

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

**TUESDAY, 21 FEBRUARY 2012
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Shawn Evans
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance
Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Miriam Schaeffer, Chemical Heritage Foundation
Ed Barnhart, AIA, Always by Design
George Thomas, CivicVisions
Mark Coggin, PE, Thorton Tomasetti, Inc.
Dan Kayser, Saylor Gregg Architects
Lyne Raymond, Saylor Gregg Architects
Mike Black-Smith
David Hollenberg, University of Pennsylvania
Rich Russell, University of Pennsylvania
Joseph Frega, Denberry
Eileen B. Quigley, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Peter Sikora, Velocitel
Steven Pollock, Esq., Montgomery McCracken
Joseph Graci
Emilia Serazio
Gagan Lakhmna, GPT
Joseph Figurski
Amber Luther, HUGE window Architecture
Gail Tomassini
Liz Zimmers
Anthony Barsi, Little Diversified Architectural Consulting
John O'Connor, Esq.
Rick Blyser, MacIntosh Construction
Van Strother, New Covenant Church
Richard W. Nevius, RWN Enterprises

Elizabeth Naylor
Richard Winston, AIA, BWA Architecture + Planning
Thomas Kirchner, AIA, BWA Architecture + Planning
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Michael Ryan, MRA
Randee Spelkoman, MRA

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Meses. Gutterman and Pentz and Messrs. D'Alessandro, Evans, and McCoubrey joined her.

ADDRESS: 36 S 03RD ST

Project: Restore front façade, construct archival storage facility
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Chemical Heritage Foundation
Applicant: Matt McClure, Ballard Spahr LLP
History: 1855
Individual Designation: 4/5/1973
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Significant, 12/12/2003
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to adaptively reuse this loft building as an archival storage facility for the Chemical Heritage Foundation. The building has been vacant for many years and is in very poor condition. The Department of Licenses & Inspections recently cited the building as Unsafe because the side and rear walls of the building are failing. The side or party wall is failing because the adjacent building was demolished many years ago and is no longer supporting the party wall. The infilled basement of the demolished building is exerting pressure on the foundation of the building in question, causing the upper section of the party wall to rotate out away from the building. The rear wall is failing because the first-floor section of the wall was removed and improperly supported many years ago for an addition. It is severely cracked and in danger of collapse. The rear wall is not visible from the public right-of-way. Exacerbating these problems, the building suffered from a fire in the 1950s as well as extensive water infiltration under previous ownership. The current owner has attempted arrest the deterioration, but to no avail. A steel structure was added inside to support the rear wall, but it and the party wall continue to move. To make the building safe, the side and rear walls and roof of this building must be reconstructed. An engineer's report detailing the structural problems is included with the application.

On 3 February 2012, the Historical Commission's staff approved an application to abate the Unsafe conditions by removing part of the side and all of the rear wall, with the proviso that the walls would be reconstructed within one year. The current application proposes to reconstruct the walls and restore the front façade. The walls would be reconstructed to replicate the historic building envelope. However, a second, lower wall would be constructed 3'-8" to the north of the original party wall location to provide sufficient space for an automated archival storage and retrieval system. The front façade would be fully restored. The fire escape was also cited as Unsafe and would be removed during the restoration of the front façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the front façade is fully restored, with the staff to review details, especially window, door, and masonry repair details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. D'Alessandro recused from the review owing to his business relationship with the property owner.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Matt McClure, Miriam Schaeffer, the vice president for finance and administration of the Chemical Heritage Foundation (CHF), architect Ed Barnhart, architectural historian George Thomas, and engineer Mark Coggin represented the application.

Mr. McClure explained that the CHF fosters an understanding of chemistry's impact on society. He stated that it is an independent, nonprofit organization, which maintains major collections of instruments, fine art, photographs, papers, and books. He reported that it host conferences and lectures, support research, offer fellowships, and produce educational materials. He stated that the CHF needs a large storage facility for its archival materials. He noted that CHF developed a design for a new building at the rear of its parking lot to house the new facility, which the Commission approved, but then determined that it would be better to invest in the existing building on the south side of the parking lot. He reported that CHF purchased the building in the 1990s after a redevelopment plan was abandoned. He stated that the building was in very poor condition. He stated that CHF invested a significant amount of money in the stabilization of the building, but it continues to deteriorate owing to inherent deficiencies that cannot be overcome. He directed the Committee to the Thorton Tomasetti engineering report, which documents the conditions and stabilization efforts. He stated that the side or party wall was not historically exposed. He added that the rear wall is not visible from any public right-of-way. Mr. McClure concluded that this project will marry the needs of CHF and the preservation goals of the Commission.

Ms. Schaeffer offered to provide additional background regarding CHF, but Ms. Hawkins suggested that the application team provide the architectural presentation instead, owing to the limited amount of time for the review.

