

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

**28 AUGUST 2007
CITY HALL, ROOM 578
9:00 A.M.**

PRESENT

Suzanne Pentz
Robert Thomas, AIA
Dan McCoubrey, AIA
Vincent Rivera

Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation 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

Hyman Myers, Vitetta
Nancy Goldenberg, Center City District
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Alexander Rice, Gardner Fox
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
David Gustafson
Nica Rand
Keith Loudenslager, Eagle Eye Painting
Debra Rouse, Eagle Eye Painting
Gary Maguire, Maguire Builders
William Vessal
Lucy Strackhouse, Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust
Mike DiSanto, Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust
Poe Leggette, LDGLLC
Joshua Otto, Brett Webber Architects
Lisa & Michael Shapson
Ellen Lariviere
Richard Stokes, Stokes Architects
Jim Cukin, Space Design
Donna Yohe, Level 5 Construction
Rachel Schade, Schade & Bolender Architects
Paul Drzal, Harman Deutsch
Nick Manekshaw, Palace of Asia, Inc.
Brett Harman, Harman Deutsch
Ben Sanchez, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP
Eric Silverman
Dave Artman, KSSR
Mark Gamba
David Amburn

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Rivera called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Ms. Pentz and Messrs. Thomas and McCoubrey joined him on the Architectural Committee.

321-327 S. BROAD STREET, CHAMBERS WYLIE CHURCH

Owner: Chambers Wylie Memorial Presbyterian

Applicant: Nancy Goldenberg

History: c. 1900; Rankin and Kellogg, architect; designated 7/6/1972

Project: Illuminate facade

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of seventeen metal light fixtures with conduit on the front façade of the church building. The fixtures and conduit will attach to the building at the joints in the stone. The emitted light will be white and will highlight particular features of the façade including the gothic arched windows.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. Nancy Goldenberg of the Center City District and architect Hyman Myers represented the application.

Ms. Goldenberg described the larger project, in which the Center City District seeks to permanently light 13 facades and temporarily light four facades of buildings on the Avenue of the Arts from City Hall to Pine Street. The lighting of buildings in Lyon, France inspired this project. These three applications constitute Phase Two of the project. Phase One, which are either temporary projections without attachments to buildings or involve buildings outside the Commission's jurisdiction, will be implemented in November. Phase Two, this phase, will be implemented in February 2008. Phase Three, the rest of the buildings, will be implemented in April 2008.

Ms. Goldenberg stated that two types of light fixtures will be used in the project, LED and metal halide. The LED lights can be programmed for different colors; the metal halide lights are white.

Mr. Myers stated that every building in the project is different; each installation is unique. When designing the installations, they have considered preservation, cost, maintenance, aesthetics, and other issues.

The Gothic Revival Chambers Wylie Church, which was designed by the Rankin & Kellogg and built between 1899 and 1901, will be lit with white metal halide lamps. Others buildings will be lit with LEDs, which can produce any color light. Ms. Goldenberg stated that the Center City District will manage the programming of the lights. It will be tasteful. The goal is to communicate with light.

Mr. Myers described the installation on the church. He stated that they will removal old conduits and light fixtures. All of the new lighting will be located above the first-floor level. He stated that the ambient street lighting now lights the first floor including the doors.

Ms. Pentz asked about the sizes of the holes the applicants propose to drill in the church façade. Mr. Myers stated that they plan to drill a single $\frac{3}{4}$ " hole in the façade for each string of lights.

Mr. Thomas asked if the applicants could light the stained glass from the inside as the staff had suggested. Mr. Myers replied that it would be nearly impossible to generate sufficient light to light the stained glass from the inside. He explained that their lighting engineers reported that stained glass is meant to be lit from the outside by the sun. To replicate that level of light on the inside would be extremely expensive and inefficient.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance commented that the overall project is “a great idea” and very exciting.” He stated that the Alliance is “enthusiastic.” However, he suggested that the applicants present the overall program to the Commission, to allow for a better understanding of each building within the larger context and the interrelationships between buildings. About the church specifically, he stated that he had visited the site and the ambient lighting does not light the doors well. He opined that the proposed lighting would create a harsh division between the first and second floors. He suggested that the applicants rethink the plan and include the first floor. He expressed two additional concerns. He contended that the bright light near the fixtures would obscure architectural details. He also stated that the representations were not accurate. He noted that they show the same levels of light in areas with and without stained glass. However, the glass will reflect light very differently than the masonry. He suggested that they highlight the key architectural features. Ms. Goldenberg agreed that the actual lighting cannot be accurately represented with Photoshop. She stated that they will adjust the light after it is installed. They will use the Terra Building as their mock-up. It will be lit on 7 November 2007. Mr. Gallery suggested that they experiment with the Terra Building before completing their other designs. Ms. Goldenberg stated that their schedule does not allow that luxury.

Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicants if they would prefer LEDs on all of the buildings. Mr. Myers stated that he would not; they are not appropriate for all buildings.

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

140 S. BROAD STREET, THE UNION LEAGUE

Owner: The Union League of Philadelphia

Applicant: Nancy Goldenberg

History: 1864-1865, John Fraser, architect; addition 1910-1911, Horace Trumbauer, architect; designated 5/28/1957

Project: Illuminate facade

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation and replacement of metal light fixtures at various locations of the façade and sidewalk. The emitted light will be white and will highlight particular features of the facade. Additional information should be submitted to determine the visibility of the fixtures from the public right-of-way.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. Nancy Goldenberg of the Center City District and architect Hyman Myers represented the application.

Ms. Goldenberg explained that white light only would be used to highlight features on the front façade of this building. Mr. Myers stated that the old light fixtures would be removed and replaced. The new fixtures would be mounted in mortar joints and existing holes only.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the entire building is currently lit, but the application only proposes lighting the central portico and mansard. Mr. Gallery asserted that it is a small building, which could and should be lit in its entirety. Mr. Rivera disagreed. Mr. McCoubrey asked how the current lights are used. Mr. Myers stated that they light the entire Broad Street façade except the mansard. He contended that the current light color is not appropriate for the brownstone building. Ms. Goldenberg stated that the owners may light the entire building in the future, but, owing to the high costs, only propose lighting the portico and mansard currently. Messrs. McCoubrey and Gallery noted that the entire building is currently lit. Mr. Myers stated that they do not want to mix the colors of the old and new lights.

Mr. Thomas stated that the representations of the lighting in the application are misleading. He remarked that the windows would be lit during most evenings, but are not shown as lit. He also commented that the best lighting is lighting that you do not notice. He stated that highlighting the portico only does not accurately portray the whole architectural composition. He suggested that the plan be revised. Mr. McCoubrey agreed. He stated that they should light the entire Broad Street façade.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the entire Broad Street façade is illuminated, with the staff to review details.

