space on the west side of City Hall. It proposes alterations at and below grade and will link with a separate project to rehabilitate the below-grade transit stations.

The Historical Commission designated City Hall as historic on May 28, 1957. At that time, the City Hall parcel was smaller than it is today. An arm of Broad Street ran along the west side of City Hall. To compensate for the loss of public space with the construction of the Municipal Services Building, the City vacated the block of Broad Street along City Hall and created a public space extending west from City Hall to 15th Street. Named for Mayor Dilworth, the plaza was designed by architect Vincent Kling and constructed between 1966 and 1974. Although Dilworth Plaza was not part of the site when City Hall was designated, it is now under the Commission's jurisdiction.

The Center City District in partnership with the City and Septa is proposing to alter Dilworth Plaza to overcome a series of chronic problems with the space related to maintenance, circulation, assembly, amenities, drainage, transit access, and disabled access. The application proposes to remove all at- and above-grade structures on the plaza, cover the sunken plaza, and create a lawn, water feature, glass-covered entrances to the concourse, and a small food service building. The plaza would be regraded and new landscaping and paving would be added.

The Commission approved the project in concept in May 2009. The approval in concept granted approvals to the locations and massings of the lawn, water feature, arced glass entranceways to the concourse level, and the café building with entrance to the transit level at the northern edge of the plaza. At that time, the Commission determined that the 1970s plaza had not achieved its own historic significance and could be removed as an alteration, not a demolition, in the legal senses of the words.

The current application proposes a detailed design for the new plaza and features that adheres to the location and massing parameters established by the in-concept approval. The entranceways will be arced in elevation and fully glazed, as originally proposed. Except at the entrance openings, the above-grade sections of the entranceways will be bounded by metal railings. The café building with transit entrance will have an exposed steel frame, steel panels, and glazing, some with a ceramic frit. Its arced roof will allude to the arced entranceways. A small elevator enclosure is proposed for the area south of the southern entranceway. The lawn and fountain are proposed as they were in the in-concept application. Paving, benches, bollards, light fixtures, and landscaping are also proposed. The new structures will not impact views of the historic building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Rehabilitation Standards 2, 4, 5, 9, and 10.

The features and spaces of Dilworth Plaza that would be altered and/or removed do not characterize the historic property. Dilworth Plaza has not acquired historic significance in its own right. The alteration of the plaza will not destroy historic materials. The new plaza will be differentiated from but compatible with City Hall. If the plaza alterations and additions are removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of City Hall and its environment will be unimpaired.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Richard Maimone and Marilia Rodrigues, engineer Andrew Scott, landscape architects Susan Weiler and Richard Roark, and Nancy Goldenberg and Paul Levy of the Center City District represented the application.

The applicants distributed an additional bound set of images to accompany their presentation. Ms. Goldenberg explained that, owing to federal funding, the project is also undergoing a Section 106 review.

Mr. Maimone summarized the project. He stated that the goals and overall design have not changed since the in-concept review, but the design has been refined. He explained that the entrances will be 17'-10" at their highest points. The café will be 14'-0" at its highest point. The views of City Hall will not be obscured. He stated that the entrance pavilions will be made entirely of structural glass, without any metal or other hardware. The laminated glass panels will be joined with a high-performance sealant. The glass panels will be 2" to 2-½" thick.

Mr. Maimone stated that the below-ground concourse design has been revised. Rather than a large open space, the primary space will be an axial corridor.

Mr. Maimone discussed the food service building. It will include a snack bar as well as stairs and an elevator to the concourse. The curved roof is intended to pick up on the glass pavilions.

Mr. Maimone stated that the pedestrian crossings across 15th Street will be shortened at John F. Kennedy Boulevard and Market Street. Ms. Hawkins asked about parking along 15th Street. Ms. Goldenberg stated that regulating the parking along the street is outside the purview of the project.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the materials for the food service building. Mr. Maimone stated that it will have an exposed steel frame, steel panels, and glazing, some with a ceramic frit.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the new, freestanding elevator toward the southern end of the plaza. Mr. Maimone stated that the elevator was originally going to be incorporated into the southern glass pavilion. However, owing to engineering and transit station requirements, it had to be moved out of the pavilion, to the south. The small elevator building will be glass on the east and west and graphics panels on the north and south. It will have a small projecting canopy to shield users as they wait for the elevator in the rain. Mr. Cluver asked why an additional elevator beyond the one at the food service building was needed. Mr. Maimone replied that the Septa station must meet ADA requirements; one elevator in this large area was not enough.

Mr. Evans asked why the project did not continue around City Hall. Ms. Goldenberg explained that this project could not address the entire area. She noted that the City Planning Commission is studying other aspects of the City Hall site.

Mr. Evans asked how the new paving would connect with City Hall itself. Ms. Weiler stated that the grade would not change around City Hall. Ms. Gutterman asked about physical connection between the new paving and the exterior of City Hall. Mr. Scott explained that there will be an expansion joint between the new paving and the building.

Mr. Cluver opined that the grass area will turn into a “dustbowl.” Ms. Weiler stated that the grass will be able to be maintained in a good condition. Mr. Maimone explained that the Center City District will maintain the plaza.