Mr. Barnhart displayed large versions of the architectural elevations. He discussed the restoration of the front façade. The fire escape, which has damaged the façade, would be removed. He explained that the non-historic windows would be replaced with replicas of the surviving historic windows. He stated that the storefront area would be restored; the non-historic brick base would be removed and the wood panels recreated. The storefront window would be replaced. He stated that Mr. Thomas, the preservation consultant, undertook a paint analysis. He explained that the building is clad with cast iron and brownstone. Originally, the front façade was brownstone colored with darker brown trim. That color scheme would be recreated. He displayed plans and sections of the archival storage system and explained its operation. He pointed out that the system is 34 feet tall and the building is 60 feet tall. To maintain the original profile of the historic building, the mechanical equipment has been located above the storage system. He stated that the historic building is 17 feet wide, but the storage system is wider. Therefore, to house the system and recreate the party wall of the historic building, a second, shorter wall will be constructed about 3'-8" north of the historic party wall configuration. Mr. Barnhart displayed a structural model of the proposed building. He is proposing a steel structure within the building. He noted that the addition at the north is shorter than the historic party wall and is stepped back away from 3rd Street. He noted that the mechanical equipment on the roof will be screened from public view. He displayed material samples. The party wall will be stucco

in a brown, earth tone color that harmonizes with the brownstone front façade. The addition will be clad in a rain screen material that is terra cotta in color. He asserted that the addition will be differentiated, but chromatically related. He explained that the historic party wall will be stucco, as it was, and the addition will be clad in rain screen, to avoid confusion between the historic and the new. He noted that a 4-inch strip of the stucco party wall is visible on the front façade and will be replicated with the new party wall.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she was surprised by the widths of the proposed wall. She asked if the width was required by the storage system. Mr. Barnhart responded that the storage system is self-supporting; it does not hang from the walls. The proposed structure must be thick because the building is very narrow and very tall. The structure is essentially a box truss. He also noted that the fireproofing adds to the thickness. He clarified that the walls would be two feet wide. Ms. Hawkins noted that the addition is needed to accommodate the structure that houses the storage system. She stated that one may be able to devise a better structural system that would reduce the width of the addition from 3'-8". Mr. Barnhart stated that he and the structural engineer studied many possible schemes for housing the storage system and determined that this was the best scheme. He added that the small floor plate of this building makes adaptive reuse of the building in its current configuration very difficult, if not impossible. He noted that after allotting space for the two means of egress, an elevator, and other mechanical equipment, there would be no space left for the new use on the 800 square-foot floor plate. Mr. McClure added that this is the perfect reuse for this building, which is currently in very poor condition and vacant. He stated that the public façade of the building would be completely restored and CHF's need accommodated. Mr. Thomas added that the new structure will not only stabilize the building in question but also the entire row. He stated that this row has been at risk since the first building at the north was demolished many years ago.

Mr. Evans stated that he hoped that a building would be constructed on the parking lot in the future. He asked if the historic front door of the building could be utilized instead of the new side entrance to allow a new building to be constructed in the parking lot up to the proposed building. Mr. Barnhart stated that he designed the new storage building in such a way that a later building could be added on the parking lot up to the historic façade, thereby maintaining the historic street wall. He noted that the new building on the parking lot would need to include a doorway to the recessed side doorway of the storage building. Mr. Barnhart explained that they had investigated the use of the historic front doors of the building in question and had concluded that it was not possible owing to space restrictions and level changes. He also noted that the floor level of the reconstructed building is being determined by the level of the connection to the main CHF building. That level is 3'-6" below the sidewalk level at the front of the building. Mr. Barnhart stated that raising the floor level to the front sidewalk level would require the construction of ramps at the rear to transport the archival materials to and from the main building. Mr. Evans agreed that any ramping would have a significant negative impact on the operation of the storage facility. Mr. Evans asked about the canopy proposed for the space between the storage and main buildings. Mr. Barnhart explained that it would be mounted on columns in the ground and would not attach to the buildings. It would provide cover from the weather when transporting materials between the buildings. Mr. Barnhart added that the slot between the main and storage buildings is the only access to the rear of the non-historic building on Chestnut. He stated that CHF plans to add floors to that building at some point in the future and will need access to the rear of it. He explained that the canopy would be temporary and could be easily removed to provide the access to the rear of the other building for the construction.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the connection of the steel frame to the front façade. Mr. Coggin, the engineer, stated that the frame would connect to the front façade at the historic floor levels, at the spandrels. Mr. Barnhart stated that window treatments would be installed in the windows and that the building would appear like an occupied building to people passing by. Ms. Schaeffer explained that the museum would maintain a display in the storefront window.

Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. Barnhart to point out the north property line. Mr. Barnhart explained that it runs along the north edge of the parking lot. CHF owns the parking lot.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance contended that the applicants had claimed that the new stair landing levels would align with the historic floor levels. He asserted that that was untrue. He asked the architect to display the section drawing. Mr. Gallery claimed that it shows that there is not relationship between the historic floor levels and the new stair levels. He stated that it is important that this appear like a real building from the street. Without the alignment of the levels, the effort to preserve the façade would be “diminished.” He stated that people would see the fire stair through the windows. He asked why the stair could not be located in its historic position. He also asked why the storage facility could not be moved back to the west, toward the rear of the building. Mr. Barnhart stated that the historic stair does not currently exist. It was removed with the failed redevelopment effort before CHF purchased the building. It was a straight-run stair that ran west from the front door along the south party wall and stopped at every floor. Reconstructing it would preclude the installation of the storage system. Mr. Barnhart also noted that the current stair was constructed illegally by the former developer and does not satisfy the building code. It must be removed. Mr. Barnhart stated that the storage system is located as far west as possible. He stated that the shelves cannot be pushed back because of the minimum turning radius of the automated cart that retrieves storage boxes. He concluded that the stair at the front is located as far back from the front façade as possible. Mr. McClure asked Mr. Barnhart to elaborate. Ms. Hawkins stated that the meeting schedule did not allow for elaboration. She asked if anyone else had comments or questions.

Mr. Baron asked if the front façade was granite rather than brownstone, as it is depicted on the proposed elevation drawings. Mr. Barnhart responded that the front façade has been painted gray, but is cast iron and brownstone. Mr. Thomas conducted paint analyses and concluded that the front façade was originally brownstone and brown painted elements. The gray paint currently on the façade is a non-historic paint. Mr. Barnhart stated that they are proposing to restore the front façade to its original appearance.