200 SOUTH BROAD STREET, THE BELLEVUE

Owner: Bellevue Associates

Applicant: Nancy Goldenberg

History: 1904, G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, architects; designated 8/2/1973

Project: Illuminate facade

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of LED light fixtures along the second and eleventh stories on the Broad Street façade. The fixtures would not be attached to terra cotta or railings. They would be attached to concrete balcony slabs and porch roofs. The emitted light is shown as white in the application materials, but could be changed to any color. The light will highlight particular features on the facade.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. Nancy Goldenberg of the Center City District and architect Hyman Myers represented the application.

Mr. Myers stated that they chose LED lights to complement the material of the building, terra cotta. The fixtures would not be attached to terra cotta or railings. They would be attached to concrete balcony slabs and porch roofs.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the application materials depict white light only. He contended that, if the applicants are seeking an approval for colored light, then they must submit an application documenting how they plan to use the color. He also asserted that the central feature of the façade is the bays. Lighting only the fronts of the bays flattens them. The entirety of each bay should be lighted. Mr. Rivera added that they should light the Walnut Street façade as well. Mr. Thomas agreed with Mr. Gallery. He stated that the proposed lighting does not treat the architecture as a volume. It flattens it. Mr. McCoubrey asked whether there is a technical problem with the lighting of the entire bays. Mr. Myers stated that there is; it is not

possible to light the sides without mounting fixtures at the front and extending them out to the sides. Mr. Rivera concluded that this is a very important building and should be lighted appropriately. He stated that the current lighting scheme appears arbitrary and does not coordinate with the building.

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

112 LOMBARD STREET

Owner: Jerome Millis

Applicant: David Pizzico

History: c. 1970; designated contributing in the Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Legalize aluminum-clad windows, doors, garage door, and enlargement of first-story rear window opening

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize aluminum-clad windows on the front and rear elevations, a wood-paneled garage door, wood entry door with decorative glass, balcony door at the fourth-floor level, infill at grade in the rear, and the enlargement of a rear masonry opening.

The Commission files reflect that, at the time of designation, notice letters were sent to the current owners regarding the Historical Commission's jurisdiction. The letters stated that the Commission must review for approval all proposed exterior alterations to the historic resource. In addition, the current owners acknowledged the Commission's jurisdiction in the past when they applied for and received an approval on a permit application in June 2005.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. Alexander Rice of Gardner-Fox represented the application.

Mr. Rice stated that the owner had retained Gardner-Fox to renovate and redesign the property. The work included gutting and completely redesigning the interior. Mr. Rice stated that the homeowner urged the contractors to complete the work quickly. Mr. Rice's colleague had suggested phasing of the project, with an interior application first and then an exterior application, while that work was underway. Mr. Rice stated that, in the transition from the design team to the construction team, the project manager neglected to submit the exterior application to the Commission. He stated that there was a lack of communication.

Mr. Rice stated that the new windows were identical to the original windows with the exception of the aluminum cladding. Neither had or has muntins. The garage door differs slightly; the top panel has an arch. At the rear, two or three masonry window openings were enlarged.

Mr. Thomas stated that, owing to the lack of visibility at the rear, he was not opposed to those changes. However, he did find the new entry door inappropriate and not compatible architecturally. He would advocate for a recommendation of denial of the door.

Ms. Pentz asked about the change in window color. Mr. Rice stated that the new color is a factory finish on the cladding chosen by the owners.

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

834 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: Ballroom Management Inc.

Applicant: Brett Harman

History: 1923; Horace Trumbauer, architect, designated 1/7/1982

Project: Install entrance marquee

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of a metal canopy at the 9th Street entranceway to a restaurant at the Ben Franklin Hotel building. The canopy would be affixed to the existing limestone cladding with steel anchors. The signage would be backlit with recessed lighting fixtures. Canvas side panels are proposed beneath the canopy.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the canopy with halo-lit letters, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of the canvas side panels, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Brett Harman and restaurant owner Nick Manekshaw represented the application.

Mr. Harman explained that this is his second appearance before the Committee for this project. In response to the Committee's earlier recommendation, he has revised the design. After site meetings with the staff, he has developed a design that offers protection from the weather and an inviting entrance. The proposed canvas side panels on the canopy are 24 inches wide. If the Committee dislikes the side panels, Mr. Harman proposed to delete them from the proposal rather than risk a denial of the entire application. Mr. Rivera remarked that he considered the side panels acceptable.

Mr. Thomas questioned the attachments of the canopy to the building. Mr. Harman tension rods connected to the galvanized frame would be bolted to limestone cladding. The frame itself would be bolted onto the horizontal faces of the pilasters. He also noted that he is working with a structural engineer to prevent damage to the limestone. Ms. Sell asked if the bolts could be attached to mortar joints or to the centers of the limestone panels to make future repairs easier. Mr. Harman agreed to work with the staff on the attachments. Mr. McCoubrey observed that the canopy should not be directly connected to the limestone at the door, especially owing to the crown molding. He suggested that it should stand out away from the masonry. Mr. Rivera suggested that the canopy should be tied to the window frames, not the pilasters.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Alliance holds an easement on the building. Mr. Harman stated he has had several conversations about the project with Randy Cotton of the Preservation Alliance. Mr. Harman stated that he would make a formal submission to the Alliance.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the canopy with side panels, provided it does not attach directly to the pilasters, with the staff to review details.

2108 WALLACE STREET

Owner: David Gustafson

Applicant: Keith Loudenslager

History: c.1859; individually designated 2/07/1974; contributing in the Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize stucco on side wall

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize stucco on the east side wall of this row house. A contractor began apply the stucco without a permit or Historical Commission approval, but was stopped by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The side elevation is highly visible from the public right-of-way and has always been exposed brick; it is not a former party wall. Currently, the building has severe water and mold problems. The applicant started applying stucco parging to this side facade in an attempt to abate the water infiltration problem. The staff doubts that the brick wall is allowing the moisture into the building. The applicant claims that the roof, flashing, and pointing are not the sources of the water and are in good condition, but has not provided any evidence to support these claims. The application also proposes to coat the stucco with Modac, a vinyl toluene acrylic coating made for highway abutments, parking garages, and other pre-cast and cast in place concrete.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. Property owners Dave Gustafson and Anne Wickliffe and Keith Louderslager, the painting contractor, represented the application.

Mr. Louderslager described the significant mold inside the home, which permeates the entire side of the house. He stated the bricks are in poor condition. He cited several homes in the area that already have been sealed in the manner he is proposing. Ms. Pentz asked if this is a former party wall or has always been an exposed exterior wall. Mr. Louderslager stated it is not a former party wall.

Mr. Gustafson stated that both neighboring buildings have been sealed with either stucco or concrete. He noted that, a few years ago during a renovation, a roofer had repointed the house, causing some bricks to crack and allowing water to seep through the walls. In an attempt to dry out the interior walls, he cracked some of the interior plaster.