Mr. Cluver asked about the edges of the glass pavilions. Mr. Maimone stated that they will be surrounded by railings. Ms. Goldenberg stated that the Center City District will provide 24-hour security.

Mr. Cluver asked about lighting. Mr. Maimone stated that the lighting is being developed. It will be relatively low lit, welcoming, and safe. He explained that they will propose a few high masts as well as a few pedestrian-scaled masts. The granite benches will have lights. The glass pavilions will be lighted at the pavement surface. Mr. Maimone concluded that the lighting will be subtle. The ice rink lighting will not be permanent; it will be seasonal. A power infrastructure will be incorporated into the plaza.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the trees. Ms. Weiler stated that they will be honey locust and others and will have light foliage, allowing views through them.

Mr. Maimone stated that the standard Walk Philadelphia and Septa signage programs will be used, but will be adapted for this site.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the rigid geometry may be beautiful, but people will take the shortest paths across the plaza. She suggested introducing diagonal paths.

Ms. Goldenberg stated that the Phoenix Rising sculpture, which is currently on the recessed plaza, will be relocated outside Dilworth Plaza.

No public comments were offered.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Rehabilitation Standards 2, 4, 5, 9, and 10.

2002-06 TRENTON AVE

Project: Replace historic paving with storm water management system

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia and Conrail

Applicant: Christopher Bergerson, Philadelphia Water Department

History: 1890, street paving

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Historic Street Paving Thematic Historic District, Contributing, 12/9/1998

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconfigure the street bed, curbs, and sidewalks along the west side of Trenton Avenue between Norris and Berges Streets in the Kensington section

of Philadelphia. The granite-block street bed is designated as historic as part of the Historic Street Paving Thematic Historic District. Most of Trenton Avenue is 60 feet in width, but this section flares out from 60 feet in width to 120 feet in width. The flare was added to the street between 1888 and 1904 to accommodate additional railroad tracks. Several sets of railroad tracks ran along Trenton Avenue to a Pennsylvania Railroad depot and yard to the south of Norris Street. The depot and yard are no longer extant.

The west curb line of Trenton Avenue would be relocated, narrowing the street bed to 60 feet, the width of the street to the north of Berges Street. The triangle of land removed from the street bed would be reused as rain garden to manage storm water. It would be one component of a very large Philadelphia Water Department initiative to manage storm water and reduce combined-sewer overflows throughout the city. The historic street paving material removed for the garden would be relaid along Trenton Avenue to repair the cartway, which is in poor condition and includes a large concrete patch that predates the designation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.7):

In making its determination as to the appropriateness of proposed alterations, demolition or construction, the Commission shall consider the following:

(.7) In specific cases as will not be contrary to the public interest, where, owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions of this section would result in unnecessary hardship so that the spirit of this section shall be observed and substantial justice done, subject to such terms and conditions as the Commission may decide, the Commission shall by a majority vote grant an exemption from the requirements of this section.

The public benefit derived from the reduction of the combined-sewer overflows resulting from this project would significantly exceed the public benefit derived from this small section of historic street paving, which is in poor condition.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Engineers Kazi Hassan and Jeremy Colello and Philadelphia Water Department representatives Chris Bergerson and Jessica Brooks represented the application.

Mr. Bergerson summarized the project for the Committee, showing photographs of the area. He stated that the granite block would be reused on site as a curb for the rain garden. He stated that settled areas in the street will be repaired. Mr. Hassan stated that much of the rain garden area is currently a concrete patch in the street. Mr. Cluver asked if any remnants of the railroad track remain. Mr. Bergerson stated that there are some subsurface remains. Mr. Cluver stated that he could accept the redevelopment of the flare in the street because it has lost its context; nothing survives to tell us that it was flared to accommodate railroad tracks. Ms. Brooks stated that the neighborhood identified this corner as a good site for a rain garden. Mr. McCoubrey asked why the new curb on Norris Street would be concrete, but the curb on Trenton Avenue would be granite. Mr. Bergerson responded that they will continue the existing materials. The transition will occur at the ADA ramp at the corner.

No public comments were offered.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.7).

2000 BELMONT MANSION DR

Project: Construct banquet facility and linking vestibule

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Joseph Jancuska, j2a Architects

History: 1750

Individual Designation: 6/26/1956

District Designation: None

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a revised design for banquet facilities at Belmont Mansion in Fairmount Park. The Historical Commission reviewed and denied an application in January 2011. The City owns the highly significant historic house in Fairmount Park. It is currently managed by the American Women's Heritage Society and operated as a banquet and event facility and the Underground Railroad Museum. The building is one of the country's most significant early mansions. Although many preservationists advocated for removing the third floor, which was added later and suffered from structural defects, the building was rehabilitated with the third floor to its mid nineteenth-century appearance about five years ago. The mansion is currently fully restored.

A concrete pad was installed to the south of the mansion several years ago to support a tent that is used for catered events like weddings and corporate affairs. The earlier application proposed removing the concrete pad and tent and erecting a freestanding pavilion to the south of the house. The current application no longer proposes a freestanding pavilion. The concrete pad for the tent would be retained. The Historical Commission's files do not include any record of its approval of this concrete pad, even though it was added many years after Belmont was designated as historic.