Mr. McClure asked the Committee chair if his expert could answer Mr. Gallery’s primary question. Ms. Hawkins responded that he could. Mr. Barnhart explained that they have worked to place uses behind the front façade that will give the building some life. He stated that the structure requires triangulation to function properly and they have located the diagonal members behind the stairway so that they do not run across directly behind the windows. He stated that they will work hard to make the stair area look acceptable from the street.

Mr. Evan suggested that they use a cladding of a different color than the terra cotta in the vertical slot that is the east façade of the addition. Mr. Evans stated that there are some minor improvements that could be made to the proposals, but “all in all it is a smart plan. It achieves the preservation of the building and the functional needs.” Mr. McCoubrey and Ms. Gutterman stated that they supported the project. Ms. Gutterman stated that more detail regarding the attachment of the addition to the party wall should be provided. She stated that she wanted to know how that joint would look. Ms. Hawkins objected to the lack of detail regarding the restoration of the front façade. Mr. Barnhart stated that he intended to provide full details of the

restoration to the staff for its review. Any aspects that did not satisfy the staff could be referred back to the Architectural Committee and Commission for review. Mr. McClure added that his team was aware that all of the restoration details needed to be presented to the staff for its review.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the front façade is fully restored, with the staff to review details, especially window, door, and masonry repair details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

ADDRESS: 9 LETITIA ST

Project: Construct five-story building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Frase Inc., Sena Bothers

Applicant: Guiseppe Sena

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a five-story building on a narrow, vacant lot in the Old City Historic District. The Commission has review-and-comment jurisdiction only over this project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The applied ornament over the windows should be simplified and the keystones omitted. The brick should be a uniform dark red color.

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

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the applicants submitted a site plan. Mr. Baron responded that they did not; they only submitted three sheets of architectural drawings.

Mr. McCoubrey contended that the single windows are very uncharacteristic of Old City. He suggested that there should be two windows separated by masonry at each floor. Ms. Gutterman objected to the balconies, which she asserted have no relation to Old City. Mr. Evans objected to the “phony” arches with keystones. He added that the design is fundamentally flawed. Ms. Hawkins reminded him that the Commission has review-and-comment jurisdiction only in this matter. Mr. Baron pointed out that nearby buildings have keystones and segmental arches. Mr. Evans stated that the proposed building might be compatible with some South Philadelphia neighborhoods, but it is not compatible with the architecture of Old City. Ms. Pentz stated that the ornament was unusual. Mr. Baron asked the Committee members to consider the materials. Mr. Evans objected to the brick veneer. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey stated that they failed to understand the architectural logic behind the balconies designs; they suggested that the balconies should be uniform, not varied.

Ms. Hawkins summarized the comments. She stated that the applicants should simplify the design of the front façade, replace the large single windows with two double-hung windows with historic proportions separated by masonry at each floor, delete the balconies, delete the arches with keystones, add brick detailing in place of the stucco detailing, and eliminate light fixtures above the first floor.

Mr. Evans asked if the rear of the proposed building would be visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Baron stated that it would not.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to comment that the plans should be revised to simplify the design of the front façade, replace the large single windows with two double-hung windows with historic proportions separated by masonry at each floor, delete the balconies, delete the arches with keystones, add brick detailing in place of the stucco detailing, and eliminate light fixtures above the first floor.

ADDRESS: 3601-7 LOCUST WLK

Project: Construct rear additions, rehabilitate exterior, alter wall, install storm windows and mechanical equipment

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: University of Pennsylvania

Applicant: W. Daniel Kayser, Saylor Gregg Architects

History: 1928; Christian Association Building; Thomas, Martin & Kirkpatrick, architects

Individual Designation: 2/7/1974

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate the former Christian Association building at the University of Pennsylvania. The building is situated at the intersection of Locust Walk and 36th Street. The application proposes restoration as well as alterations to the building.

The restoration work would include repairs to the exterior masonry, most of the original leaded windows, and the roof. The exterior masonry would be repointed and limestone trim would be cleaned and conserved. The majority of the steel casement windows with leaded-glass would be retained and restored. Exterior storms would be installed at these windows. The application also proposes the replacement of basement-level windows, which are also steel casements. The applicant has not submitted information on the condition of these windows or specifications on the replacement units. This element of the application should be deemed incomplete. The roof is slate. The application proposes to replace it with new slate. The drawings note the replacement slate will be “uniform”; it is unclear, however, if the new slate would replicate the extant slate. The application does not include information on the uniformity or the color of the extant slate or information on the proposed slate. This element of the application may meet the Standards, but more details are necessary to complete the review.