Ms. Pentz asked about the locations of the downspouts. The owner replied they are in the rear, opposite the open wall. Mr. Gustafson described the roof to Ms. Pentz. It is flat and slightly pitched, not gabled. After reviewing photographs, Ms. Pentz noted a difference in the brick on the front and side of the building. Mr. Rivera asked if the side wall was pointed with a hard cement instead of a mortar, which can softening and weaken the brick and compromise the wall. He instructed that any hard cement pointing should be removed and replaced with an appropriate mortar. Ms. Pentz opined that it may be more destructive to undo the recent work. Mr. Thomas suggested, if the stucco is approved, a band of two bricks at the corner to reveal should be left exposed to reveal the former wall.

Mr. Gustafson stated his need for a cost effective treatment to solve his problem. Mr. Louderslager suggested spraying the wall with a water sealer, screening it, and applying three coats of Portland cement with a popcorn finish, and then coating the wall with Modac. Committee members objected to the water sealer, Portland cement, Modac, and rough finish. They suggested a standard lime and cement stucco with a smooth finish.

Ms. Pentz expressed concern about the water sealant, which is inappropriate for a masonry building that must breathe. Mr. Louderslager responded that the work was stopped before the process was completed. Mr. Baron stated that the proposal is antithetical to best practices for historic masonry. The wall should allow water vapor, but not liquid water, to pass in and out. The sealants would lock water into the building. Ms. Pentz stated that stucco may be appropriate in this instance if the brick has lost all integrity. However, the sealants are not appropriate. She suggested that the applicant to work with the staff on an appropriate stucco mixture and finish.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of applying a standard lime and cement stucco with a smooth finish to the side wall with the brick at the corner revealed, provided no Modac or other water sealant is used, with the staff to review details.

2047 RITTENHOUSE SQUARE

Owner: William Cheeseman

Applicant: William Cheeseman

History: c. 1880; contributing to the Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995.

Project: Install aluminum clad windows with simulated muntins

OVERVIEW: In June 2006, the Commission reviewed an application for façade alterations for this building. At that time, it denied the second-story window enlargement and alteration to the historic entranceway, but approved the replacement of the existing step with a granite step, a five-panel door to match the existing door, lintels and sills, garage door, and six-over-six, true-divided-light, wood windows, with staff to review details.

The applicant now proposes a revision to the earlier approval. He proposes to install six-over-six, simulated-divided-light, aluminum-clad, double-hung windows, not true-divided-light, wood windows, at the second and third stories of the front facade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. No one represented the application.

The Committee discussed the proposed windows and determined that they are not appropriate for this building.

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

2414 PINE STREET

Owner: Howard A. Trauger

Applicant: Gerry Maguire

History: Non-contributing vacant Lot in Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District

Project: Review and Comment – Construct a three-story building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a three-story structure on a vacant lot within the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District. The proposed building is contemporary in design

and compatible with the district in height, massing, and fenestration. Information about materials is missing from this submission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. Gerry Maguire, the contractor, and David Amburn, the architect, represented the application.

Mr. Amburn described the project, a three-story residential building to be erected on a vacant lot. He stated that the lot had been used in the past for a swimming pool for an adjacent house, but had always been a separate parcel. He explained that the proposed materials for the front façade are cast stone at the base and brick above with a zinc-clad bay.

Ms. Sell commented on her research on the adjacent Horn Mansion at 2410-2412 Pine Street. Joseph Horn was a partner in the Horn & Hardart chain.

Ms. Pentz asked if the front façade would be located in the same plane as the neighboring facades. Mr. Amburn stated that it would. Mr. McCoubrey asked about its height relative to the neighbors. Mr. Amburn stated that it would be taller than one adjacent building and shorter than the other. Mr. Rivera asked about the excavations for the basement. Mr. Amburn stated that it would be the same depth and length as the neighbor to avoid underpinning.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance displayed photographs of the streetscape to the Committee to acquaint the Committee with the context. Mr. Gallery described the properties as two-story, historically intact buildings with traditional variations, but of the same scale and character. He contended that the proposed building would have no relationship to anything on the block. He disagreed with the staff's recommendation. He asserted that the proposed building would be unsympathetic and not in harmony with the architectural elements of the nearby buildings. Mr. Gallery stated that the surrounding buildings have no bays, no changes in façade materials, and no metal panels. Mr. Gallery suggested that the façade be redesigned to be more compatible with its surroundings. He displayed a photograph with a hand-drawn rendering of the proposed building superimposed upon it; using it, he alleged that the new building would be much taller than the surrounding buildings. The applicants claimed that the rendering did not accurately represent their proposal. Mr. Amburn disagreed with Mr. Gallery's statements and contended that the nearby buildings present various materials and scales. He stated that he did not want to mimic historic buildings. He noted that he had included cast stone at the first floor as a reference to other houses on the block.

Ms. Pentz suggested that the façade of the new building should be shifted a few inches back to reveal the three-dimensional nature of the quoins on the Horn Mansion. Messrs. Amburn and Maguire agreed that the façade could be slightly recessed to reveal the quoins. Mr. McCoubrey stated that continuity on the front façade is important. He suggested deleting the cast stone and using brick for the entire façade. Messrs. Amburn and Maguire agreed that they could modify the façade materials to achieve a more consistent façade. Mr. Rivera agreed about the brick. He also suggested reducing the total height of the building. Mr. Amburn replied that the design complies with the zoning height restrictions of 35 feet. Ms. Pentz stated that she needs to see the front elevation in context before making a decision about the height. Mr. Amburn offered to provide a revised elevation with the neighboring buildings prior to the Commission meeting. Mr. Rivera suggested that the height of the building be "sympathetic" to the mansion, but not necessarily less than the mansion.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Commission comment that the front façade should be set back to reveal the entirety of the quoins on the adjacent building; that the front façade should be brick, not cast stone, at the first floor; and that the height should be limited to that of the taller adjacent building.

100 ARCH STREET, UNITS 1A AND 1B

Owner: CE Acquisitions

Applicant: John Leggette

History: c. 1835; individually designated on 08/05/1976; contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Install exterior security bars

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install exterior security grates to this Greek Revival building in Old City. The applicant has based the design on the grates on a neighboring structure on the same block. However, this neighboring structure dates from a later period. Exterior security grates were not utilized during the Greek Revival period.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 3.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. General contractor John Leggette represented the application.

Mr. Leggette stated that his client seeks to install the bars for security and aesthetic reasons. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the use of the space. Mr. Leggette replied that they are storefronts that are being converted to residential use. Messrs. McCoubrey and Rivera opined that the bars are not appropriate for the building. Mr. Danta agreed and stated that exterior bars are not appropriate for the Greek Revival building. He suggested interior bars to satisfy the security needs.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 3.