The earlier application proposed constructing a large addition to house a banquet room, kitchen, and storage at the rear of the outbuilding that stands to the southwest of the house. The outbuilding, called the cottage complex, was constructed in several campaigns from the eighteenth century to the 1980s. The current application also proposes an addition in the same location, but its design has been significantly revised to include many suggestions offered by the Committee and Commission. Most notably, the new design for the addition includes a pitched, standing-seam metal roof and more glazing.

The earlier application proposed a glazed vestibule that would connect the main house to the even older cottage building and its additions. It would connect to the house under a corner of the porch and extend out from the porch to the rear building. Although there had been a non-historic vestibule at this location at one time, it was removed as part of the recent restoration of the mansion. The current application still proposes the linking vestibule. The vestibule would introduce an asymmetry to the otherwise restored symmetrical house.

The earlier application proposed a new entrance gate with stone pillars at the driveway. The gate has been deleted from the current application. Like the earlier application, the current application proposes a series of changes to the grounds including repaving the parking area. It should be noted that the site plan, which was based on the earlier design, is no longer accurate, but was included with the current application.

Although the application proposes significant earth disturbing activities for foundations for the new construction, it does not address the question of archaeology. The historical significance of

this site warrants archaeological protections. Before any earth is disturbed, a Phase 1A archaeology study should be undertaken to determine the potential impact to archaeological resources. If the study indicates that important resources will be impacted, then additional archaeological investigations should be undertaken.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the addition, paving, and landscaping; denial of the vestibule, provided archaeological resources are protected, with the staff to review details including all archaeological studies and conclusions, pursuant to Standards 2, 8, 9, 10 and the Site and Settings Guidelines.

In general, the application complies with the cited Rehabilitation Standards and Guidelines. However, the vestibule does not comply with Standards 2 and 9. It alters the symmetry and spatial relations of the newly restored eighteenth-century mansion.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Joe Jancuska, Audrey Johnson-Thornton of the American Women's Heritage Society, and Theresa Stuhlman of the Department of Parks & Recreation represented the application.

Mr. Jancuska stated that he has attempted to incorporate the comments of the Architectural Committee and Commission into this revised design. He stated that he has eliminated the freestanding pavilion, to which most reviewers had objected. Mr. Jancuska stated that he was planning to reuse the existing gates rather than replace the gates. He added that he is no longer proposing the lamps at the gates; the new site lighting for the parking lot will illuminate the gate area. He stated that he is still proposing the site work, landscaping, fencing, and gate and walk to the off-site parking. Mr. Cluver asked about the extant gate. Mr. Jancuska replied that it is a black wrought-iron gate. Ms. Pentz stated that the applicants should update their site plan to reflect the current proposal. Mr. Jancuska responded that he would update it once he knew what was acceptable to the Commission. Mr. Baron asked Mr. Jancuska if the fencing and lighting were part of today's application. Mr. Jancuska responded that he was seeking approval of them. Mr. Baron told him that he must provide documentation of the proposed fencing and lighting before the Commission can act on those aspects of the application. It was noted that these aspects of the application may fall within the staff's purview to review. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Jancuska to describe the storm water management issues at the site. He responded that they would adjust the grade of the parking lot slightly to compel the water to drain off it appropriately. Ms. Hawkins asked about the archaeological implications of regrading the parking lot. Mr. Jancuska replied that they would only be changing the grade an inch or two; the regrading would not have any implications for archaeological resources. The existing paving would be maintained and a new layer installed on top of it. Mr. Baron asked Mr. Jancuska to describe the new fencing. Mr. Jancuska stated that they would replace the chain link fence with a black, aluminum, six-foot estate fence.

Mr. Jancuska stated that the rear addition has been revised to be lighter with more glazing. The building now has a tiered roof system with the slope of the porch roof and the metal roofing found throughout the site. The glazing is light grey with a clear anodized aluminum framing system. He stated that he wanted the framing to disappear into the glass. Mr. Cluver noted that the banquet room will have a partition that can be used to divide it into two spaces. He asked if there will be a wide mullion where the partition hits the window. Mr. Jancuska replied that the partition will have a gasket that will seal at the glass. He stated that he wants the windows on all sides of the banquet room to look the same from the exterior.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the exterior cladding materials. Mr. Jancuska stated that the cornice profile would match the cornice on the mansion in size, but not profile. It will probably be an Azek material. The walls would be stucco painted to match the other stucco on the site.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the roof design. He asked if it was intended to bring light in or add character to the banquet space. Mr. Jancuska stated that the ceiling in the banquet room would not be vaulted. The raised roof would not be visible in the interior. It was added for massing purposes, to improve the exterior appearance. Mr. Jancuska stated that the design breaks up the roof, which would have had too much contiguous metal otherwise. Mr. Cluver asked about the color of the metal roof. Mr. Jancuska replied that it would match the other metal roofs at the site. Mr. Cluver suggested that the architect review the entire color package for the addition. Mr. Jancuska responded that he is using colors already found at the site. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he thinks that a simpler roof system might be more appropriate. Mr. Jancuska commented that he would be willing to accept either roof, the more complex one he proposed or a simpler roof. Mr. Baron asked the Committee members if they had a preference for one roof design or the other. The Committee members responded that they preferred a simpler roof design, not the roof proposed.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he saw some benefits to the roof design that was proposed. He stated that the roof is somewhat massive and the proposed design breaks up the mass. He suggested keeping the two-tiered roof and changing the interior ceiling design to take advantage of it. He claimed that a flat ceiling would be "overwhelming." He suggested that a vaulted ceiling would be more "elegant." Mr. Jancuska stated that the ceiling would be coffered and would be symmetrical around the center line, where the partition would be located.