The alterations to the building would be located away from Locust Walk. The alterations include the construction of two additions, the enlargement of areaways, and the creation of a new entrance. The additions would be located towards the rear of the building. One would house a fire stair. The other would house a new restroom core. One would be set back in the side yard of the building. This location is not easily accessible by the public and the addition at this location would be inconspicuous. The second addition is proposed for a more publicly visible area of the building. It would be located along a walkway that runs parallel to Locust Walk. This walkway is open to the public. The addition would straddle the corner of the building along this walkway and protrude from the historic plane of the wall. The exact dimensions of the addition are not provided in the plans. The addition would be clad in glass and cast concrete. The concrete would be colored to match the limestone trim on the building. The addition, although

visible, would not obstruct any character defining elements of the historic building. Also, its massing and location would be respectful of the original building. The areaways around the basement level of the building would be enlarged. The application provides very little information about the existing conditions and the proposed enlargement. The drawings note the addition of iron guardrails and new granite curbs, but provide no information on the elements they are replacing. The existing brick wall that encloses the areaway along 36th Street is not original to the building. It likely dates to the 1940s and was present by 1951. Lastly, a new entrance is proposed for the basement level along 36th Street. There are currently two windows at this location. The application provides little information on the design of this new entrance or the need for it; a plan of the interior was not included in the submission packet. This element of the design should be deemed incomplete until further information is submitted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of masonry restoration, restoration of steel casements and leaded glass, installation of storms, and the addition of two fire-escape stair towers, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10; denial of the replacement of original steel casement windows, pursuant to Standards 2, 5 and 6; denial of the enlargement of areaways, demolition of existing brick walls around areaways, creation of a new entrance and replacement of the slate roof, owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Daniel Keiser and Lyne Raymond and David Hollenberg and Richard Russell of the University of Pennsylvania represented the application.

Mr. Keiser distributed supplemental drawings to the Committee members.

Mr. Hollenberg clarified that the university would not pursue the installation of storm windows and was being withdrawn from the application. Mr. Hollenberg stated that the university is very excited about this project. He stated that the university had purchased the building about nine years ago and that had done an initial stabilization at that time and that the complete rehabilitation of the exterior would now be possible owing to secured finances.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the applicant describe the overall scope and explain the elements deemed incomplete by the staff. Ms. Hawkins suggested that they begin with the basement windows. Ms. Raymond stated that the basement windows are original steel windows and that they have substantial deterioration and rust. She pointed out that they propose to replace the units with aluminum units that would have thermal breaks and would replicate the exterior leading. She noted that the basement windows do not have colored glass and would be easily replicated. Mr. Hollenberg clarified that they would try to salvage and reuse the existing leaded glass in basement-level windows whenever possible. He also pointed out that they have reconsidered the installation of storm windows because the energy savings would not be significant. He noted that they would perhaps install storm windows at basement level because of the extensive use of this space. He clarified that, if they decide to install storms in this level, then they would install interior storms, which would not affect the exterior of the building in any way. Mr. Hollenberg stated that the salvaged window units would be reused along 36th Street. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the windows would be operable. Ms. Raymond answered that they would be fixed units.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the roof would be replaced in kind. Mr. Keiser answered that the existing slate is graduated, meaning that the slate shingles at the base of the roof are the largest and the shingles become gradually smaller in size toward the peak of the roof. The smallest shingles are located at the ridgeline. He also noted that colors of the shingles vary from grey to green. He

stated that the replacement roofing would be natural slate with the color variation but not the graduation.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the proposed additions. Ms. Raymond described the proposed additions. She noted that the proposed cladding is intended to respond to the Annenberg Center building across the walkway. She also stated that the curtain wall was selected to create transparency along the walkway and to mitigate the massing of the addition, since it extends beyond the plane of the façade. She explained that the addition to the recessed section of the building would house restrooms. Mr. Hollenberg clarified that the size and location of the stair tower was influenced by the presence of a major register of windows that illuminate the auditorium. He noted that, if the addition would align with the plane of the wall, then it would disrupt the register of windows. He noted that the disruption of those windows would have a significant adverse effect on the interior of the building and would leave the auditorium without natural light. The auditorium is an important interior space in the building.

Mr. Evans pointed out that, historically, the walkway did not exist and that buildings occupied that site. Mr. Hollenberg agreed, but reported that it has since become a major walkway at the campus. He asserted that the treatment of the stair tower is important because the walkway experiences heavy pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Keiser explained that the brick garden wall, which is proposed to be demolished, is not original. He noted that the demolition is required to create a new exterior entrance to the basement. He explained that there are basement wells along the walkway and that these wells would be expanded into an areaway in order to provide more natural light to the basement. He stated that this change is necessary, owing to the increased use of the basement level. Ms. Hawkins asked if the areaway along the walkway would be made deeper than the existing wells. Mr. Keiser answered that the areaway would be slightly wider and deeper than the existing wells.

Ms. Hawkins requested clarification on the proposed new entrance along 36th Street. Mr. Keiser explained that they are proposing a cascading stair that is reminiscent of the stairs across the walkway at the Annenberg Public Policy Center. He noted that two windows would be removed to create the entrance. Ms. Hawkins asked if the cladding material would be natural limestone or cast stone. Mr. Keiser answered that they have not chosen the material yet. Mr. Hollenberg stated that the primary facades have natural limestone trim and the rear facades cast stone. He noted that they would follow that precedent. Ms. Hawkins asked if the panels would extend beyond the outer edge of the existing windows. Mr. Keiser answered that they would not. Ms. Raymond stated that the façade has strong vertical elements where limestone trim is prevalent. She noted that there is a limestone-clad bay window just above the proposed new entrance. Mr. Evans pointed out that the color rendering and the architectural drawing depicted different widths for the proposed new entrance. Mr. Hollenberg clarified that the proposed entrance would not extend beyond the outer edge of the existing windows and that no infill masonry would be necessary. Ms. Hawkins asked if the new limestone panels would be flush with the plane of the wall or proud of it. Ms. Raymond answered that the panels would be flush.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the meaning of the hoop and triangle over the new entrance. Mr. Keiser answered that it was a space holder for a light fixture that had yet to be chosen.