115 ORIANA STREET

Owner: William Vessal

Applicant: William Vessal

History: c. 1870. Contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Revise approved addition; construct roof deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a revision to the design of an addition already approved by the Commission as well as the construction of a roof deck. The addition was approved by the Historical Commission on July 2006 with detailed specifications of its height. The addition as shown in the current proposal has revised fenestration and massing that does not conform to the height restrictions specified in the Commission's approval. The proposed deck would be constructed in front of the addition and extend the entire width of the addition. The building has a three-foot parapet that would lessen its visibility.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Owner William Vessal represented the application.

Mr. Vessal stated that neither the deck nor the addition would be visible from the street. He explained that the building has a three-foot parapet at the front. Ms. Pentz asked if the addition has been constructed yet. Mr. Vessal stated that it has not yet been constructed. He stated again that it would not be visible. Mr. Danta stated although not visible from Orianna Street directly in front of the building, it would be obliquely visible from Cherry Street to the west.

Ms. Pentz asked if the design of the addition as approved by the Commission had changed. Mr. Danta replied the fenestration, massing, and height of the addition had been revised. Mr. Baron informed the Committee that the addition depicted in this application does not comply with the Commission's approval. The Commission approved specific roof heights for the addition. The 15-foot-high addition depicted in this proposal exceeds the height of the approved addition. Ms. Pentz read the Commission's decision regarding the addition which states that the addition should be no higher than 11 feet tall for the westernmost 6 feet of the addition. Mr. Vessal responded that he had reduced the height of the addition. Mr. McCoubrey noted that he had not reduced as much as the Commission required. Mr. Vessal stated that the addition would only be visible from the public right-of-way over a parking lot; that visibility over the lot should not be taken into account. He stated that the addition would be the same height as the existing elevator shaft on the roof of the property. Mr. McCoubrey replied that an addition as tall as the elevator shaft would not be appropriate. Mr. Vessal claimed that his building is not historic. Ms. Pentz noted that it was built in the 1870s and is classified as contributing in the district. Mr. Vessal claimed that it was rebuilt in the 1940s and should not be considered historic. Mr. Danta stated that the building had been significantly altered from its 1870s condition.

Mr. Rivera asked the applicant if he could lower the level of the deck, which appears to stand very tall. Mr. Vessal stated that it is already lower than the structure of the addition.

Ms. Pentz stated that she would vote to deny because the proposal does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Vessal argued that the addition will be visible whether it is 11 or 14 feet tall; he should not be required to reduce its height if it will be visible in any case. Mr. Danta suggested that Mr. Vessal make his case to the Commission, which has discretionary power. The Committee is bound to base its recommendation on the Standards. Mr. Vessal stated that it would be "illogical" to approve a shorter, yet visible addition, but deny a slightly taller one. He stated that he was very unhappy with the Committee's decision.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

120 MARKET STREET

Owner: VMA Lounge

Applicant: Brett Webber

History: c. 1835; individually designated 10/07/1976; designated as contributing in Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Install illuminated signage

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install two internally illuminated signs on this Greek Revival commercial building along Market Street. One sign would be a flat wall sign attached to the entablature above the storefront. This ground floor dates from a late twentieth-century

restoration of the edifice. The sign will be halo lit with metal lettering. The second sign would be a hanging circular sign. This sign will also be attached to the same location and internally illuminated with an acrylic face.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of flat sign, denial of hanging sign, pursuant to Standard 9

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Josh Otto represented the application.

Mr. Otto submitted revised drawings reflecting the recommendation of the staff. The staff recommended redesigning the hanging sign, which was originally proposed as an internally illuminated with an acrylic face, to be halo lit like the flat wall sign.

Ms. Pentz asked about the mounting attachments for the signs. Mr. Otto stated that they would mount to wood. Mr. Danta reported that the wood storefronts the signs would mount to were completely rebuilt in the 1980s.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application with the revised hanging sign, pursuant to Standard 9.

4600 RIDGE AVENUE, MOUNT PLEASANT BARN

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Lucy Strackhouse, Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust

History: c. 1761; designated on 5/26/1956

Project: Reroof barn and construct dormer

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reroof and construct a wide dormer on the south barn at Mount Pleasant in Fairmount Park. There are two very similar eighteenth-century barns at Mount Pleasant. One stands to the south of the entrance driveway; one to the north. This application proposes work to the south barn only. It is anticipated that the Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust will move into both barns and use them as its offices and workshops at some point in the near future. The barns have been greatly altered and little of the eighteenth-century fabric survives. Moreover, the south barn has been poorly maintained. Its roof is partially collapsed, exposing the interior to the elements. The application proposes reroofing the structure and constructing a new dormer on the south and less visible side of the roof. The south side of the south barn faces a densely overgrown wooded area. The dormer would allow the currently unusable loft area to be used as space for the Trust's offices. The dormer would set back from the side facade facing Mount Pleasant to reduce its visibility from the historic house.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Rivera recused, owing to his involvement in the project, leaving the Committee without a quorum. Mr. Danta asked if anyone objected to proceeding without a quorum. No one objected.

Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Lucy Strackhouse of the Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust and Mick DiSanto of the Fairmount Park Commission represented the application.

Ms. Strackhouse provided an overview of the larger project to move her agency to the barns at Mt. Pleasant. She explained that the move is not finalized, but she would like to have the dormer constructed now because the Fairmount Park Commission is about to replace the roof anyway.

Ms. Pentz asked if she would seek an approval to add a dormer to the north barn as well. Ms. Strackhouse replied that she would not. The north barn is visible to the public on all sides; a dormer would not be appropriate. The south façade of the south barn is not visible owing to the dense vegetation. Ms. Strackhouse explained that she intends to restore the barns to their eighteenth-century appearances once a funding source is identified. She stated that she would submit applications to the Commission for the restorations.

Ms. Pentz asked about the histories of the barns. Ms. Strackhouse explained that the south barn was constructed in 1762, before the house; it was the first structure on the property. It burned in 1907; none of the wood timbers are original. Also, it has been modified numerous times. The north barn was also damaged in a fire, which occurred in 1920. The north barn has been significantly modified to house public toilet facilities.

Ms. Pentz asked about visibility. Ms. Strackhouse explained that all facades of the north barn are visible. A road passes along the south and west sides of it. To the north and east, it opens onto playing fields. Only the north and west sides of the south barn are visible. The south and east are obscured by dense vegetation. The invasive vines and other low level vegetation would be cleared, but the large white pines would be retained.

Ms. Pentz asked about utilities in the south barn. Mr. DiSanto explained that it already has electrical and water services as well as a furnace that does not work.

Ms. Pentz stated that this site is one of the most important in Philadelphia. She was concerned that an approval of this application would set a precedent for the north barn. Mr. Danta reported that he and Mr. Farnham had visited the site and looked very closely at the barn and its setting. He stated that the façade for which the dormer is proposed is not visible to the public. It faces a wooded area. He also stated that the building has been modified many times and is in very poor condition. The roof, which was not original, is significantly collapsed and open to the sky. He contended that these mitigating factors make this project acceptable. He also noted that the Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust plans to restore both barns to their eighteenth-centuries appearances and also to use the barns, ensuring their maintenance and security.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

6000-02 GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Owner: Joseph L. Messa Jr.

