

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

**TUESDAY, 24 JANUARY 2012
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, Chair
John Cluver
Shawn Evans
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey

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

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance
Nicole Marquis, Marquis & Co.
Tim Kerner, Terra Studio
Rachel Fuld
Juliet Geldi, North Street Design
Gary Brent, MG Permits
John Stittner, Icon Identity Solutions
Julie Dorenbos, Skin Palette
Susie Celek, Skin Palette
Robert D'Alonzo
Yan Li
Subhas Mazumdar
Rui Gung
Yong Quan Zheng
Wendy Li
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg, LLP
Alan Nochumson, Esq., Nochumson PC
Nicole McGraw, Dr. Martins
Constantine Tsikos
Lisa Wershaw
Steven Engelmeyr
Guy Gindhart
Vasilios Dimopoulos, Dimopoulos Realty LP
Frederick Barletta, Colliers L&A
Bishop Charles E. Bennison Jr., Episcopal Diocese
Joseph K. Beyer, Beyer Studio, Inc.
Jerald Goodman, Esq., Drinker Biddle
Mary Kohart, Episcopal Diocese

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Evans joined her. Messrs. Cluver and McCoubrey joined them later in the meeting.

ADDRESS: 127 S 18TH ST

Project: Install awning and signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: ADR 18th and Sansom LLC

Applicant: Nicole Marquis, Hip City Veg

History: 1870; storefront added, 1915

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a wood awning above the non-historic storefront at 127 S. 18th Street. The awning would be supported by an aluminum frame mounted into existing bracket holes. The awning will consist of six-inch oak boards spaced three inches apart over the aluminum frame. This application also proposes vinyl decal signage for the storefront window.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Business owner Nicole Marquis represented the application.

Ms. Marquis stated that the Sign Committee of the Art Commission reviewed her proposal last week and that the members of the Committee stated that they would approve the awning, contingent on the Historical Commission's approval. She stated that her new restaurant is intended to be an example of sustainability and this would carry through to the reclaimed wood awning. She stated that the awning would consist of oak that will look exquisite and would complement the Rittenhouse Square area. She opined that the proposed awning would be an improvement over the existing awning, which is a vinyl back-lit awning.

Mr. Evans asked the staff about the awning shown in the designation photo and the one that is currently installed on the storefront. Ms. Cote explained that the awning in the designation photo was grandfathered in with the designation and that the Commission has no record of review for the existing awning. Mr. Evans informed the applicant that the existing awning is essentially illegal.

Ms. Hawkins stated that historically awnings were made of fabric. She stated that she thought that this was the first time the Committee had reviewed a proposal for a wood awning.

Ms. Marquis clarified that this awning may require new installation holes, but that she would use existing holes where possible. She stated that she would patch the old holes with the dust from the new holes. She stated that this would make the building look even better. She stated that the awning will need to be supported every 30 inches as opposed to every 36 inches. She supplied a photograph of a wood awning found in Center City. She stated that she proposed to have a metal frame around the wood as shown in the photograph.

Mr. Evans stated that he was concerned that the installation of the awning as proposed would prevent one from reading the limestone of the first story of the building. He observed that it would separate the lower portion of the building from the upper floors. Ms. Hawkins stated that a wood awning would appear more permanent than a traditional fabric awning and that a wood awning would require more installation holes to support the additional weight.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the awning could be lowered to the window opening. Ms. Marquis stated that she would look into that, but she noted that was concerned that it would not meet the entrance height requirement. Mr. McCoubrey stated that awnings are typically utilitarian in nature in that they provide shade and protection from the weather as well as a signage opportunity. He stated that the proposed awning appears to be more of a decorative element. Ms. Hawkins stated that the proposed awning is too wide and too high. Mr. Evans opined that the architecture of the building does not want an awning. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the awning fit within the window opening.

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

ADDRESS: 1634 PINE ST

Project: Demolish rear slope of roof, construct roof deck and dormer

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: William J. and Ann D. O'Hara

Applicant: Timothy Kerner, Terra Studio LLC

History: 1885

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a dormer on front slope of the roof at 1634 Pine Street. The proposed dormer would be clad in cement panel siding and a metal roof with aluminum clad windows. The dormer is proposed to be set back 10 feet from the front façade and may not be visible from Pine Street. However, it may be visible from S. 17th or S. Chadwick Streets.

This application also proposes to demolish the rear slope of the main roof to make way for a roof deck. The deck would be accessed by a spiral stair leading from the roof of a two-story, rear addition. A door cut is proposed for the third-floor rear of the main block to access the spiral stair on the roof of the two-story addition. The rear of the property is visible from Waverly Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Tim Kerner and property owners Allison and Kyle Miller represented the application.

Mr. Kerner referenced the photographs submitted in the application and pointed out the view from Waverly Street. He stated that a rear garage on the property fronts on Waverly Street. He stated that the reason for the proposed roof deck is that the current existing courtyard is not very private as the neighbors use their backyard space as parking for a business. He stated that the building has two rear additions and that the rear of the property is minimally and obliquely

visible from Waverly Street. Mr. Kerner referred to the section drawing showing that the rear half of the gable roof would be demolished for the construction of the deck. He stated that the deck would not be visible from Pine Street. He stated that the dormer on the front slope is proposed to provide office space and light for the property owner. He stated that the proposed dormer does not disrupt the rhythm of the row as it is not visible from Pine Street. He noted that he and his clients are open to discussing the materials of the dormer.

Ms. Hawkins asked why the roof deck was proposed to be so high above what would have been the historic cornice line. Mr. Kerner responded that the extra height would provide views of the Center City skyline.

Mr. Evans asked if a brick wall along the property line of the courtyard would address the privacy concerns. Mr. Kerner responded that building such a wall would be difficult because there is a shared alleyway between the two properties. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the wall could be inset from the property line.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she was most concerned with the proposed height of the roof deck and the removal of half of the main roof. Mr. Gutterman stated that she was most troubled by the width of the proposed dormer. She stated that the proposed dormer does not relate to the house. Mr. Evans stated that he was more concerned with the dormer over the deck. Ms. Gutterman concurred. Ms. Hawkins stated that the large deck would require the removal of a large amount of historic fabric.

The Committee suggested deleting the dormer from the proposal and relocating and reducing the size of the deck. Without the deck on the rear half of the main block, the additional space that the dormer would provide would be unnecessary.

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

ADDRESS: 229-37 ARCH ST

Project: Restore facades, replace and add windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Berger Development L.P.

Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker + Partners

History: 1913; Berger Brothers Company; expanded, 1918

Individual Designation: 1/6/1977

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

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: The site at 229-37 Arch Street encompasses several historic and non-historic buildings. The site extends from Arch Street, north along Bread Street, to Cherry Street. The site is adjacent to the Betsy Ross House, which stands to the west. There are three historic buildings within the site: a five-story industrial building facing Arch Street, a four-story industrial building at the corner of Cherry Street, and a three-story light industrial building on Cherry Street. A modern four-story addition, constructed in 1990, connects the building on Cherry with the one on Arch Street.

In December 2007, the Historical Commission reviewed a conceptual proposal to demolish the 1990 addition, construct a tower in its place, rehabilitate the façade on Arch Street, and reopen

and cut window openings on both east and west elevations of the Arch Street building. The Commission voted to approve the proposal in concept.

The current application proposes to retain the 1990 addition, rehabilitate the historic façade on Arch Street, and to reopen and cut window and vent openings on both east and west elevations of the Arch Street building.

The west elevation of the historic Arch Street building is a stucco party wall and contains several non-historic openings. This application proposes a regular fenestration and brick vent pattern for this façade. The east elevation of the historic Arch Street building contains historic and non-historic, as well as, infilled openings. The historic openings had six-over-six double-hung windows. This application proposes to retain the existing non-historic windows and install windows that match the configuration of the non-historic windows in the new and reopened openings. The staff suggests that the historic six-over-six windows should be installed in the restored openings, and a one-over-one version of the historic window in the new openings. The existing windows can remain in place until such time that their replacement is necessary.

This application proposes to rehabilitate the front façade of the historic Arch Street building. According to historic photographs, the first floor contained two sets of wood double doors, flanked by storefront windows with a granite sill over a tripartite basement entrance, on either side of the central entrance. By 1976, the basement entrances had been infilled with brick. By the time of the creation of the historic district in 2003 a granite base ran the entire length of the front façade. The application proposes to remove the granite base at the two historic entrances and below the shop windows. Metal storefront doors are proposed for the historic entrances and brick infill for the area below the shop windows. The staff suggests that the historic door be replicated to full height in either wood or metal, and that the brick infill below the shop window is articulated to reflect the tripartite configuration.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the appropriate windows are installed in the appropriate openings, and historic entrances are restored, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Cecil Baker, John Bastian, and Eric Leighton represented the application.

Mr. Evans asked if any new construction was proposed. Mr. Leighton responded that there is minor new construction proposed with the removal of the existing elevator shaft in the Arch Street building, a shaft extension is proposed for the 1990s addition along with a corridor to connect with the Arch Street building.

Mr. Leighton stated that the approach was to keep as many of the existing windows in place, open any previous openings that had been infilled, and then add new openings to complete the fenestration pattern. He indicated on the drawings where they proposed to keep the existing windows, open the infilled openings with windows to match the existing, and open new openings with windows to match the existing. He stated that there are 32 window openings with existing windows, there are 13 infilled openings, and would be nine new window openings. Ms. Gutterman asked if they are proposing arched openings and windows. Mr. Baker responded that they are showing arching the openings and windows in the drawings; however, they would prefer to have the flat-head openings and windows. Ms. Gutterman opined that the new arched openings and windows would confuse the new and old openings. Mr. Baker replied that they would prefer to install one-over-one windows with flat tops in the new openings.

Mr. Evans asked the staff to point out the openings for which they suggested six-over-six windows. Ms. Cote responded that the staff suggested installing six-over-six windows in the restored openings, where the infill would be removed. Ms. Hawkins observed that the elevation would have a very piecemeal appearance with the square head one-over-ones, the existing windows, and six-over-six windows in the restored openings. Mr. Leighton stated that their proposal is intended to give the façade a consistent appearance. Mr. Baron stated that the awning windows seemed inappropriate for the Arch Street building. He stated that the staff is suggesting the different windows for the different openings so as not to perpetuate an inappropriate and non-historic look for the building. He stated that, if the owner needs to replace the existing windows at a later date, then the appropriate historic window could be installed. Ms. Hawkins asked if the historic windows for the east elevation of the Arch Street building were, in fact, six-over-six. Ms. Cote referred her to a period photograph showing the historic six-over-six window. Mr. Baker stated that Bread Street is narrow and a pedestrian would never be able to get a full-on view of the east elevation and did not see a problem with having different windows in different openings.

Mr. Evans asked about the stucco infill proposed on Bread Street. Mr. Leighton explained that that was the main entrance for the 1990s addition. He stated that the current scheme relocates the main entrance for the apartments to the courtyard on the west side of the building. He stated that the floor plan reflects a staircase behind the proposed infill. Ms. Hawkins asked if a window could be included or if it could be filled with brick. Mr. Leighton stated that that was possible.

Mr. Leighton explained that they propose a regular fenestration pattern of the west elevation, which is currently a stucco party wall with random punched openings. He stated that they also propose to add brick at the first floor to clean up the existing patchy and uneven stucco.

Mr. Leighton explained that a granite base now runs the entire front façade of the Arch Street building. He stated that they propose to restore the entrances. Mr. Baker stated that they would articulate the brick base to reflect the historic tripartite configuration. Ms. Cote stated that the staff also suggested that the new doors replicate the historic doors and be full height, without an extra transom. The applicants agreed to restore the entrance doors. Mr. Evans stated that the historic configuration of the storefront is very clear in the historic photographs. He suggested that, because we have documentation of the historic configuration, that area should be restored as well, rather than simply making an allusion to it. Mr. Baker stated that this area could be restored as well.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the new openings on the east elevation have squareheaded one-over-one windows and that the reopened historic openings on the east elevation are arched with six-over-six windows, the infill area on the 1990s addition is either brick or contains a window, and the historic entrances and storefronts are restored, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 315 CHERRY ST

Project: Construct third-story addition and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rachel Fuld & David Patchefsky

Applicant: Rachel Fuld

History: 1915

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof-top addition with roof deck towards the rear of the building. The building is a two-story light industrial building and it is situated in the middle of a row of three such buildings. The three buildings are almost identical in massing and design; however, the corner building, 317, is slightly taller than the building in question.

The proposed addition would be set back nine feet from the front façade on Cherry Street. The addition would be clad in metal panels. The fenestration would be oriented towards the east and south. The addition would include a roof deck. The deck would be set back 14 feet from the edge of the addition, not the front façade. The total set back from the front façade of the building would be 23 feet. The applicant has submitted sight-line studies that indicate that the addition would not be visible from Orianna Street, and slightly visible from Cherry Street. The proposed roof deck would not be visible from either street.