Mr. D'Alessandro requested clarification on the proposed location of mechanical equipment. Mr. Keiser explained that the mechanical would be located on the roof and would not be visible.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the proposed stair tower along the walkway was unusually harsh. He objected to the choice of materials. He noted that a trim material should not be used as a dominant material for the addition. He explained that the architects have followed the “differentiated with” portion of the Standards, but have not responded to the “compatible with” section in a successful manner. He stated that brick would be compatible and still be perfectly differentiated as a new addition. He encouraged the Committee and the applicant to reconsider the choice of materials. He noted that the application is very good otherwise.

Ms. Raymond explained that they had done some material studies and that the precast seemed the most appropriate. She pointed out that the base of the addition would be granite. Mr. Keiser stated that the location of the additions, in a side yard, did not require too refined of an articulation and that the additions could become too precious if they were treated with such care.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for more clarification on the pattern of the joints at the proposed entrance. Mr. Keiser explained that those details had not been finalized and that they would design the cladding to be compatible with the patterns found on the building. Mr. McCoubrey noted that he agreed with Mr. Gallery’s comment regarding the choice of material. He stated that the additions seem to be more directly related to the Annenberg building than the historic building to which they would attach. Ms. Raymond stated that limestone is present along the length of the walkway. She explained that there are limestone walls along this walkway. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that perhaps limestone should be used for the trim. Mr. Evans reiterated that this walkway did not exist historically and that the rears of these buildings were not meant to be exposed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application as presented to the Committee, with the staff to review the final details, including any changes to the cladding material of the additions.

ADDRESS: 2201 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Add and relocate antennas

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Coronado Condominium Association, Inc.

Applicant: Eileen Quigley, Ballard Spahr LLP

History: 1910; Coronado Apartments; Milligan & Webber, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to relocate several cellular phone antennas on the roof of a Beaux Arts apartment building in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. The building currently has antennas that are attached to the walls of the penthouse. The application proposes to relocate these antennas to a new armature that would sit on top of a pilot house on the penthouse. The proposed armature and antennas would be highly visible. The proposed armature and antennas would disrupt the appearance of the roof line by adding a highly conspicuous element that is incompatible with the architecture and overall design of this building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Eileen Quigley, engineers Joseph Frega and Andrew Petersohn, and site acquisition specialist Peter Sikora represented the application.

Ms. Quigley stated that the antennas are currently located on the walls of a privately-owned penthouse and that it would be a better to relocate them to the area above the roof and away from the residential unit. She stated that this is a crucial site for telecommunications in this district. She stated that the antennas could be painted to match the color of the elevator pilothouse to diminish their visibility. Mr. Danta stated that the application did not propose to install the antennas to the brick elevator pilothouse. Instead, it proposes to install them on a new armature that would stand above the pilothouse. Ms. Quigley stated that they would not necessarily be on top of the pilothouse. The Committee members disagreed with Ms. Quigley and showed her how the drawings submitted clearly showed new armature on top of the pilothouse. Mr. Sikora clarified that the armature would be attached to the pilothouse. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Sikora if any portion of the proposed armature or antennas would protrude above the highest point of the existing pilothouse. Mr. Sikora answered that they would. Ms. Hawkins clarified that all of the antennas and the armature would stand above the highest point of the existing pilothouse. Mr. Sikora agreed with her statement. Ms. Gutterman stated that since there would be no masonry behind the new armature and the antennas, then they could not be painted to blend with any masonry; the antennas would be seen against the sky. Mr. Sikora clarified that the proposed armature would be attached to the existing pilothouse. Ms. Hawkins asked how high the proposed antennas would stand above the pilothouse. Mr. Sikora answered that the armature and antennas would extend about eight feet above the top of the pilothouse.

Mr. Evans asked why the antennas could not be mounted to the walls of the elevator pilothouse, without extending above the roof of the pilothouse. Mr. Sikora answered that they need the extra height to clear the roof of the building. Mr. Evans noted that the proposed antennas would be located much higher than the current antennas. He asked if the current antennas clear the edge of the building. Mr. Sikora stated that the proposal is optimal from an engineering point of view. Ms. Hawkins stated that there are ways to make this proposal acceptable without adversely affecting this historic building.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance noted that the Alliance holds a preservation easement on this building. He agreed with the staff's recommendation and noted that this would be an insensitive alteration. He reported that four of the existing antennas that are illegal and that the Alliance had requested that the owner remove them.

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

ADDRESS: 2201 CHESTNUT ST, UNIT 901

Project: Construct roof deck
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Emilia and James Serazio
Applicant: Maggie Persofsky
History: 1910; Coronado Apartments; Milligan & Webber, architects
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Significant, 2/8/1995
Preservation Easement: Yes
Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ADDRESS: 2201 CHESTNUT ST, UNIT 903

Project: Construct roof deck
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Kent R. Bergey
Applicant: Maggie Persofsky
History: 1910; Coronado Apartments; Milligan & Webber, architects
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Significant, 2/8/1995
Preservation Easement: Yes
Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: These applications propose the construction of two small decks on the roof of a Beaux Arts apartment building in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. Decks were present at the time of designation. These decks were recently removed for a reroofing project. The proposed decks would be installed in the same locations as they previously existed. The deck railings would be taller than the removed railings to meet current code requirements. The increase in height would make the railings slightly more visible than they were before. The railings would be visible against the backdrop of the penthouse on the roof of the building, not the sky. The applicant proposes two color choices for the railings: a light brown color to match the color of the penthouse wall, or black. The staff recommends that the railing should be painted light brown to match the color of the wall behind it. This would minimize the visibility of the railing. The railings, although slightly taller than before, would be seen by the public against the backdrop of the penthouse on the building. These railings would be inconspicuous to the pedestrian.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Steven Pollock, engineer Joe Graci, and property owner Emilia Serazio represented the application.