Applicant: Joseph Paoletti

History: c. 1790, designated 5/28/1957

Project: Legalize vinyl windows, stucco side addition, repair trim

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize vinyl windows installed throughout the building. This building is an important eighteenth-century house on Germantown Avenue. Owing to settlement, some of the window openings are not square and the new vinyl replacements were installed within new square openings that have been built-down from the original openings with

framing lumber. However, most of the original frames remain. The application also proposes to stucco a side addition. This addition was stuccoed at the time of designation. Lastly, the applicant proposes to restore and repair the wood cornices, but has not provided any details. However, if the cornice repair is a strict restoration, then it can be approved at the staff level.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the legalization of the vinyl windows, pursuant to Standard 6; denial of cornice repair owing to incompleteness; approval of the stucco repair, provided it has a smooth finish, with the staff to review details.

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

The Committee and staff discussed the building and the application. The Committee concurred with the staff's recommendation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend Denial of the legalization of the vinyl windows, pursuant to Standard 6; denial of cornice repair owing to incompleteness; approval of the stucco repair, provided it has a smooth finish, with the staff to review details.

664 AND 666 N. 15TH STREET

Owner: John Kang DBA, City View Homes LLC

Applicant: Elaine DeDuca

History: Vacant lots at the time of designation in Spring Garden Historic District, 2000

Project: Construct two new townhouses

OVERVIEW: These two parcels were empty lots at the time of designation; therefore, the Historical Commission has review and comment jurisdiction only. This application proposes to construct two townhouses. The design is respectful of the adjacent buildings in scale and rhythm and maintains the same cornice line. The design incorporates historical elements, but utilizes them in such a manner so as not to be mistaken as original historic fabric. The proposed buildings would be three-stories in height with garage doors. The second and third floors would be engaged by a wood clad bay window. There would be a roof terrace with a penthouse. However, these would not be visible from the street owing to a 19-foot set-back and the use of the parapet and cornice as the terrace's railing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the proposed townhouses are generally compatible with the contributing resources of the district. However, street-level garages on front façades are not appropriate for historic districts.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Ed Fink represented the application.

Mr. Fink informed the Committee of the Zoning Board approval of the garages. He stated that the owner believes that he could not sell the properties without garages. He noted that the neighborhood is dangerous and garages are essential. Mr. Danta stated that there is no rear access for garages at the backs of the buildings. Ms. Pentz asked for additional information about the lots. Mr. Fink stated that the vacant area is four row houses wide. His employer is building two row houses on two of the four vacant lots. Ms. Pentz asked about the cornice heights of these buildings compared to the neighbors. Mr. Fink stated that the proposed cornice

heights are almost exactly the same as those of the existing buildings. He also noted that the penthouse is not visible from the street.

Mr. McCoubrey objected to the garages. Mr. Fink responded that the Planning Commission had also expressed reservations about them, but that the developer believes that they are necessary for the viability of the project.

Mr. Danta advised the applicant of the implications of review and comment jurisdiction.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Commission comment that the proposed townhouses are generally compatible with the contributing resources of the district. However, street-level garages on front façades are not appropriate for historic districts.

700 S. 2ND STREET

Owner: Ellen M. Lariviere

Applicant: Ellen M. Lariviere

History: Designated 5/31/1966

Project: Reface first-story rear and construct two-story addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate this large corner property for residential use. It proposes add two floors to a one-story rear section of the building, reface the existing portion of the rear section, alter window and door configurations, and install a garage at the Philip Street. Based on atlas research, a portion of the rear section may be a fragment of a much earlier building that stood on Philip Street. This application also proposes to install new shutters. The drawings are incomplete and do not provide any window, shutter, and door details.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the fragment of the earlier building on Philip Street is retained, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Developer Ellen Lariviere represented the application.

Ms. Lariviere explained that she plans to live in one section of the building and rent the other space as apartments.

The staff noted that the very old fragment of a building at the rear at the corner of Bainbridge and Philip Streets has a brick watertable. In response to Mr. Rivera's question, Ms. Lariviere explained that the watertable is approximately 25 feet long and runs east along Bainbridge from Philip. Committee members asked her to explain the relationship of the new facades at the upper floors with the existing first-floor façade and watertable. She stated that she would match the brick, but was unable to provide any details. She reported that her architect was unable to attend the Committee meeting. Ms. Pentz stated that these details needed to be shown on the drawings. She recommended that the applicant prepare annotated drawings that show the proposed details such as the relationships of the new and old facades. She contended that the current drawings are inadequate. Mr. Baron agreed. Ms. Pentz stated that she could not recommend a final approval without additional information. She suggested limiting any approval to an approval in concept.

Mr. Rivera noted the lack of open space and asked if the Zoning Board had approved the project. Ms. Lariviere stated that she had not yet appeared before the Zoning Board. Mr. Rivera opined that the proposed building would be too dense and without open space; he suggested that the façade step back at the second floor. Other Committee members noted that such zoning issues were outside the Commission's purview.

Mr. Rivera suggested that the garage should be located on Bainbridge, not Philip Street. Ms. Lariviere explained that she had located the garage on Philip because the neighbors would oppose a garage on Bainbridge. She stated that there is a moratorium on garages on Bainbridge. Ms. Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey stated that they would vote to recommend approval in concept. Mr. Rivera stated that he would recommend denial owing to the lack of open or outdoor space.

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

702 S. FRONT STREET

Owner: Mike and Lisa Shapson

Applicant: Mike and Lisa Shapson

History: c.1780; designated 6/24/1958

Project: Demolish rear ell and construct two-story addition with deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the historic rear ell and construct a two-story addition with a deck. The second floor of the addition would be cantilevered over the historic alley way. The addition would be parged with stucco.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Property owners Lisa and Michael Shapson and architect Deborah Anderson represented the application.

Mr. Shapson stated that the foundation of the rear ell has deteriorated and needs immediate repair. He displayed photographs showing areas where the floors in the ell had dropped significantly and are pulling away from the walls. He stated that the rear ell is in poor condition and has no windows at the second floor. He stated that he would like to demolish the ell, rebuilding the foundation, and rebuild the ell with a larger second floor. Mr. Shapson clarified that the proposed ell would cantilever over the side alley, which is private, not shared. Ms. Pentz explained that less radical solutions may be available. She noted that, for example, the ell could be shored up and the foundation repaired or rebuilt in place. She conceded that that approach may be expensive and may not work if the ell is deteriorated above grade. Ms. Cote stated that it is unknown whether any of the ell is original. In 1867, the building had a one-story ell. By 1870, a second story had been added to the ell. Mr. Rivera noted that the two adjacent buildings do not have rear ells.