The Commission approved a roof-top addition on a neighboring property along Orianna Street in August 2006. That addition is visible from Cherry Street. The Commission, however, denied a roof deck proposed for the roof-top space between the front façade and the addition because it would have been highly conspicuous.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Kevin Rasmussen represented the application.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that the addition would add two bedrooms to this house. Ms. Gutterman asked about the material of the railings. Mr. Rasmussen answered that the railings would be metal cables. Ms. Hawkins asked about the color of the metal cladding panels. Mr. Rasmussen answered they would be a dull grey.

Mr. Evans asked why the staff believed that the addition would not be visible. Mr. Danta answered that the addition would be visible, but not conspicuous. He explained that the Commission had approved a similar application on Orianna Street, where the addition was also visible, yet not conspicuous. Mr. Danta noted that the addition and the deck would be visible from a distance on Cherry Street. He stated that spatially the addition and deck would blend with the rest of the block, on which stand buildings of various heights and massings. Ms. Gutterman asked why the staff believed the addition would blend with the other buildings. Mr. Danta explained that there are taller buildings further east on the block, and that the block has buildings of varied heights and materials. He stated that the addition would add one more form within a varied backdrop. He noted that this setting is very different from a block with an intact row of Second Empire houses. He stated that, in such a setting, this addition might not be appropriate, but in this context it is appropriate. Ms. Hawkins stated that she was concerned that the addition would be visible from the front façade. Ms. Gutterman asked if the Commission

would be setting a precedent if it approved this application. Mr. Danta answered that the Commission had already set a precedent when it approved the Orianna Street application.

Messrs. Evans and McCoubrey advocated for a recommendation of approval. Ms. Gutterman and Ms. Hawkins advocated for a recommendation of denial.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: A majority of the members of the Architectural Committee failed to agree on a recommendation. Therefore, the Architectural Committee offered no recommendation.

ADDRESS: 2003 DELANCEY PL

Project: Construct basement entrance with railing and planter

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Francine Sella

Applicant: Juliet Geldi, North Street Design LLC

History: 1865; rehabbed in Colonial Revival style, 1912

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes work to the front of this townhouse. The house was built in 1865 as part of a row. The property was altered in 1912 by the prominent firm of Stewardson & Page. The Commission approved an application in July 2011 that included the restoration of the front façade and the addition of a garage at the rear.

The current application proposes to add a service entrance at the front façade. The entrance would be located below grade and would require the temporary removal of the marble steps leading to the front door of the house. The service entrance would be created by excavating beneath the marble steps. The steps would be removed and reinstalled upon the completion of the excavation. The water table would not be altered, but the cheek wall on the side of the marble steps would be altered; a window opening would be enlarged for the entranceway to the area under the steps. The steps down to the service entrance would be enclosed with a wrought iron fence. A planter is proposed to encircle the entrance. The planter would abut the marble steps.

The creation of a service entrance with planter would disrupt the spatial relationships of the significant 1912 front façade by Stewardson & Page. Furthermore, the addition of a planter next to the white marble steps could irreparably damage the marble. The rear of this property is accessible and a garage has been approved for that elevation. The rear façade faces a service alley. The applicant should consider the addition of the service entrance at the rear of the property.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Juliet Geldi represented the application.

Ms. Geldi stated that a precedent exists on the block; a house with a similar service entrance is nearby. She stated that the sidewalk is wide enough to accommodate the alteration without any

infringement to the public right-of-way. She noted that the next door house, which was designed by George Howe, has a sunken entrance.

Mr. Evans asked why the owners wanted to construct the service entrance. Ms. Geldi answered that the owners may eventually develop the basement as an apartment and that the entrance would need to be located away from the garage at the rear. She explained that the building code would not allow the legal occupancy of a basement-level apartment with the entrance through a garage. Ms. Gutterman asked about the uses of the basement that require service access. Ms. Geldi answered that the basement includes storage spaces and a mechanical room. Ms. Danta asked about the internal connections to the basement. Ms. Geldi answered that the service entrance leads to the main stair of the house.

Mr. McCoubrey expressed his concern with the proposed disassembly of the marble steps. He noted that the steps are monolithic and that their temporary disassembly may crack the steps. He also opined that the steps would not be properly supported once a door is inserted. Mr. Evans stated that this alteration would have a significant impact on historic resources, yet does not appear to be useful or necessary. Mr. Evans also expressed his concern with the impact it could have on the neighboring Howe house, which is a significant historic house.

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

ADDRESS: 1424-26 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sunny Spring LLC

Applicant: Gary Brent, MG Permits

History: 1903; Jacob Reed's Sons; William L. Price, architect; rear 5th story added, 1909, Spencer Roberts, architect

Individual Designation: 3/29/1966

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install two signs on the front façade along Chestnut Street. This building was designed by prominent Philadelphia architect William Price, one of the most accomplished practitioners of the Arts & Crafts movement in the region. This building, which originally housed Jacob Reed's Sons' Men Clothing Store, was among the first reinforced concrete structures in Philadelphia. Its fine façade is very well preserved.

The current tenant, CVS Pharmacies, currently has four signs on this façade, two bronze wall plaques on each end pilaster, a flat sign over the entrance, and a stained-glass transom with the pharmacy's logo. The Commission approved these signs in 1996. During that review, the Commission denied the installation of an illuminated pendant sign over the main entrance. In 2007, the pharmacy requested the installation of a five-foot long illuminated sign on the front façade along Chestnut Street. The sign was proposed to be attached to the frieze of the entablature delineating the ground floor from the upper stories. The sign would have been directly attached to the original marble cladding. The Commission denied that application.

The current application proposes to install two signs in addition to the four signs that currently exist: a non-illuminated plastic face sign over the main entrance and an illuminated projecting

sign. The wall sign would be 10 feet long and it would have a white background. It would be located directly above the revolving-door entrance. The entrance to the store is painted dark brown. The projecting sign would also have a plastic face and it would be installed on the western pier directly above an existing bronze CVS wall plaque. The sign would be attached directly onto the marble. This sign would necessitate the installation of an electrical box.

The Commission's approval in 1996 balanced the needs of the tenant for advertisement with the preservation of this remarkable façade by one of the most prominent Philadelphia architects of the late nineteenth century. The two CVS bronze plaques that were approved closely resemble two original bronze plaques advertising the Jacob Reed's Sons' Store. The sign over the entrance also resembles the original sign for the store.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Expediter Gary Brent and sign designer John Stittner represented the application.