Mr. Pollock submitted photographs to show the visibility of the proposed decks from the public right-of-way. He agreed that the lighter color on the railing would be best. He noted that the building code requires a 42" railing. He contended that the decks would be minimally visible.

Ms. Hawkins asked if metal railing could be substituted for the proposed wood railings. Mr. Graci answered that they could structurally, but he objected to the maintenance of painted metal railings. Mr. Pollock noted that the proposed railings would be easily removed for roof repairs. He clarified that the proposed decks would be very light weight. Mr. Pollock noted that the decks had been pulled back three feet from where the decks had been located previously.

Mr. Evans asked if these deck applications were linked to the antennas application in any way. Mr. Pollock answered that they are not. He clarified that the applications are completely separate.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the railings are painted to match the color of the penthouse masonry, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

ADDRESS: 1808 SPRUCE ST

Project: Rehabilitate building, remove garage, construct garage, rear addition, and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Emil Associates, LLC

Applicant: Stephen Mileto, QB3, LLC

History: 1855

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the front façade of this row house. Details of the restoration were not included. However, the staff can review the window and door shop drawings as well as the paint removal, masonry cleaning, and re-pointing specifications.

This application proposes to demolish the existing garage facing the service alley of Cypress Street and replace it with a masonry garage with painted steel garage and person doors. The roof of the garage would serve as a terrace. This application proposes to modify the bay in that the first floor of the bay would be demolished and west chamfer would be closed off and new window openings created in the second and third floor of the bay. New window openings and balconies are proposed for the east elevation of the rear ell. Lastly, a one-story addition is proposed above the rear ell, with a roof deck with a painted steel and glass guardrail. The roof deck would be accessed by a stair penthouse.

Please note that the balconies and roof deck guardrail do not appear in the elevation drawings but are indicated in the annotations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the front façade is restored, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Gagan Lakhmna and architect Stephen Mileto represented the application.

Mr. Mileto stated that the balconies and roof deck appear in the larger set of drawings but do not appear in the reduced set. Mr. Mileto provided a copy of the larger set to the Committee. He described the current condition of the building. He stated that the western side of the rear bay faces a stucco wall of the neighbor's addition. He stated that the owner is looking to convert the building from five apartments to three condominium units. Mr. Mileto described the lay-out of the three units.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the roof deck appears to be rather large. She asked if the mechanical equipment could be placed on the same level rather than on the main block of the building. Mr.

Mr. Lahkmna responded that the three condenser units could be located on the roof of the addition.

Mr. Evans stated that he was surprised to see that the staff recommended approval to altering the rear bay. Ms. Coté stated that this is a rear service alley with no front of buildings facing it, and that a portion of the bay would remain.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the visibility of the rear. Ms. Coté replied that the rear is visible from Cypress Street, a service alley, and appears not to be visible from 18th Street.

Mr. Mileto described the proposed rear garage, which would be constructed with reclaimed brick and sided with dark charcoal zinc metal panels with a matte finish and flat seam.

Mr. Evans stated that he was uneasy about the proposed modifications to the bay. Ms. Hawkins asked if the exterior appearance of the bay could remain and the door to the terrace inserted within the existing window opening. Mr. Lahkmna affirmed that it could.

Mr. Evans asked about the neighboring addition. Ms. Coté stated that the Commission reviewed and approved that addition in 2000.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance asked for the reasons behind the increased fenestration of the rear ell. Mr. Mileto stated that he wanted to provide more light to the interior of the rear ell. Mr. Leech opined that the fourth-floor addition appears to be muddled by all the proposed changes that are occurring below.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the front façade is restored, the bay is retained above the garage, and a window opening in the bay is converted to a single-leaf door to the terrace, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standard 9.

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 storefront at 127 S. 18th Street. The awning would be supported by an aluminum frame mounted into the limestone using existing holes where possible. The awning will consist of six-inch oak boards spaced three inches apart by solid acrylic. The Committee reviewed a similar application last month. This proposal has brought the awning in closer to the window opening to reveal six inches between the awning and the dental molding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Ms. Coté explained that the design was revised from the one presented last month. The awning has been relocated closer to the window opening. The awning would not be mounted to the window frame because it will not structurally support the awning. The Committee members agreed that the proposed awning does not comply with the Standards.

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

ADDRESS: 739 S 02ND ST

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: George and Karen Roskam

Applicant: Amber Luther, Hugewindow

History: 1835

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 3/30/1965

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to demolish a third-floor addition and the rear wall of the main block at the third floor at this property at the corner of 2nd and Pemberton Streets. The roof line would then be extended and a full width dormer would be added. Skylights are proposed for historic rear slope of the roof. This application also proposes to enlarge the fanlight window in the gable and cut a new window opening on the third floor.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Amber Luther represented the application.

Ms. Luther stated the owners recently acquired the house and would like to add to the house in a way that is visually pleasing. Ms. Luther stated that the design can be modified. She indicated that she is willing to work with the Commission to revise the design to make it acceptable.

Ms. Hawkings stated that the proposed extension of the roofline significantly changes the form and character of the building. Ms. Pentz concurred and stated the fanlight in the gable should not be modified.

Mr. Evans suggested that the concept of a rear addition is plausible. He suggested, however, that any addition should maintain, not obscure, the original form of the building. Ms. Gutterman suggested that a new addition would be appropriate below the existing roofline. Ms. Hawkins stated that a dormer might be included to give additional height, as long as the existing form of the building remains.