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

219-229 SOUTH 18TH STREET

Owner: Rittenhouse Regency Affiliates

Applicant: Richard Stokes

History: 1929, Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects; contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Alter storefronts

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter two facades on 18th and Locust Streets. At the entrance, the canopy would be removed and new openings would be created to match the original openings determined with historic photographs. The existing round column would be clad with brick, salvaged from another section of the building, and with a new granite base to match the existing. New folding painted wood doors with rounded glazing are proposed for all the existing openings and wood panels would be installed over the brick between the openings. New awnings that span entire openings are also proposed.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Richard Stokes represented the application.

Mr. Stokes explained that Stephen Starr is planning an authentic French bistro in the first-floor commercial space in this building at the corner of 18th and Locust Streets. He noted that the building is undergoing a major renovation for condominiums; the Commission has reviewed all aspects of the project. He noted that the storefront areas of the building have been significantly altered. He is proposing to restore the corner of the building, which significantly altered for an entrance to a hotel that once occupied the building. He will use brick salvaged from other areas of the building and replicate the missing granite base. He proposes to replace the extant non-historic folding storefront doors with new folding doors that would look like Parisian bistro doors. He displayed photographs of French bistros and explained that all of the interior and exterior features would be made in Paris to ensure authenticity. He proposes to remove the aluminum storefronts and replace them with wood ones. He proposes to cover the historic masonry pilasters with wood and back-painted glass panels to make it appear like a French bistro. He also proposes large awnings on both 18th and Locust Streets. He claimed that all non-historic alterations including the panels, doors, and awnings would be reversible. He stated that he would not change any window or door openings except to restore those that have been altered.

Liz Blazeovich of the Preservation Alliance noted that the Commission had rejected a similar proposal recently for a restaurant at the Ben Franklin Hotel on Chestnut Street. She suggested that the applicant restore the storefront and then ornament it with simply awnings and signs.

Mr. Rivera opined that the proposal is unrelated to the historic building and would negatively impact its character. Mr. Stokes stated that he proposed to restore the storefront and then add a stage set in front of it. He remarked that his design was an authentic recreation of a typical Parisian bistro. Mr. McCoubrey contended that Mr. Stokes could maintain the historic architecture, but achieve the Parisian feel with signage and other devices. He stated that the masonry pilasters should not be covered and the awnings should be restricted to bays and not run across large portions of the facades. Ms. Pentz agreed. Mr. Baron suggested that, after restoring the brick piers, the applicant could attach small signs that allow the piers to remain visible. These signs could be painted onto glass to achieve the Parisian look he desires.

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

150 S. INDEPENDENCE MALL, 170 S. INDEPENDENCE MALL, AND 675 SANSOM STREET

Owner: Walnut Street Capital

Applicant: Jonathan Dyer

History: Public Ledger Building: 1926-27; Horace Trumbauer, architect;
significant to Society Hill Historic District, 03/10/1999

Curtis Building: 1910-14; Edgar Seeler, architect
individually designated 03/07/1974

significant to Society Hill Historic District, 03/10/1999

675 Sansom Street: 1923

contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 03/10/1999

Project: Replace concrete sidewalks with decorative sidewalks

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the concrete sidewalks around the Public Ledger Building, the Curtis Building, and 675 Sansom Street, with gray three foot square concrete panels and decorative brick work and the company logo at the entrances.

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

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

Mr. Coburn summarized the application. He stated that the owner is concerned about pedestrian safety. He is proposing a dark grey concrete sidewalk on Walnut, 6th and 7th Streets, but not Chestnut Street. The sidewalks would have a three-foot-square grid and brick borders and stainless steel logos at the entrances. Some extant brick areas, such as that at the corner of 6th and Chestnut, would be retained. The unique sidewalk would help provide the buildings with a brand identity. Mr. Coburn also noted that the existing granite curbs would be reset.

Mr. Baron explained the staff recommendation of approval, stating that this two-block area is its own zone and does not relate directly to a larger context. Therefore, there is no extant historic paving to match or complement.

Messrs. McCoubrey and Rivera stated that the three-foot-square modules were not appropriate; they are too small and result in many oddly shaped and sized pieces at boundaries. They suggested larger scaled panels to harmonize with the very large buildings. Mr. Rivera also suggested that the concrete should be textured.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the concrete panels are larger and textured like honed granite, with the Architectural Committee to review details.

2121 DELANCEY STREET

Owner: Lean and Tae Kim

Applicant: Rachel S. Schade

History: c. 1865

individually designated, 01/06/1972

contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 02/08/1995

Project: Restore façade, construct stairhouse and deck on rear ell

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the façade by installing four-over-four double-hung windows with true-divided-lights and refinishing the existing shutters. This application also proposes to install one-over-one aluminum clad double-hung windows throughout the rear, infill a window with glass block, convert two doors to double-hung windows, and install two air conditioning condensers at grade and one on the one-story roof. A roof deck with stair house is proposed for the rear ell and a skylight is proposed for the roof of the 1960s rear addition. This application also proposes to alter the rear facade of the 1960 addition by enlarging an opening, relocating a window, removing the sliding aluminum doors and balcony, and installing clad French doors.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the height of the stair house is reduced and the windows at the back of the main block and in the historic rear ell are six-over-six, wood, true-divided-light, double-hung windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Architect Rachel Schade represented the application.

Ms. Schade stated that she may restore rather than replace the front windows. She stated that she is willing to specify wood windows at the rear as the staff recommended.

Ms. Schade observed that the rear shed is a 1960s-era addition and is not historic. She proposes to add a skylight, enlarge a window opening, move a window, and replace sliding doors with French doors in the addition. The Committee members agreed that the alterations would be acceptable.

The discussion turned to the deck and stair house. Ms. Schade stated that the ceiling height in the stair house is set at 8 feet, but should could reduce it to seven feet and slope the roof to make it less conspicuous. The Committee members approved of the suggestion.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the height of the stair house is reduced by one foot and the windows at the back of the main block and in the historic rear ell are six-over-six, wood, true-divided-light, double-hung windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

1531-33 PINE STREET

Applicant: Donna Yohe

Owner: 1531 Pine Street Associates

History: c. 1865

individually designated and contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District

Project: Coat brownstone on first-story façade; install railings

OVERVIEW: The proposal involves alterations to two rowhouses that were formerly used by an electrical institute and have been converted to condominiums. The proposal calls for legalizing the removal of the paint at the ground-floor façade and the treatment of the brownstone base with an elastomeric coating. The applicant removed the paint with a combination of paint stripper and a rotary grinder. The grinder left a circular pattern in the brownstone. The brownstone was patched with Jahn brownstone patching material and a sample was approved. Other patches did not match the approved sample and the applicant now wishes to coat the stone to hide these patches. Staff recommends that the stone should be lightly sanded with a belt-sander to remove the circular pattern and the mismatched patches should be replaced to match. The brownstone is in fairly good condition and the coating would not allow the stone to breath properly.