Mr. Brent stated that CVS would like to have signs that have greater impacts on vehicular and pedestrian traffic. He noted that the entrance to the store is set back from the front façade of the building. Mr. Danta stated that the best solution would be to install an illuminated sign inside the display window because the Commission does not have jurisdiction over the interior of this building. Ms. Hawkins concurred with Mr. Danta.

Mr. Stittner asked if the Committee would accept any other type of signage on the façade. Ms. Hawkins stated this building is just too significant and that there are ways to get advertisement without detracting from this very important façade. Mr. Danta suggested that the sign could be located at the mezzanine level for better visibility from a distance. Mr. Evans agreed with Mr. Danta. He advised the applicant to strongly consider signage in the display window.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance asked about the removal of the original Mercer Tiles from the recessed entranceway of the building. Mr. Danta answered that the tiles were illegally removed, and that the Commission had requested a violation. He stated that the Commission staff is currently working on the enforcement of the violation.

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

ADDRESS: 126 S 19TH ST

Project: Legalize awnings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John Ciccone

Applicant: Julie Dorenbos, Skin Palette

History: 1900

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the recladding of two awnings on the front façade of this building. The building was originally constructed as a residence about 1900.

Subsequently, the ground floor was altered for commercial use. The ground floor is clad in white marble, which is original to the residential design.

The building had a large box awning at the time of designation in 1995. The awning was later removed without a permit. The applicant submitted a photograph dated 1997 that shows it in place. The applicant, who is the tenant in this commercial ground-floor space, claims in a cover letter that she only replaced the canvas on an existing awning structure. The awning armature, however, was illegally installed. It is not the awning armature that appears in the 1995 and 1997 photographs. Furthermore, the photograph on Google Street View, which was taken fairly recently, shows the building without any awnings and its ground floor vacant.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Julie Dorenbos and Susie Celek represented the application.

Ms. Celek clarified that they had not installed the awning, and that they only replaced the canvas on an existing armature. Ms. Hawkins stated that the awning must have been illegally installed by a previous tenant. Ms. Celek apologized and stated that they did not know it was illegal.

Mr. Evans asked when the Google Street Views were taken. Mr. Danta answered that he did not have the exact date, but that they likely date from 2010. Ms. Celek noted that the previous tenant, City Nails, occupied the space for about 12 months in 2010.

Ms. Hawkins noted that it is unfortunate that the current tenant is now in the middle of an illegal condition for which it is not responsible. She stated that the ground-floor storefront is "spectacular." She stated that the awnings detract from the architecture of the building. Ms. Dorenbos asked if any type of awning would work for this building. Mr. Danta answered that the staff could approve an awning that is scaled appropriately and fits within the masonry opening of the display window, rather than overlapping onto the marble cladding. He stated that the entrance door is very refined and that an awning should not be located on the marble door surround.

Ms. Dorenbos stated that they had spent \$5,000 to reclad the awning. Ms. Hawkins stated that the cost of the awning could not be factored into the Committee's review, which is based on the Standards. Ms. Hawkins stated that an awning that respects the masonry opening would be appropriate and could be approved at the staff level.

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

ADDRESS: 46 N FRONT ST

Project: Alter and legalize rear alterations, construct deck, replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Third Federal Bank

Applicant: Gerry Gutierrez, Group G LLC

History: 1785; storefront piers added by Samuel Wetherill

Individual Designation: 11/29/1960

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

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the modification of a highly significant merchant's house to partially correct illegal modifications undertaken by a former owner in 2007. In 2001, this house was completely restored with correct windows. In 2007, a developer converted the structure to a four-unit building. That developer added a floor onto the rear ell, a bay onto the west façade to accommodate a new stair and hall passage, enlarged a door opening, and installed vinyl windows without an approval or building permit. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation and stopped the work. The developer went bankrupt and the Third Federal Bank seized the building, which it now owns. The current application, which was submitted by a prospective buyer, seeks to correct many elements in violation including the removal of the rear bay and replacement of the vinyl windows. The rear ell would retain the additional story, but would be reduced in height to sit below the rear cornice; a sloped shed roof like the original roof would replace the current roof. The application proposes returning the widened rear door opening to its single-leaf size and installing a door with muntins. The deck seen in an older photograph of the building would be reconstructed. Wood windows with muntins would be installed in the rear ell. The Committee reviewed and recommended for approval of an identical application a few months ago, but the application was withdrawn before the Commission meeting because of uncertainty about the sale.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. He reported that architect Gerry Gutierrez was unable to attend the meeting, owing to a conflict.

Mr. Baron read the overview and explained that the current application satisfied the Committee's recommendation on the similar recent application including complying with the Committee's that the rear door opening be narrowed to its original width. The Committee members pointed out that photographs showed awnings on the front doors and some solar equipment on the roof. They noted that those existing features were not on the plans and therefore the review would not consider those features.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 2041 LOCUST ST

Project: Construct rear addition, restore front façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2041 Locust Street LLC

Applicant: Guy Gindhart, Gindhart Planning & Design

History: 1870; storefront added, 1895

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the rehabilitation of the front façade of this townhouse and the construction of a rear addition. The prospective owners are undertaking their due diligence before purchasing this long-empty, poorly-kept house. They seek to restore the masonry façade with the removal of paint and the installation of two-over-two windows and louvered shutters at the upper floors. The much altered storefront would be modified with the installation of three double hung windows with transoms within the existing masonry opening. The doorway would be restored to its c. 1920 condition with the removal of a later pediment.

The application proposes demolishing the rear wall of the rear ell and adding a full lot-width addition and garage with deck. The building would also be expanded upward with the construction of additional floors on the rear ell and the insertion of an elevator. Although it would be taller than the main block of the house, the addition would be set back 24 feet from the front façade. The addition would be visible from the rear, which faces carriage houses on an alley-like street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Architect Guy Gindhart and prospective owners Lisa Wershaw and Steve Englemeyr represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the architect would prepare a revised drawing that specified the retention of the chimney and reconstruction of the split pediment. The Committee members contended that the chimney should be retained and supported, if the interior section was removed. The applicants said that they would prefer to remove the pediment altogether; however, their second choice would be to retain the existing triangular pediment. The Committee members explained that the frontispiece needed a pediment to make sense architecturally, because the columns are intended to support something. They explained, however, that the applicants have the right to retain the existing pediment. The property owner defines the scope of work and the Committee reviews within that scope.