Mr. Jancuska stated that the vestibule between the mansion and back building would be as simple and unobtrusive as possible. It is needed to protect users from the elements. Ms. Johnson-Thornton stated that the vestibule is much needed. Ms. Hawkins stated that she was very opposed to the vestibule. Mr. Baron spoke against the vestibule, stating that the non-historic vestibule that stood in this location until recently was removed during the last restoration. Reinstalling a vestibule would destroy the symmetry of the historic building. Ms. Pentz stated that she is opposed to the vestibule. Mr. Evans asked if it would be possible to create a simple roof for the passage rather than an enclosed structure. Ms. Hawkins stated that this site would benefit from a master plan to guide its redevelopment. Ms. Johnson-Thornton stated that they must have the connection. Ms. Hawkins disagreed. She stated that the Independence Square buildings are not connected. She stated that a simple roof structure would be acceptable. Ms. Johnson-Thornton stated that she wanted a structure with sides to protect users from inclement weather. Ms. Gutterman stated that she could accept a freestanding roof that did not connect to either building. Mr. Jancuska asked if they could include fabric sides hung from the roof. The Committee members agreed that that design would be acceptable, provided it did not extend under the mansion's porch roof. Ms. Gutterman stated that the sides could be transparent. Ms. Hawkins concluded that the vestibule would not touch either historic building and would have soft, impermanent sides.

Mr. Evans asked if the concrete pad for the tent in the side yard would be retained. Ms. Pentz suggested that the Historical Commission had never reviewed or approved that pad. Mr. Baron stated that he did not believe that the Commission had ever approved the tent pad. Ms. Johnson-Thornton stated that the pad has been in place for 22 years. It was noted that the site was designated as historic more than 50 years ago.

Mr. Gallery stated that he is concerned about the proposed opaque glass spandrel panels at the banquet hall addition that would extend from the bottoms of the windows down to the ground. He stated that they seem "strange." He stated that there should be a base to the building. Mr. Jancuska stated that he is attempting to keep the building light, like a pavilion. Ms. Hawkins stated that glass spandrel panels at the ground may be easily broken. Mr. Jancuska stated that he wants a light building. Mr. McCoubrey suggested dropping the windows to the floor level. Mr. Jancuska replied that he could bring the windows down to the floor level and then run the stucco under the windows to the ground.

Mr. Baron stated that the archaeological investigations should take place before construction begins. Mr. Cluver added that the archaeology should take place before the building permit is issued. Ms. Johnson-Thornton stated that the construction must begin in March. Ms. Stuhlman noted that the State Historic Preservation Office must review the project before construction can begin.

Ms. Pentz stated that the Commission should not legalize the tent pad when approving this application.

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

1. provided the vestibule is a temporary structure with tent-like sides that does not attach to either building or the porch roof;
2. provided the two-tiered roof at the rear banquet addition is replaced with a continuously pitched roof, the windows are extended down to the floor, and the glass spandrels are replaced with a stucco base;
3. provided a Phase IA archaeological study and any other necessary archaeological studies recommended by the Phase IA are undertaken before construction begins; and,
4. provided the tent pad is not legalized;
5. with the staff to review details including the colors, materials, fence, and lighting;
6. pursuant to Standards 2, 8, 9, 10 and the Site and Settings Guidelines.

2131 ST JAMES ST

Project: Construct rear addition, add vent and skylight

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joyce Frye

Applicant: James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Company

History: 1923, Spencer Roberts, architect, English Village

Individual Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: Overview: This application proposes the construction of a single-story, rear addition that would expand an existing addition, filling in the side and rear yard. The addition would house a kitchen. The addition would include a large skylight. The application also proposes installing an exhaust fan for the stove, which would vent through a large square metal duct rising up the rear wall to above the third-story roof. The duct would be highly visible from Chancellor, Walnut, and 22nd Streets.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the addition; denial of the exhaust fan and duct, pursuant to Rehabilitation Standard 9 and the Roof Guideline.

In general, the application is compliant with the Rehabilitation Standards and the proposed improvements are appropriate. However, the materials, features, and size of the proposed exhaust fan and ductwork do not satisfy Standard 9 and the cited Roof Guideline. The exhaust system should be redesigned so that the equipment is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect James Campbell and property owner Joyce Frye represented the application.