The second item is the railings. When the renovation project was approved by the Commission, the applicant's drawings showed that the new railings would match the original ones found on an adjacent property. The applicant was even able to buy several pieces of original railing but found the cost of replicating them too great. The applicant now proposes four different designs.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Scott and Donna Yohe of the construction company represented the application.

The Committee considered the railings first. Ms. Yohe stated that she would prefer that the railings on the two buildings match now that the properties have been consolidated. Mr. Yohe stated that he has been searching for pieces to match the original railing for two years, but has only found four of them. Mr. Baron stated that \$11,000 to replicate the original railings is not a large amount of money when compared to the windows, for example. Mr. Baron also reported that the asking prices for the condominium units are large sums and should support the replication of the historic railings. Mr. Yohe responded that the units are not selling; they are sitting. He clarified that \$11,000 is only for the replication; it would cost \$15,000 to replicate and install the historic railings. Ms. Yohe stated that comparing the costs of the units to the costs of the railings is illogical. She reported that she did not budget \$15,000 for railings. She said that she "never imagined in her wildest fantasies" that two small railings would cost \$15,000. She said that they budgeted \$3 or \$4,000 for the railings, which should be sufficient. Mr. Baron noted that the existing railings are grandfathered and can be retained at no cost. Ms. Pentz suggested that the applicants retain the existing railings if they do not want to pay for historic railings. Mr. Baron showed photographs of the existing railings; one is a diamond pattern; the other is a straight picket. Mr. Yohe noted that there are a variety of railings on the block. Ms. Yohe requested approval of any one of her four designs she provided in the packet. She stated that she only wanted matching railings that were reasonably priced. Mr. Rivera suggested Option 4; Mr. Baron stated that it does not match the original. He added that the Commission requires exact matches for windows and, being consistent, should do the same for railings when the evidence and documentation exists. He remarked that the Commission does not allow old vinyl windows to be replaced with new vinyl windows. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the existing railings

are in the designation photographs; the historic railings were not removed while the building was under the Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Baron stated that the applicants are making an economic hardship argument. Ms. Yohe asked if it would be possible to replace the diamond railing with a second straight picket railing to match the existing railing. Mr. Baron stated that it would not meet Standard 6 which calls for replacements to match the original design. Mr. Rivera stated that the Commission often approves straight pickets. Mr. Baron countered that the Commission typically approves simple railings when a building had no railings originally and need railings to meet code. This building had railings and we know what they were originally. Mr. Yohe noted that the entire building has been restored at great expense. Mr. Baron commended the work on much of the building but noted that the Commission approved a package which allowed for a fair amount of modernization at the rear with a restoration of the front that included the railings. Ms. Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey said that applicants have three simple options: they could retain the existing railings; restore one of the railings to its original design and retaining the other railing; or restore both railings. Mr. Riviera said that he would recommend approval of Option 1.

The discussion turned to the brownstone. Mr. Baron presented background information and explained that no permit exists for the masonry repair. A staff member visited the site to approve a sample patch which has retained the correct color to this day. Other patches done later did not always match as well. Ms. Yohe reported that the brownstone was repaired according to the approved specifications using Jahn patching material. She stated that Mr. Baron had recommended the repair method. She stated that they had expended a great deal of money and effort attempting to restore the brownstone, but the restoration was not successful. She stated that the brownstone now looks "horrendous." She stated that the brownstone was discovered to be in very poor condition when they removed the paint. Mr. Yohe reported that they undertook a very expensive restoration of the brownstone and rebuilt many missing and damaged features. However, despite using exactly the same Jahn patching material in all instances, the patches are two very different colors. Mr. Yohe stated that it is unreasonable to chip out the patches and put new patches in, hoping that they will all match. Mr. Yohe claimed that two brownstone buildings across the street had been recently repaired and then coated. He would like to apply a similar coating to get a uniform look. He stated that his buildings look poor now because of the mismatched patches. He remarked that it looks like a car that needs a paint job. Ms. Yohe stated that buyers will not consider their building in this state. Mr. Baron pointed out what he considered to be the worst patch in a photograph. Mr. Yohe stated that he had the patching color approved by the staff. Ms. Pentz stated that she would prefer that the brownstone not be coated with Thorolastic. Mr. Yohe stated that the building is now a "Dalmatian." Mr. Baron pointed out that if the applicants had not removed the paint, they could have painted over the existing paint which they chose not to do. Pointing out what he considered to be the worst patch on the façade in a photograph, he explained how the façade could be made to look uniform with relatively little work. Mr. Baron stated that the applicant could seek a permit to coat the steps because they now consist of brownstone covered with cement. Ms. Yohe stated that they had Mr. Baron approve the patching product and the color and she feels now that she is being penalized. Mr. Yohe again stated that they went to great expense to restore the brownstone. They would now like to make it look better. Ms. Yohe noted that their subcontractor attended Jahn classes for his certification. Ms. Pentz stated that she thinks the brownstone should not be coated.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended denial of all four proposed railings and the coating of the brownstone, pursuant to Standard 6.

31-33 S. 2ND STREET

Applicant: Paul Drzal, Harmann Deutsch, Architects

Owner: EFL Partners V

History: 31 S 2nd, constructed c. 1840

33 S. 2nd, façade constructed c. 1905

Both individually designated and contributing to the Old City District

Project: construct storefronts, lighting and signage

OVERVIEW: This proposal involves installing storefronts in two commercial buildings. The existing storefronts are not original.

The building at 31 S. 2nd had a Greek Revival storefront with columns supporting the extant marble architrave. The location of joints and shadow outlines of the former capitols would seem to indicate that the storefront was constructed as part of a pair with 29 S. 2nd Street. The applicant does not wish to reproduce the historic storefront, but rather to restore the marble architrave and add wood faced columns and infill doors. The size of proposed glass panes should be revised to better match the windows above.

The proposed storefront for 33 S. 2nd appears compatible, but research has not uncovered any historic documentation of the original storefront. The applicant also proposes a flat wall sign, a projecting banner sign, and façade lighting.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Craig Deutsch represented the application.

Mr. Deutsch asked the Committee if staining the wood storefront proposed for 33 would be acceptable. Messrs. McCoubrey and Rivera replied that it should be painted not stained. Stain was not used historically for wood trim on buildings.

Mr. Baron stated that the staff preferred the signage within a glass, not a wood, transom. Mr. Deutsch described the signage as three-dimensional metal lettering back lit and allowing views of the transom.