The Committee members discussed the elevator and skylights with the applicants and were convinced that they would not be visible from the public right-of-way. They then discussed the placement of the windows on the side wall and the stuccoing the side wall. The Committee members said that they understood the desire to raise the windows to unify the floor levels between the front and back of the house. However, they objected to raising the third-floor windows raised above the corbelled cornice of the rear ell. They determined that it would be appropriate to stucco the new addition, but not the existing walls of the ell. They suggested but did not insist on adding windows to the garage door.

Returning to the discussion of the front façade, the Committee members decided that the three-part window scheme in the storefront was an acceptable solution. The Committee members suggested that the basement window should also be divided in three parts.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 1316 WALNUT ST

Project: Replace storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jason Real Estate Inc.

Applicant: Yong Quan Zheng

History: 1887; University Club; Wilson Eyre Jr., architect

Individual Designation: 7/12/2000

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the modification of this highly significant club building with an aluminum storefront. The club was converted to commercial use long ago and already has a non-historic storefront. On 6 October 2011, the applicants sought and obtained permission from Commission to demolish and reconstruct the interiors. However, they exceeded that permit and demolished a side bay and infilled rear windows with cinderblock, installed cast stone lintels, and began stuccoing the side of the building. It should be noted that the rear of the building is highly visible and was noted in the nomination as having historical significance. The side of the building, where the bay was removed and the stuccoing was started, is not highly visible. Owing to the unpermitted work, the Department of Licenses & Inspections has issued a Stop Work Order. The plans submitted with this application do not address the work that is in violation. No work can begin at the building until the illegal work that resulted in the Stop Work Order is addressed.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Subhas Mazumdar and Rui Gung and owner Yong Quan Zheng and his daughter Wendy Li represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that he has been working with the applicants to address the illegal work at the side and rear. He said that they may have brought architectural plans for those areas with them to the meeting, but the staff has not seen them. The Committee members agreed that all plans must be submitted in advance of the meeting. The Committee cannot consider plans for the first time at a Committee meeting; plans must be submitted to and reviewed by the staff and forwarded to the Committee in advance of its meeting.

The Committee member reviewed the original and newly amended storefront plans and determined that the proposed storefront was not appropriate for this building. The Committee members suggested that the windows should be reduced to either two or three leaves between the doors. They recommended that the panels beneath the windows should be more solid and opaque. They advised the applicant to use an interior see-through roll up gate. They found a sign with halo-lit letters acceptable. The Committee members agreed that, owing to the Stop

Work Order, the storefront should be approved only in conjunction with a plan to correct the illegal work at the side and rear.

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

ADDRESS: 1636 SPRUCE ST

Project: Legalize windows and dormer alterations

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Alexander G. Bochetto

Applicant: Carl Primavera, Klehr, Harrison, Harvey & Branzburg LLP

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize modifications to the dormers of this corner townhouse. The owner removed the wood two-over-two windows and installed one-over-one windows with storm windows. In addition, the wood bead-board pediments above the dormer windows were removed and replaced with glass.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Carl Primavera and architect Robert D'Alonzo represented the application.

Mr. Primavera explained that the owner removed the windows and the bead-board pediments to allow more sunlight into the space. He showed photographs of the work. He explained that it would be possible to add vertical muntins to the windows to recreate the two-over-two look. The Committee members asked if the muntin would be installed on the exteriors of the windows. Mr. Primavera explained that they could not because of the configuration of these windows. The Committee members stated that the bead-board pediments should be reinstalled and new windows with exterior vertical muntins installed. Mr. Primavera was asked about the roof deck, which was not constructed according to the approved plans, but which was not part of the current application. He explained that the architect was surveying the deck to draw as-built plans, but that he had not been authorized to apply to legalize the deck at this time.

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

ADDRESS: 1710 WALNUT ST

Project: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joan W. Kersher

Applicant: Alan Nochumson, Nochumson P.C.

History: 1840; H.W. Catherwood House; alts, Furness & Hewitt, 1874; storefront, 1930

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install an acrylic, internally-illuminated wall sign over a storefront window and an awning over the main entrance of this building. The awning will be a Sunbrella material and have open sides. No attachment information has been provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Alan Nochumson and retailer Nicole McGraw represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked the staff to clarify if the recommendation of denial was for both the box sign and awning. Ms. Sell responded that the staff considered the awning to be compatible with the building, provided the attachment details were appropriate, but objected to the internally-illuminated box sign, which is not compatible with the building or historic district.

Mr. Nochumson stated that they intended to make minor revisions to the awning proposal based on the suggestions of the Art Commission. He distributed images of those revisions. The awning will no longer cover the dentils and will not have the "Dr. Martin's" logo on the sloped section. He stated that the retailer originally planned to install a blade sign on an existing pole, but discovered that its use had been precluded by the Commission in August 2011. Referring to the minutes of that Commission meeting, Mr. Nochumson stated that the chair, Mr. Sherman, suggested an awning over the door as a possible alternative. Based on this suggestion, he proposed an awning with sides to the staff. He explained that the staff recommended that the awning have open sides and that he made those revisions as well. He concluded that this awning design results from Art Commissions and staff reviews and a suggestion of the Historical Commission chair. He stated that he is willing to work with the Committee to find a solution for the box sign. He explained that they need a sign in that location. He explained they have been in business since August 2011 and the only sign they have is a small logo in the window. He stated that the Art Commission did not take a position on the box sign. He acknowledged that they would prefer internal illumination, but have with them options for external illumination. He distributed copies of several options for external illumination: gooseneck, canopy, and strip light fixtures.

Ms. Hawkins suggested the awning be relocated within the masonry opening of the door, that its fasteners are attached to frame of the door, and that the fabric is a Sunbrella fabric.

Mr. Evans argued that he does not find any option for the wall sign and lighting appropriate owing to the original masonry ornamental blocks at the corners and center above the storefront window. Mr. Nochumson stated the blocks to the left and right would not be obscured. Mr. Evans stated that the large center block would be concealed. Mr. Evans suggested that the applicant utilize the storefront window for signage or add signage in the interior behind the window. Mr. Nochumson stated that they are wary of window signage blocking the view of the

merchandise. Mr. Evans responded that the window is 15 feet tall and signage could be installed high in the window. Ms. Hawkins explained that there are more possibilities for illuminated signage behind the glass because the Commission does not have jurisdiction over interior alterations. She opined that signage at the pedestrian eye-level will generate more attention than signage high above the ground. Mr. Nochumson asked the Committee if there was a possibility to install signage within the center block above the window. The Committee members stated they would not recommend approval of that option. Mr. Cluver asserted the only signage option in that location would be individual projecting letters that allow the architectural detail to be visible. Mr. Evans contended that letters at that height would not be easily viewed by pedestrians.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that, if the application is revised to relocate the awning within the masonry opening and eliminate the box sign, it may be approved at the staff level.