Mr. Campbell stated that his clients are gourmet cooks and would like to install a large range with grill. The cooking equipment must be exhausted to the outside. They do not want exhaust at the roof-level of the addition because of the nearby windows. Therefore, they want to exhaust above the roofline of the main section of the house. Mr. Campbell disputed the staff's claim that the duct would be highly visible. He stated that the duct would be located 16 feet back from the face of the addition in a narrow gap between the two houses. He asserted that it would be minimally visible from Chancellor Street. He added that it could be painted to match the building behind it and could be incorporated into the interior during a subsequent renovation that the owners are planning. Mr. Cluver asked about the noise that the fan would make. Mr. Campbell responded that it would be a residential fan that would not make much noise; it would be a 3,000 cfm unit. Mr. Baron reminded the Committee that the Commission has typically required such fan ductwork to be installed in the interior. Ms. Frye stated that it would be very expensive to run the duct in the interior. Mr. Evans asked why the duct could not exhaust at the roof of the addition. Mr. Campbell stated that the goal was to get the exhaust away from the windows and skylight. Ms. Frye stated that mounting the fan on the roof of the addition would locate it directly in front of their bathroom window, obstructing the view. Mr. Evans stated that it is a question of balancing the needs of the property owner with those of the public. Ms. Pentz noted that the duct will block some of the bathroom window. Ms. Gutterman asked why it would extend above the roofline. Mr. Campbell responded that it extends up to move it away from the third-floor window.

Ms. Hawkins asked if all aspects of the project satisfy the building code. Mr. Campbell conceded that the skylight does not meet code; it is too close to the party wall. Ms. Hawkins suggested a skylight with a lower profile. Mr. Campbell stated that the skylight was chosen "to open up the space." Ms. Hawkins stated that she was opposed to the shape of the skylight. Mr. Campbell stated that the skylight will be set back from the façade and will be inconspicuous. The Committee members suggested that a hipped skylight would be preferable to a barrel-vaulted skylight.

The Committee members agreed that the addition itself was appropriate. Mr. Baron stated that, although this is the rear of a house, the facades to the east are fronts of buildings. They are carriage houses. Mr. Cluver objected to the duct. Ms. Frye advocated for extending the duct to the roof. She contended that kitchen grease would collect on the skylight and bathroom window if the range was only ventilated to the roof of the addition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the exhaust fan and duct, but approval of all other aspects of the

application, provided the skylight is hipped, not barrel-vaulted, pursuant to Rehabilitation Standard 9 and the Roof Guideline.

1001-07 S 04TH ST

Project: Legalize signage, modify cross on steeple

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Phat Quang Buddhist Congregation of USA

Applicant: Anh Minh Nguyen, Phat Quang Buddhist Congregation of USA

History: 1869, Emanuel Evangelical Church

Individual Designation: 7/23/1963

District Designation: None

OVERVIEW: The application proposes to legalize two signs that were installed on the former church building as well as to modify the cross at the peak of the steeple. One of the signs is located over the main door, hiding an original decorative frieze with the name of the church in German. The new sign is plastic and is attached with screws. The second sign, facing Washington Avenue, is attached with brackets and covers the bottom of a window. The application proposes altering the cross atop the steeple by cutting off the arms. The cross is not original. Historic photographs of the church show a weathervane where the cross now stands.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the alteration of the cross; denial of the legalization of the signs, with the staff to review details of the cross alteration to ensure that it does not create a water infiltration problem, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, and 9.

The signs cover character-defining, distinctive features, the frieze and window, and do not satisfy Standards 2, 5, and 9. The plastic signs are not compatible with the historic materials and do not satisfy Standard 9. The cross has not acquired historic significance in its own right and may be altered.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Anh Minh Nguyen represented the application.

Mr. Baron displayed photographs of the German-language relief for the Lutheran church over the main doorway, which was covered with one of the signs. He stated that the material of the relief is unknown. Ms. Pentz posited that it might be wood. She stated that she would like to see the German sign re-exposed. Mr. Baron contended that there are appropriate places for signage on this building; the locations of the installed signs are inappropriate. He noted that this application seeks legalization of the existing signs, not approval of new signs. Mr. Evans asked the applicants if they had a “spiritual” objection to exposing the old sign. Mr. Nguyen stated that he would not want to re-expose the sign for the Lutheran church because it would create confusion. He stated that the sign, cross, and style of the building all create confusion. People do not believe that it is a Buddhist temple. Mr. Nguyen noted that he has already removed the illegal sign at the window. Mr. Cluver pointed out that there is still an old sign on the building that refers to it as a church; he suggested that that sign was causing the confusion because it is in English, not German. Mr. Nguyen explained that he has already replaced the interior floor and the roof. He stated that he is committed to preserving the building. Ms. Hawkins suggested removing the plastic sign over the door to reveal the German-language sign and installing new signs for the temple elsewhere. Mr. Nguyen objected, stating that revealing the German-language sign for the former church would create confusion. Ms. Gutterman agreed and stated

that she would vote to allow a sign that covered the German-language sign as long as the German-language sign was preserved under the new sign. Mr. Evans agreed with Ms. Gutterman and contended that covering the old sign temporarily was acceptable. Mr. Evans stated that he would even support the plastic sign. He stated that the Commission should support this fledgling institution, which has stepped in to save this building. Mr. Baron claimed that the German-language sign is a character-defining element that should not be covered.