Ms. Pentz stated that she did not think that the new window opening proposed for the third floor was inappropriate. Others on the Committee were opposed to the new window opening.

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

ADDRESS: 108 CHRISTIAN ST

Project: Legalize decks, alter front stoop, replace basement windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bill and Gail Tomassini

Applicant: Liz Zimmers, Zimmers Associates

History: 1835

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 5/31/1966

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a series of decks, landings, and stairs installed on the pitch of the roof and down the rear elevation of this building. The railings are vinyl; the decking is Trex. A single-leaf door was installed in a cut-down window opening at the third story. The alterations were performed without the approval of the Historical Commission or a permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. A building permit is required for a deck whether the property is designated as historic or not.

This application proposes to install a window at the first story on the rear of this building. No information has been provided about its material or construction.

On the façade, the application proposes to remove brick from a non-historic stair and install an iron railing. The basement windows are also proposed to be replaced in-kind.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of front stair alterations, basement windows, and rear window; denial of the legalization of the decks, landings, and stairs, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Gail Tomassini and applicant Liz Zimmers represented the application.

Ms. Zimmers explained that the front stair railing appears to be a later addition because the brick does not match the original brick on the façade. She proposed to remove several inches of brick from the rail and install a stone cap and wrought iron rail similar to the adjacent property. She explained that they propose to make the basement windows operable. She stated that she will provide shop drawings to the staff.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant for the material of the existing stair. Ms. Zimmers responded that it is brick and concrete. Ms. Hawkins concluded that it is non-historic stair. Ms. Zimmers added that they will angle-cut the brick and install a continuous stone cap.

Ms. Zimmers stated that the owners were renting a home in the area and subsequently purchased this property. She claimed that the building had been recently renovated prior to their purchase, but she could not locate any permits for the renovation. She explained that the construction of the decks and stairs was completed over the summer of 2011. She explained that the owners wanted decks on the building. She stated that she consulted with the owners and suggested that decks could be installed on the first through third stories with minimal visibility. She stated that the neighboring house is set back 20 feet from the property line;

therefore, it is not feasible to construct a deck that is not visible. She explained that during the summer of 2011, the owners installed the decks with the intention for them not to be visible from Christian Street. She stated that other neighbors have decks and told the owners that permits were not required for the work. She stated that a roofer recommended raising the height of the roof deck making it visible from the street. She distributed photographs of views of the property from 2nd Street. She opined that, owing to the white color of the pickets, the deck cannot be perceived on a cloudy day.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the decks are visible from a public right-of-way to the rear. Ms. Zimmerman stated that she is not sure if they are visible from Shot Tower Playground, which is a public space adjacent to the rear of this property. Ms. Hawkins stated that they are most likely visible from the rear as there are multiple levels. Ms. Tomassini argued that there is a deck on the rear of the neighbor's property. Ms. Hawkins stated that it is not known if that deck is legal. Ms. Zimmerman stated that it may not be visible owing to a four-story house that blocks the view. Ms. Hawkins acknowledged that portions of the decks may not be visible, but certainly the upper-story and roof portions are visible from public rights-of-way.

Ms. Zimmerman stated that the block is comprised of buildings of varying heights that have been modified. Some are new construction and some buildings have decks. She argued that this building is not in a row of similar-looking buildings that would be differentiated by a deck. She stated that much was done to reduce the visibility. She stated that decks are approved on historic buildings. She acknowledged its public visibility, but argued that the original historic fabric and the new construction are differentiated.

Ms. Hawkins acknowledged the varying nature of the streetscape, but stated that decks should be inconspicuous. She acknowledged that there are unique conditions at this property, such as the set-back of the adjacent property. However, she asserted that the deck on the main roof is inappropriate. Ms. Pentz asked the applicant what the rear façade looked like before the addition of the decks and landings. Ms. Tomassini explained that the French doors on the first story were existing. She stated that one window was cut down to become a door on the third story. She stated that the second story was not altered. Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant if the railings are made of vinyl. Ms. Tomassini responded that the railings are a resin vinyl and the decking is Trex. Ms. Pentz contended that vinyl is not a compatible material.

Ms. Hawkins contended that the decks are not appropriate. She noted that the visibility from the park is unclear. She agreed with Ms. Pentz that the Committee would not recommend approval of vinyl railings or, at a minimum, any that are conspicuous from the public right-of-way. She suggested that the applicant take photographs of rear from the adjacent park to determine the extent of public visibility.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that there are two issues with the deck installation: first, the visibility from public rights-of-way and, second, the intrusion on the main body of the house. He explained that appropriate decks are typically located on rear ells of houses. He contended that the upper level deck is the most egregious. Mr. Evans argued that the Committee would not typically recommend approval of a multi-story deck. Ms. Tomassini explained that their goal was to create an indoor/outdoor approach to the living space.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of front stair alterations, basement windows, and rear window, with the staff to review details; denial of the legalization of the decks, landings, and stairs, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 132 CARPENTER ST

Project: Legalize windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joseph Figurski

Applicant: Joseph Figurski

History: 1825

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 6/28/1966

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize five vinyl windows with capping that were installed in this row house without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit. The first and second-story windows are nine-over-nines, but should be six-over-sixes. The Commission was alerted of the work in the summer of 2010 and requested a violation.

The property owner has submitted an application claiming that the replacement of the vinyl windows with historically appropriate windows would result in an unnecessary hardship.