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

ADDRESS: 1719 GREEN ST

Project: Legalize vinyl windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Constantine Tsikos

Applicant: Constantine Tsikos

History: 1854; Josiah L. Haines, builder

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install one-over-one vinyl windows in all elevations of this building and legalize four vinyl windows in the rear ell. The original windows in this building were wood. This grand Italianate building is situated on the corner of 18th and Green Streets. All elevations are highly visible from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Constantine Tsikos represented the application.

Mr. Tsikos claimed that the existing windows are aluminum. Ms. Hawkins stated that the photographs show that the existing windows are wood. Mr. Tsikos stated that he purchased the building in 1996. At that time, the windows were aluminum. Ms. Sell distributed color photographs of the windows to the Committee.

Ms. Hawkins explained that, regardless of the existing material, the Historical Commission requires a review and seeks to replicate the original windows when windows are replaced. Mr. Tsikos claimed he did not know about the Commission's jurisdiction. He stated that he stopped the work when he discovered that it required the Commission's review. Ms. Hawkins explained that a vinyl window is not compatible with the architecture of the building. She added that aluminum capping is also inappropriate.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the existing windows do not appear to be aluminum in the photographs. Mr. Tsikos clarified that the storm windows on the exterior are aluminum, but that the windows behind the storms are wood. Mr. Tsikos asked the Committee if he could retain the exterior storm windows and replace the wood windows behind them with vinyl replacements. Ms. Gutterman explained that he may retain the storm windows, but that installing vinyl windows, even behind the storm windows, would not satisfy historic preservation standards. She stated that, in fact, it would be more appropriate to retain the wood windows and replace the exterior storm windows.

Ms. Hawkins explained that the Committee has never recommended approval of vinyl windows. Mr. Tsikos stated that the new windows would be more energy efficient. He explained that he has spent over \$13,000 on the windows. Ms. Hawkins explained that the Architectural Committee only reviews applications from an architectural and preservation perspective. She explained that the Commission has a financial hardship process to which he could apply if he believed that installing appropriate windows would impose an excessive burden. Mr. Cluver added that the contractor did not seek the requisite permits for the work. A building permit is required for replacing windows in a multi-family building such as this one, regardless of whether the building is designated as historic. If the requisite permit had been sought, the contractor would have been apprised of its historic designation.

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

ADDRESS: 11 S 21ST ST

Project: Stucco front façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dimopoulos Realty, L.P.

Applicant: Frank Schuch, S & S Concrete

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to stucco the façade of this building. The stucco would be installed over a wire lathe and the stucco material would be a masonry cement. The original exterior cladding material is brownstone. The first story has been stuccoed. The original brownstone is exposed at the upper stories, but has been painted white. The brownstone has deteriorated in several areas. The appropriate preservation treatment for the upper stories would be to remove the white paint and repair the brownstone, not cover it with stucco.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Vasilios Dimopoulos represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff is authorized to approve stucco at the first story, given that it is already stuccoed. Ms. Sell affirmed that the staff could approve appropriate stucco replacement at the first story only. Ms. Hawkins asked if the new stucco would thicken the wall. Mr. Dimopoulos stated that the wiring and stucco would thicken the wall by one inch.

Mr. Dimopoulos explained that the building is in poor condition. He stated that they purchased the building in 2008 with the best intentions. However, they cannot afford to do the work that is suggested by the staff. He stated that he is concerned that a piece of the façade may fall and hurt someone. He explained that he met with the staff prior to the Committee meeting and was advised to have architectural experts evaluate the building and develop a plan for repair. He stated that the windows and rear of the building are not original. He explained that moisture is seeping in down the walls of the bar area on the first floor.

Mr. Cluver stated that there is a right way and a wrong way to fix the problem. He noted that the building has remarkable detail in the brownstone and to cover it would have an adverse effect on the historic character of the building and the row of once-matching buildings.

Mr. Dimopoulos stated that the building once had a fourth story that was destroyed in a fire. He asserted that the façade is beginning to fall off of the building. He reported he had a few contractors evaluate the façade and they have advised him that it is a public safety hazard. He stated that the staff recommended using a Jahn masonry repair material to make repairs to the façade. He explained that, to make the repairs with Jahn, a mason would need to remove the face of the brownstone by a half inch to apply the material. He stated that the brownstone has many cracks. He stated that he was told the blocks may deteriorate further if more breaking occurs and the entire block may be lost. He concluded that it may not be financially effective to perform that kind of work.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the brownstone may not be the source of the water infiltration. He opined that the water may be entering through the roof and/or the window sills. Mr. Dimopoulos argued that the water is not coming through the roof, but rather behind the stucco on the first story owing to the lack of proper flashing over the stucco. He added that the brickwork at the cornice level was laid on top of the brownstone and moisture is coming through the top.

Mr. Baron explained that the purpose of a cornice is to shed water away from a wall. With the removal of the cornice, a condition was created that would naturally lead to water infiltration. Covering the brownstone with paint helps to trap yet more water. Mr. Baron stated that even if one were to stucco, the material needs to attach to something sound. He said that it is possible however to remove the loose brownstone and patch using a lime based brown colored mortar building up the original shapes without extending beyond the original plane of the brownstone surface.

Mr. Dimopoulos explained that the purpose of the wiring is to create a sound surface. He added that the contractor could recreate the appearance of the blocks in the stucco on top of the old brownstone. Ms. Hawkins stated that it would be challenging to recreate all of the existing details. She added that to apply stucco to this surface is a temporary solution and would need to be revisited in a few years.

Mr. Dimopoulos asserted that his main concerns are public safety issues. Mr. Evans explained that the Architectural Committee cannot prohibit property owners from making their properties safe.

Mr. Dimopoulos acknowledged work cannot begin until the paint is removed. Ms. Hawkins added that these masonry repairs should be undertaken in warmer weather. Mr. Dimopoulos stated that he is concerned about the safety hazard. Ms. Hawkins replied that any safety issues should be addressed with the Department of Licenses & Inspections and the Commission's staff. Ms. Gutterman suggested that Mr. Dimopoulos hire a contractor to remove pieces that

may pose a risk. He responded that he did not want to do any work without the Commission's approval. Ms. Gutterman recommended that he work with the staff to document any stabilization work before it is undertaken. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the staff provide names of masons and contractors with experience with this type of work.