Mr. Nguyen stated that he wants to remove the arms of the cross. He explained that he would rent a crane to access it. Mr. Evans stated that the cross looks like a cheap piece of hardware that may be able to be disassembled easily. The Committee members agreed that, because it is not original or old, the cross could be modified or removed, provided the alteration does not allow water to infiltrate into the steeple. Ms. Pentz informed Mr. Nguyen that renting a high lift to access the steeple would be very expensive. She also informed him that the City now requires buildings over 60 feet in height to be inspected regularly. She suggested that, if Mr. Nguyen was going to spend the money for a high lift, he should combine the cross alteration with some other inspection and maintenance activities. She observed that the steeple is leaning and should be inspected to determine the cause of the condition. Mr. Evans agreed and stated that Mr. Nguyen should consider some interim repairs. Mr. Nguyen stated that his congregants want the cross removed. Ms. Pentz, a structural engineer, stated that she did not oppose the removal of the symbol, but she asked Mr. Nguyen to proceed cautiously. She informed him that such crosses and weather vanes are often mounted on iron rods that are structural. She suggested that he remove the cross with care because the base of it may be performing a structural function.

Mr. Nguyen again stated that he wants to cover the German-language relief identifying the building as a Lutheran Church. Ms. Gutterman stated that she would make a motion to leave the sign. Mr. Evans replied that he was confused by the proposed motion. Was Ms. Gutterman making a motion to legalize the plastic sign? Ms. Gutterman stated that she now wanted to make a motion to deny the legalization of the plastic sign over the door and require its removal to expose the German relief. Ms. Gutterman then stated that she was having second thoughts. She stated that she now would make a motion to legalize the plastic sign, leaving the German relief covered. Several Committee members expressed confusion. Ms. Hawkins asked Ms. Gutterman to make a clear motion.

FAILED MOTION: Ms. Gutterman moved to legalize the plastic sign over the door and approve the modification of the cross, with the staff to review details. Ms. Pentz seconded the motion, which failed by a vote of 2 to 4. Ms. Hawkins and Messrs. Cluver, Evans, and McCoubrey dissented.

Mr. Cluver stated that he thought that the plastic sign over the door should be removed, revealing the German-language relief, but that the word “kirche,” German for “church,” could be obscured with a banner or some other mechanism. He also opined that more appropriate signs announcing the new use for the building as Buddhist temple could be mounted near the door. He suggested that the staff could review a banner over the relief and new signs for approval. He stated that he would move to recommend denial of the legalization of the extant signs, but approval of the alteration of the cross.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the alteration of the cross, but denial of the legalization of the signs,

with the staff to review details of the cross alteration to ensure that it does not create a water infiltration problem, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, and 9.

1126-36 ARCH ST

Project: Enlarge mezzanine, construct restrooms, relocate kitchen, alter aisle, add partitions

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Reading Terminal Market

Applicant: Tony Bracali, Friday Architects/Planners, Inc.

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

Individual Designation: 2/5/1981

District Designation: None

OVERVIEW: This application proposes several changes to the interior of the Reading Terminal Market. Although the interior of the Reading Terminal Market has not been designated as historic under the Historical Commission's new interiors authority, the Commission was empowered to review proposals to alter interior of the market by ordinance in 1989, when the City accepted ownership of the Reading Terminal and leased it the Pennsylvania Convention Center Authority.

This application proposes straightening what is called Avenue D, the north-south aisle running along the eastern edge of the market. Currently, Avenue D twists and turns as it runs around the freight elevator area and other obstructions. The application proposes to straighten the aisle by shifting some vendor and storage space and then realigning the walkway.

This application also proposes creating a flexible rental room along Avenue D at the east end of the Center Court. The room would be separated from the public space by a sliding butt-glazed wall with large graphics. A very large sign reading "Center Court" would be installed over the entrance to the room. The back wall of the room would be painted with a large, bright mural with graphics.

This application also proposes demolishing the inadequate restrooms, which do not meet code, and replacing them with new, larger restrooms. Also, the demonstration kitchen would be relocated.

The application also proposes enlarging a mezzanine area, which currently houses the administrative offices for the market. The current space is not adequate for the market's needs. A conference room would be added at the west end of the mezzanine, extending out over a non-historic vendor space. The extension would be clad in corrugated metal and butt-glazed windows.

The application includes numerous floor plans and renderings, but no elevation drawings or reflected ceiling plans. It is difficult to determine precisely the extent of the application, in part because the renderings are not entirely consistent. For example, the colored renderings of the mezzanine extension do not match the line-drawing renderings. Also, for instance, new drop ceilings are shown in some of renderings, but are not called out in architectural drawings. Are the drop ceilings proposed, or are they simply indicative of the limitations of the rendering system? The applicants should better define the extent of the application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the following features are eliminated or redesigned to be compatible with the character of the market: butt-glazed sliding wall at the rental room; butt-glazed mezzanine windows; large-scale graphics, mural, and signage at the rental room; and drop ceilings; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 68(a) of the Lease and Service Greement by and between City of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania Convention Center Authority, 1989.

In general, the application is compliant with the Rehabilitation Standards and the proposed improvements are appropriate. However, the contemporary aesthetic of the butt glazing, graphics, signage, and mural is not compatible with the simple, eclectic, nostalgic, early-mid twentieth-century aesthetic that characterizes the market. These aspects of the proposal do not satisfy Standard 9. They should be redesigned. Also, the drop ceilings and other features intended to give the new spaces a finished appearance should be eliminated and the open, light industrial appearance with exposed structure and utilities should be maintained to satisfy Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Tony Bracali and market manager Paul Steinke represented the application.