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

519 S. JUNIPER STREET

Applicant: Benjamin Sanchez, Ballard Spahr, Andrews and Ingersoll

Owners: Eric & Rachel Silverman

History: c.1835; individually designated 1984

Project: alter and legalize alterations to windows, doors, lintels, and shutters

OVERVIEW: The application involves an early 19th century rowhouse. It was constructed with a storefront with two corner commercial doors and a residence upstairs with a door from Rodman Street.

In 2006, the Commission's staff requested violations for work to a number of properties on Juniper Street including 519. The violation reached the new homeowner immediately after a

sale. The terms of the agreement of sale however specified that the seller would correct any violations. The seller had installed aluminum-clad wood windows in the various facades of the building on all floors, decorative Fypon lintels with keystones above doors and windows where there had been none, and plastic shutters with incorrect panels where there had been none at the time of designation. Incorrect doors had been installed in the storefront doorways at some time after 1981. The seller installed a fluted pilaster door surround at the residential doorway on Rodman Street.

The application proposes a compromise in which the applicants would remove the plastic shutters and the Fypon lintels in all locations except over the Rodman Street residential door and restore the masonry. They would install correct wood shutters with real metal hardware. They would remove the inappropriate main storefront window and install the correct double-hung window. They seek the legalization of the upper floor aluminum-clad Pella Windows, the doors at all locations, and the surround at the Rodman Street residential door.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the upper floor windows and Rodman Street door surround, but approval of the remainder of the application, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Property owners Rachel and Eric Silverman and attorney Ben Sanchez represented the application.

Mr. Sanchez explained that the Silvermans received a violation in the mail addressed to the previous owner just two weeks after purchasing the property. The agreement sale stipulated that the seller would cure any violations; however, he has not. Mr. Sanchez listed the numerous restoration costs already incurred by his clients, including the costs of the shutters and windows. Mr. Silverman noted that the conditions behind the lintels are unknown. He worried that they might discover problems requiring expensive repairs. Mr. Sanchez posited that they may be opening a Pandora's box when they remove the decorative lintels. Ms. Pentz opined that the lintels are the most inappropriate features. Ms. Silverman stated that she would like to retain the illegal door surround because it is attractive. Mr. Rivera noted that this is an important corner property. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the sharp brick edge is an important feature of the doorway; that edge has been lost with the installation of the faux door surround. He suggested the applicants may feel differently about the look of the door once the offending surround is removed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposed alterations and legalizations, provided the door surround on Rodman Street is restored to its historic appearance, with the staff to review details.

1604 MT. VERNON STREET

Applicant: John Gibbons, architect

Owner: Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation

History: Vacant lot at time of inclusion in Spring Garden District

Project: Construct rowhouse in the style of the remainder of row.

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for reconstructing a four-story row house. The application proposes an accurate restoration of all elements of the historic row house except the basement windows and the rear. The Commission has review and comment jurisdiction.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the historically appropriate basement windows are installed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 4 of the Reconstruction Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Dave Artman represented the application.

Mr. Artman and the Committee discussed the project. He explained that they are willing to install the correct basement windows and have provided a revised drawing. The Committee members concurred with the staff recommendation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Commission comment that the proposal is appropriate, provided the historically appropriate basement windows are installed, pursuant to Standard 4 of the Reconstruction Guidelines.

1619-21 WALLACE STREET

Applicant: John Gibbons, architect

Owner: Spring Garden Community Development Corporation

History: 1619 Wallace Street, built c. 1863 designated contributing to Spring Garden District 2000, demolished without a permit 2002

1621 Wallace Street, vacant lot at time of designation of district

Project: Construct three-story building and reconstruct illegally demolished building

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for constructing a single handicap accessible residential building on the site of two vacant lots. A designated row house stood on one of the lots. It was demolished by the Philadelphia Housing Authority without Historical Commission approval or a demolition permit in 2002. The Commission's staff informed the authority in writing prior to the demolition of the Commission's jurisdiction and process as well as the federal Section 106 jurisdiction and process. The proposal essentially restores both lots back to their original row house appearance. The ground floor of 1621 Wallace is an exception; it would include an at-grade entrance to meet ADA requirements. The building at 1619 Wallace Street would be reconstructed with lowered first-floor windows and without its mansard, which was a later addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 4 of the Reconstruction Standards and Standard 9 of the Rehabilitation Standards.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Dave Artman represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that one lot was a vacant lot at the time of designation; the other had a building on it. The building was demolished illegally. This application proposed to reconstruct the illegally demolished building, but without the mansard. The mansard was not original, but was a later addition. Also, at the first floor, the windows will be lower than the original windows owing to the at-grade access for disabled people. Mr. Artman responded this building would house the handicap units required for the entire development of 23 properties. It would also alleviate the necessity of building ramps on multiple properties. Mr. McCoubrey noted the size of the large glass transom, and suggested doubling it up. Mr. Rivera suggested dropping the door and transom.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 4 of the Reconstruction Standards and Standard 9 of the Rehabilitation Standards.

601 N. 17TH STREET

Applicant: John Gibbons, architect

Owner: Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation

History: Vacant at the time of inclusion in Spring Garden Historic District

Project: Review and Comment - Construct a three-story building with storefront

OVERVIEW: The Commission has Review-and-Comment jurisdiction over this vacant lot. The application proposes the construction of a corner building with storefront. The proposed design is compatible with the district and surrounding buildings in massing, scale, rhythm and materials.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Dave Artman represented the application.

Mr. Artman and the Committee discussed the proposed building. The Committee members agreed that it is compatible with the district and surrounding buildings in massing, scale, rhythm and materials.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Commission comment that the proposed building is compatible with the district and surrounding buildings in massing, scale, rhythm and materials.

2209 PINE STREET

Applicant/Owner: Mark Gamba

History: built c. 1855, added mansard c. 1900, rear altered twentieth century.

Project: Restore façade, alter rear

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for the restoration of the front façade of this rowhouse, and alterations to the rear. The rear is obliquely visible from Panama Street. The plans for the rear show cutting new windows in the base of the building, not visible to the public, closing several windows on the right side, restoring the second floor bay, cutting a two-story window at the 3rd and 4th stories and a two leaf door onto an existing balcony. Because of structural issues the applicant proposes to replace the masonry wall at the 3rd and 4th stories with wood framing and stucco.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the rear masonry wall is supported and retained, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: The Committee lacked a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Mark Gamba, the owner, represented the application.

Mr. Gamba introduced photographs displaying the deteriorating conditions that included severe bowing of the structure holding up the rear third floor wall. Mr. Gamba explained that this is the reason he seeks to rebuild that area, which is presently stuccoed and barely visible. Explaining his reasons for blocking the three windows, Mr. Gamba stated that he has a handicapped family member and must install an elevator. He also remarked that he hopes to keep the stairwell in place; the large glass window would recapture the light lost from the closed windows.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Reconstruction Standard 4: Reconstruction will be based on an accurate duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by documentary or physical evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different features from other historic properties. A reconstructed property will re-create the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color, and texture.

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 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.