Ms. Hawkins concluded that there is not enough information to determine that installation of stucco is warranted. She suggested the applicant work with the staff, a mason, and/or a preservation consultant to document the building to find an appropriate solution. She added that a rooftop cornice would help to shed water away from the building and suggested a transition between the storefront and the masonry above would help to shed water and provide a line between the two levels. Mr. Cluver noted that the Commission has reviewed many applications proposing the construction of an additional story and this is a building where it would be appropriate.

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

ADDRESS: 6008 WAYNE AVE

Project: Remove stained-glass windows, install clear glass

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Mary Kohart, Episcopal Diocese of PA, c/o E. Greenleaf

History: 1873; St. Peter's Episcopal Church and Rectory; George W. Hewitt, architect

Individual Designation: 11/30/1965

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the removal of 40 stained-glass windows and the installation of clear glass in their places at the St. Peter's Episcopal Church complex in Germantown.

The St. Peter's Parish has been closed and the complex has been deconsecrated. The Episcopal Diocese has entered into a sales agreement with the Waldorf School of Philadelphia, which plans to convert the complex for school use.

The Historical Commission reviewed and denied a similar application in December 2009. The Diocese appealed the decision to the Board of License & Inspection Review, which remanded the application back to the Commission. At the second review in May 2010, the Commission again denied the application to remove the windows. The Historical Commission asserted that the application was not ripe for review because, although the Diocese claimed that it needed to remove the windows before selling the property, it did not have a buyer for the property. The Diocese now asserts that the application is ripe because a buyer has entered into a sales agreement for the property. The agreement is contingent upon the removal of the windows (see Section 10.b). The Diocese contends that it must remove and reuse the windows in accordance with Canon law before the buyer takes possession of the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE: The staff recommends that the Architectural Committee limit its review to determining whether the removal of the stained-glass windows in question and replacement with clear glass complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the design-related review criteria set forth in Section 14-2007(7)(k) of

the historic preservation ordinance. The Committee should avoid considering legal and other questions posed by this application, which are outside its purview. The Historical Commission will consider such questions. The staff recommends to the Architectural Committee that the removal and replacement of the stained-glass windows does not comply with Standards 2 and 5 and the Windows Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Episcopal Bishop Charles E. Bennison Jr., Episcopal Diocesan Chancellor Mary Kohart, stained glass consultant Joseph K. Beyer, attorney Jerald Goodman, and realtor Frederick Barletta represented the application.

Ms. Kohart explained that the Episcopal Diocese did not have a buyer for the property when it submitted its earlier application to remove the stained glass windows at St. Peter's. She stated that they now have a buyer, the Waldorf School of Philadelphia, and that the agreement of sale stipulates that the sale is contingent on the receipt of approvals and permits to remove the windows. She stated that the property, which is large and beautiful, has been marketed for sale for seven years without any "nibbles" until the current prospective buyer. She stated that they tried to sell it to other religious organizations, but none came forward. She stated that the Waldorf School intends to renovate the buildings in the complex for educational uses. She contended that the school cannot use the church building with the stained glass windows in place. She noted that the windows are of artistic and historical value and that that value can best be protected by removing them from the church and relocating them to other religious institutions. She stated that the Diocese does not have the financial capacity to renovate and reuse the St. Peter's complex. Therefore, it must turn the property over to a new owner, who can use it. She reported that the Bishop White window, which depicts the founder of the Episcopal Church in America, would be displayed either in the Diocese headquarters or in the Cathedral. She observed that all of the windows were donated by parishioners; the Diocese has an obligation to honor the intentions behind the donations. She said that the windows would be reused within churches in the Diocese if possible; if not, they would be sold to congregations outside the Diocese. She noted that the windows depict scenes that are significant to the Episcopal Church. She stated that they may not be appropriate for other denominations, for example the Catholic Church. They have unique Episcopal themes.

Mr. Cluver asked if the windows are original to the building. Ms. Kohart responded that they were not installed when the building was constructed. They were installed over time as they were donated to commemorate people and events. The windows were executed by various artists over time and have varying values. She stated that some of the scenes depicted in the windows would be inappropriate for a school.

Mr. McCoubrey asked how the stained glass would be replaced with the clear glass. Mr. Beyer explained that the stained glass would be removed and replaced with 1/4-inch plate glass. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Commission's staff should review the details of the glass replacement. Mr. Goodman noted that the buyer would submit plans to the Commission for review if it decided to replace the clear glass at a later date. He observed that the Waldorf School would be submitting its complete rehabilitation plan to the Commission for its review. Mr. Evans stated that the Commission cannot simply allow the Episcopal Diocese to remove the stained glass windows and leave the building open to the elements with the hope that the Waldorf School will install something appropriate in the window openings. He stated that the Committee needs to ensure that the windows will be properly reglazed. He asserted that the information had not been provided. Mr. Cluver disagreed and pointed to the Tab 2 in the current application, which is a proposal to reglaze the windows with plate glass. Mr. Evans asked Mr.

Beyer to explain the proposal. Mr. Beyer stated that the windows would not be left unglazed as Mr. Evans had implied. The application proposes the removal of the stained glass and the reglazing with clear glass. He explained that the stained glass windows are set in several types of window frames. He enumerated the several types of frames, for example wood frames with steel hoppers at the bottom. He stated that some are set in limestone frames. Some of the stained glass windows are segmented with horizontal steel bars. Mr. Beyer assured the Committee members that all of the window frame elements, whether wood, stone, or metal, would be left in place after the removal of the stained glass and would be reglazed with the clear glass. Mr. Evans disagreed and asserted that, for example, the steel horizontal bars are integral to the stained glass and would need to be removed with the glass. Mr. Beyer assured him that he is a stained glass expert, has surveyed all of the openings, and has determined that the framing elements including the horizontal steel bars can and will be left in place and reglazed. Ms. Gutterman stated that the Committee would need to review detailed drawings of every window to verify that the glass replacement was appropriate. Others suggested that that task should be left to the staff. Ms. Hawkins suggested that details for every window type, not every window, would be sufficient. Mr. Beyer again stated that he is proposing only to remove stained glass; any wood, stone, and steel that is in place would remain in place. He added that the divisions of the glass and operability of the windows will be maintained. For example, an operable hopper will remain an operable hopper; only the glass itself will be changed. Mr. Evans pointed to Plan 5G and asserted that the horizontal steel bar that runs through the image of Christ is integral to the stained glass and would be removed with the glass. Mr. Beyer corrected him, stating that the steel T-bar supports the glass but is not integral to the glass. He elaborated, stating that in this instance the bar would be removed, the stained glass slid out from the tracery, the clear glass inserted, and the bar reinstalled.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she was involved in a similar case, when a church was converted to a synagogue. In that case, the preservation agency allowed the stained glass windows to be removed but required that the street-facing windows were reglazed with leaded, colored glass. She suggested that the applicants propose to install more compatible glass in the windows facing Wayne Avenue. She acknowledged that the stained glass windows with religious significance need to be removed. She also stated that the Commission would likely see more and more applications of this type as religious organizations divested themselves of surplus properties.