Mr. Steinke introduced the project and summarized the history of the market. He noted that the market opened on this day, February 22, in 1892. He explained that this project was developed to address some shortcomings of the market's configuration. He cited that the Market has seen a 27% increase in visitor traffic since 2003, but no changes have been made to accommodate the increase.

He described the existing condition of Avenue D as a service aisle and a visually less desirable area. He explained that there is also a desire to add to the market's growth with additional tenants. However, the market is currently at full capacity. He stated that Mr. Bracali and Friday Architects were hired to address these problems and have proposed a solution, to straighten Avenue D, create more depth to the aisle, and move storage and refrigeration to the basement.

In response to the staff overview, Mr. Steinke noted that the lease and service agreement between the City and the Convention Center Authority was extinguished in April 2010, when the Convention Center became a ward of the state. He also explained that the drawings and renderings submitted show general plans to reconfigure the space, rather than a complete proposal with details, materials, and finishes. Mr. Bracali added that the renderings and schematics are conflicting and ambiguous because they do not address final details. For example, the mural and drop ceiling are not included in the plan and are not proposed.

Mr. Bracali described the existing and historic conditions of Avenue D. He explained that the original market plan had all straight aisles and that Avenue D may have been altered when stairs were cut for the Convention Center. He proposed to straighten the aisle, relocate the toilet rooms, and extend Center Court to the east wall. Mr. Steinke added that some visiting groups expressed a desire to have reserved seating, an amenity the market currently cannot offer. He explained that the multi-purpose room proposal includes butt-glazed transparent screen wall that would roll back when the seating is opened to the public. Mr. Bracali noted the demonstration kitchen would also be adjacent to the room, allowing for additional seating for audience members. Mr. Bracali explained that some current tenants including the bookstore and Flying Monkey Bakery would be relocated to straighten and open Avenue D.

Mr. Steinke explained that the sign for Center Court in the rendering is not the proposed design, but is rather a placeholder for future signage. Mr. Bracali stated that the ductwork is low in that area and a ceiling of some sort would be desired. However, the materials would be metal and the back wall would be tiled in a muted color. He acknowledged the staff's opinion regarding butt-glazing, but concluded that it is a workable solution to create depth and translucency within the market. Ms. Hawkins asked if the walls would be intended to provide acoustic privacy. Mr. Steinke responded that acoustic dampening would be preferable, but privacy is not necessary as he would want visitors to experience the environment of the market. Mr. Bracali stated the wall would not be taller than 8'-6".

Mr. Steike stated that the reconfiguration would allow for three to six new vendors to address the demand for space in the market. Mr. Bracali stated that the existing toilet rooms will become storage and offices and the new toilet rooms will be installed in the former office spaces.

Mr. Steinke explained that the mezzanine extension would be for administrative offices. It would be expanded between Avenues C and D, over Tootsie's Salad Express. He stated that it is their goal to make the extension inconspicuous and fade into the background. Ms. Hawkins noted that the extension is not shown on the plans. Mr. Bracali stated that he will include a more detailed floor plan of the mezzanine in relation to the market at the next meeting. He showed where the mezzanine will be extended on a large set of drawings. Mr. Steinke added that the extension will provide more work stations for additional staff and address the ADA code with the installation of a wheelchair lift. Mr. Bracali stated the extension would be clad with corrugated metal with full-height fixed windows. Based on comments in the overview, he offered the idea of making the addition appear more structural with exposed beams, fasteners, and divisions in glass.

Mr. Cluver asked why the mezzanine extension could not expand to the north and south. Mr. Bracali responded that there is significant ductwork and the concrete slab of the current mezzanine would need to be doubled, posing a costly expenditure and making the project infeasible. He explained that other tenants have mezzanine space above their spaces and the owner of Tootsie's is aware of the addition. Mr. Bracali distributed photographs of other mezzanines in the Market and other public markets.

Ms. Gutterman advised that the extension and Center Court space should not resemble a mall food court, but rather retain the homegrown aesthetic and flavor of the market.

Ms. Pentz asked if the vacated 1989 agreement changes the Commission's authority to review this application. Ms. Hawkins suggested that, until the legal issues are researched, the Committee should provide comments and direction on the architecture only. She asked if there was a general consensus in the Committee that the application is not complete. Ms. Sell suggested that the Committee members consider the option to allow the applicant to amend the application to seek in-concept approval, rather than final approval. Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants if they agreed to amend their application to propose the project in-concept. Mr. Steinke agreed to the amendment.

Ms. Hawkins summarized that the Committee would recommend approval of the reconfiguration of Avenue D. She asked Committee members for a consensus on the Center Court room and suggested that it appear modern, but not stark and sleek. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he approved of the signage for the area. Mr. Cluver stated that an architectural feature to create a definition of the space is necessary, but a ceiling is a heavy-handed approach. Mr. Bracali

asked for Committee's opinion on the use of butt-glazing. Mr. Cluver responded that butt-glazing is the most transparent of the options and therefore preferable. Ms. Hawkins added that a visual separation is acceptable, but would prefer something toned down from a large graphic. In regards to the mezzanine, Mr. Cluver suggested a more structurally revealing design, like an erector set. Mr. Bracali responded that he could adapt that framework and work it into the language of the market. Mr. McCoubrey added that the existing rafters should be read through the mezzanine.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept, pursuant to Standard 9.