Mr. Beyer pointed out that the stained glass windows are set behind Lexan storm windows that have fogged and yellowed over time. He stated that the stained glass windows are not visible from the exterior currently. Mr. Evans asked Mr. Beyer if he intended to remove the Lexan windows as he removed the stained glass windows. Mr. Beyer responded that he did not intend to remove the Lexan windows. The removal of the stained glass windows would be undertaken from the interior. Mr. Evans claimed that he would not be able to seal the new glass if he did the work from the interior. Mr. Beyer disagreed, asserting that he could accomplish the work from the interior. He stated that, if the Commission required it, he would seal the new glass from the exterior. He stated that, if he removed the Lexan, he would not reinstall it. Mr. Cluver asked him if the Lexan storm windows were ventilated. Mr. Cluver asserted that they would damage the stained glass if they were not ventilated. Mr. Beyer reported that they are not ventilated and remarked that the lack of ventilation would not necessarily result in damage to the stained glass.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants if and when the Waldorf School would seek an approval to replace the clear glass with some other fenestration. Ms. Kohart responded that she could not speak for the School and was not aware of its plans. She did, however, offer to invite a representative of the School to accompany her application team to the Commission meeting.

Ms. Hawkins agreed that it would be helpful to have a representative of the School at that meeting. She stated that, although the applicants are suggesting that the clear glass might be temporary, the Commission would have no capacity to compel the new owner to replace it if it is approved outright. She recommended that the Diocese and School should jointly propose a permanent solution. The applicants responded that their solution is a permanent solution. Ms. Gutterman stated that the applicants should provide detailed information about the glass replacement for every type of window. Ms. Kohart stated that Mr. Beyer had already developed that information, which he would share with the staff when it conducts its detailed review.

Ms. Hawkins stated that, in her opinion, the removal of the stained glass and its replacement with clear glass does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Evans agreed that, strictly interpreted, the removal and replacement do not meet the Standards. However, he asserted that the Commission must look at this and similar applications in context. He contended that applying the Standards strictly may not be the best approach to the preservation of this overall complex. He stated that the Commission must be flexible in its approaches to the adaptive reuse of religious buildings. Mr. Bennison agreed with Mr. Evans. He reported that there are 300 to 350 vacant religious buildings in Philadelphia at this time. He noted that the Catholic Archdiocese announced last week that it would close 46 more churches. He asserted that religious organizations cannot sell its surplus churches to other denominations. There is no market for them. He recounted a recent meeting between religious leaders in the city, at which they discovered that they had planned to sell buildings to one another, but that there was no demand for them. He reported that he has seven empty churches currently, which are draining the Diocesan coffers as it pays for insurance, maintenance, security, and other carrying costs. He also reported that, of the 141 churches under his supervision, 61 cannot afford full-time priests. He said that "it is an amazing collapse of a system." He stated that the vacant historic religious buildings will survive only if they can be "secularized." Otherwise, the religious institutions will be bankrupted and none of the buildings will be maintained. Mr. Barletta, the realtor, agreed with the Bishop. He stated that the problems associated with finding reuses for vacant religious buildings are "immense." He stated that, if historic preservation regulations are applied rigidly, then the buildings will not survive. Regarding this situation, he stated that the Waldorf School will rehabilitate the buildings in stages. He stated that the School will stabilize every building first and then move on to their rehabilitations. The church will be the last building to be reused. He concluded that these buildings are very durable, but they require some major interventions to arrest water infiltration and address other problems.

Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Farnham if the staff had found any documentation regarding the appearances of the windows at the time of construction. He noted that the extant windows were installed over time as they were donated to the church. He wondered about the appearances of the original windows before the donated windows were installed. Mr. Farnham responded that no documentation of the original windows had been uncovered. Ms. Kohart stated that she had reviewed the Diocese's files on the complex and found no information about the original windows. Mr. Evans stated that he was aware of instances when leaded, sometimes colored, glass was installed initially in churches, with the assumption that it would be replaced with more expensive stained glass at a later date. Ms. Hawkins stated that there may be a compromise solution for this application. For example, perhaps the windows facing the street could be reglazed with leaded or colored glass and the remainder could be reglazed with clear glass. Mr. Beyer stated that the removal of the stained glass windows would be "regrettable," but that the windows could be better preserved in another setting. He added that the windows need to be removed and restored, regardless of whether they are reinstalled in the building or installed elsewhere.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance requested that neither the Committee nor the Commission recommend or grant approval of this application until the Waldorf School appears and states in position regarding the windows. Mr. Gallery stated that he had met with the Waldorf School, which explained that it is planning to demolish the chapel and construct a new building. Mr. Gallery also reported that the School indicated that it would be willing to retain several of the stained glass windows proposed for removal. He stated that he cannot speak for the School, but is simply reporting what he was told. He again asked the Committee to defer any decision until it has heard from the School.

Ms. Kohart submitted a copy of the agreement of sale for the property with the Waldorf School. She stated that the removal of the windows is a condition of the sale. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee must review the submitted application and base its review on the preservation standards set forth in the ordinance. Mr. Goodman asked the Committee if it could continue its review of the matter and allow his client to reappear with a representative of the Waldorf School. Mr. Farnham interjected that the Committee does not have the authority to continue the review of an application, but that the Commission does. He suggested that the applicants attend the Commission meeting with a representative of the Waldorf School, who can answer the Commission's questions about the School's intentions for the windows and the complex of buildings. Mr. Farnham advised the Committee to apply the preservation standards to the application and leave the other questions to the Commission, which has the discretionary authority to consider them. Mr. Bennison asked if they should withdraw the application and resubmit it with information about the Waldorf School's plans. Ms. Hawkins suggested that they not take any action at the moment, but hear the Committee's recommendation and make a decision after the meeting. Mr. Farnham reminded everyone that the Committee's recommendation is non-binding. He suggested that the Commission, not the Committee, should determine the appropriate process for the review of this application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5 and the Windows Guidelines.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:00 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 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials,

features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

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