2029 GREEN ST

Project: Replace rolldown gate

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Matthew Van Wollen

Applicant: Frank Reis, Walnut Tree Construction

History: parking area

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish two metal roll-down gates with central pedestrian door and install one very large metal roll-down gate in their places as part of a conversion of the house at 2031 Green Street from a multi-family to a single-family residence. The lot at 2029 Green serves as a parking area for the house at 2031 Green. The two parcels have separate tax addresses, but are joined on one deed. The double roll-down gates were extant at the time of the district designation in 2000. A review of the zoning folder for this property did not provide evidence of a zoning permit or Streets Department approval for parking on this lot.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9, the Setting Guideline, and Section 6.7 of the Rules & Regulations, Submission Requirements.

The application is incomplete. It does not provide any image or rendering showing the appearance of the proposed roll-down gate. Although no image of the proposed gate is provided, it would appear from the specification that the proposed gate is not appropriate to or compatible with the historic setting owing to its size, scale, and materials. The proposed gate may be appropriate to a service alley, but it is not appropriate to one of the finest mid and late nineteenth-century residential blocks in the city. The proposed gate does not satisfy Rehabilitation Standard 9 or the cited Rehabilitation Setting Guideline. Note that the existing gates are also not compatible with the historic streetscape and district, but they predate the designation of the property and are therefore grandfathered. Despite being grandfathered, the Commission has full jurisdiction over any proposed replacement of them.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Maria Van Wollen and contractor Frank Reis represented the application.

Mr. Reis distributed copies of the proposed gate elevation drawing. Ms. Gutterman asked if there was a reason for needing a 19-foot-wide garage door. Ms. Van Wollen responded that the

current doors are very narrow and they have a mini-van that requires more room. Ms. Hawkins asked what the new gate will look like. Mr. Reis responded that it will be a solid, ribbed metal, roll-down gate, painted to match the cream color of the front door. Ms. Gutterman asked how they would access the garage. Mr. Reis responded that there is a side door that leads to the vehicles and a landscaped garden. Mr. Evans asked if the garage is for two cars. Ms. Van Wollen confirmed that it will be for two cars. Ms. Hawkins asked why a single door is preferred over the existing double-door design. Ms. Van Wollen responded that she prefers a single wide door, as are found throughout the neighborhood. Ms. Gutterman countered that there are typically not garage doors that are as large as wide as 19 feet. Ms. Van Wollen stated that the lot is more than 19 feet wide. Ms. Gutterman stated that typically one would see a 12-foot-wide garage door and suggested the massing be broken up into two doors without a middle walkway. Mr. Reis stated that it is the applicant's goal to make the garage doors blend with the streetscape and make it more aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Evans suggested the applicant research potential zoning and Streets Department issues.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the garage is divided into two doors that are not smaller than nine feet wide with a 12-inch center pier.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 2:05 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 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 8: Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

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.

Roof Guideline: Not recommended: Installing mechanical or service equipment so that it damages or obscures character-defining features; or is conspicuous from the public right-of-way.

Site Guideline: Recommended: Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserves the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.

Site Guideline: Not Recommended: Locating any new construction on the building site in a location which contains important landscape features or open space, for example removing a lawn and walkway and installing a parking lot.

Site Guideline: Not Recommended: Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color, and texture; which destroys historic relationships on the site; or which damages or destroys important landscape features.

Site Guideline: Recommended: Surveying and documenting areas where the terrain will be altered to determine the potential impact to important landscape features or archaeological resources.

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

Site Guideline: Recommended: Planning and carrying out any necessary investigation using professional archaeologists and modern archaeological methods when preservation in place is not feasible.

Setting Guideline: Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving building and landscape features which are important in defining the historic character of the setting. Such features can include roads and streets, furnishings such as lights or benches, vegetation, gardens, and yards, adjacent open space such as fields, parks, commons or woodlands, and important views or visual relationships.

Setting Guideline: Not Recommended: Introducing a new building or landscape feature that is out of scale or otherwise inappropriate to the setting's historic character, e.g., replacing picket fencing with chain link fencing.

Section 6.7 of the Rules & Regulations, Submission Requirements

The submission requirements may vary according to the proposed scope of work. The staff can advise the applicant on specific submission requirements. At a minimum, an applicant must submit the following:

6.7.e For applications proposing work to designated exteriors, a legible, dimensioned, accurately-scaled plot or site plan and legible, dimensioned, accurately-scaled drawings of all elevations to which alterations are proposed. ... All drawings must be annotated and/or be accompanied by a complete set of

specifications that describe the proposed undertaking in detail. For less complex projects, annotated photographs and/or photomontages with notes and/or specifications may be acceptable in lieu of drawings.

Section 68(a) of the Lease and Service Agreement by and between City of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania Convention Center Authority, 1989.

The Authority agrees that the plans for the interior and exterior renovation and improvement to the Reading Terminal Market shall be subject to the review and approval of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. The review and approval of the Philadelphia Historical Commission shall be to determine that the proposed renovations and improvements are consistent with any restrictions set forth in any deed, lease or declaration of covenants and restrictions respecting the Reading Terminal Market and in conformity with the provisions and requirements of the City Historic Preservation Ordinance, The Philadelphia Code, §14-2007.