Section 11 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations addresses unnecessary hardship. It defines the submission requirements as:

a building permit application, a description of the scope of work, drawings if available, cost estimates for the proposed work and Federal Income Tax Returns for the previous two years demonstrating household income or other evidence to demonstrate qualification for this exemption.

The applicant has not submitted federal income tax returns, but has provided other documents including copies of the Pennsylvania Property Tax or Rent Rebate Claim, PA-1000, for 2009 and 2010, which includes a statement of total income.

Section 11 of the Rules & Regulations states that:

As its initial criterion for evaluating a request for an exception under the Unnecessary Hardship provision, the Commission may employ the Section 8 eligibility guidelines of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), which defines a low or moderate-income household as one with an income of not more than eighty percent (80%) of the median family income for the Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD Metropolitan Statistical Area.

For 2012, HUD defines the low income (80%) limit for a household of one for the Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD Metropolitan Statistical Area as \$45,500. Based on the documentation provided, the staff can attest that this property owner's annual income is below that level.

The applicant has provided two estimates to replace the five windows in violation as well as the door, transom over the door, and basement windows, which were not included within the violation. The estimates are for \$11,440.80 and \$11,165.00.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Legalization of the windows, provided the capping is removed from the dormer and the dormer woodwork is repaired, scraped, and painted, which can be accomplished at little cost, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.7).

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney John O'Conner and owner Joseph Figurski represented the application.

Mr. Figurski stated that he received a letter from the Commission's staff regarding the windows in 2010, at the same time he was confronting several medical issues. He claimed that the vinyl windows were installed in 1988. He stated that he agreed with the staff recommendation. He asked the Committee how much the recommended work will cost as he only has \$13,000 in his checking account. Ms. Pentz stated that it would cost much less than \$13,000.

Mr. McCoubrey asked the staff why the application was forwarded to the Architectural Committee and not the Committee on Financial Hardship. Mr. Farnham explained that when an applicant qualifies for consideration under the Unnecessary Hardship provision, that is that the applicant demonstrates that he or she make less than 80% of the median annual income in the area, the application is not forwarded to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Instead, it is forwarded to the Architectural Committee, which advises whether the illegal work can be mitigated inexpensively. He explained that the financial information is kept confidential and not disseminated to Committee or Commission members. The staff simply confirms to the review bodies that the Unnecessary Hardship condition has been met. He explained that the Committee is charged with looking for ways to bring the illegal work closer to the meeting the Standards without incurring significant expense to property owner. He explained that the Commission then determines whether to grant a variance to the Standards. He cited a similar application for a property on Germantown Avenue that was submitted several years ago.

Mr. Figurski stated that if he had known the windows were not compliant, he would have addressed the violation when he was making more money than he is today.

Mr. Evans stated that he is concerned that removing the capping might expose more work than simply repairing the woodwork. Mr. Figurski stated that he is willing to undertake the work.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend legalization of the windows, provided the capping is removed from the dormer and the dormer woodwork is repaired, scraped, and painted, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.7).

ADDRESS: 2027 WALNUT ST

Project: Construct addition with ramp for ATM

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: AMCD Walnut St. Associates LP

Applicant: Matthew Boyle, Security Vault Works, Inc.

History: 1855

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 alter the storefront and install an ADA ramp. The ramp would be installed along the front façade and project four and one-half feet from the building. No information has been provided to demonstrate that the ramp could not be constructed on the interior.

The application proposes to repair and/or replace ornately carved wood elements within the transom. This unique transom is a character-defining feature and should be preserved. No

information has been provided documenting which spindles need replacement, their condition, or methods of reproduction.

An awning for the front façade will be proposed as a separate application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Anthony Barsi represented the application.

Mr. Barsi explained that his client, Bank of America, will be installing an ATM within the main entrance and it is necessary to make it ADA compliant. He stated that there is a five and one-half-inch step into the entry, which will require a ramp. He explained that the ramp cannot be tucked into the space because a five-by-five-foot landing is required at the top of a ramp, which would interfere with the entry doors to both Bank of America and the apartments above. He explained that they considered partially recessing it into the entry. However, the sidewalk slopes away from the building down toward the street at such a steep pitch that the ramp would need to extend further into the sidewalk to maintain the ADA slopes and reach the sidewalk level. He explained that their proposal is the easiest and most sensitive. He added that they chose a black wrought iron rail with lamb's tongue on the end.

Mr. Barsi explained that their proposal to repair and paint the spindles was as a result of an agreement with the landlord in exchange for the installation of an awning. He specified that the awning proposal will come in a separate submission and should not be considered part of this application. He noted that the woodwork will be repaired where possible and any replacement of the spindles will be in-kind. He stated that they do not know the extent of the damage, but that the contractor will investigate.

Mr. Barsi submitted color copies of the paint proposals to the Committee members. He stated that the window frames would be a darker neutral color and the storefront would be a lighter neutral color. Ms. Gutterman asked if there was any investigation to find the historic material colors. Mr. Barsi stated that it is his understanding that the building is not historic, but lies within the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. Ms. Sell clarified that the building is designated as historic and the same level of jurisdiction applies to the exterior. She added that the color selections were discussed at staff level and that they are not appropriate. She stated that the staff could consult with the applicant on appropriate color choices that would replicate the colors of the historic materials beneath as opposed to existing paint or branding colors. Mr. Evans noted that it appears as though the lighter storefront color was painted after designation.

Ms. Hawkins argued that five and one-half inches is not a very large step height. She stated that there appears to be room on the interior as the partition is something that will be added and not structural. She argued that there does not appear to be a reason why the entire construction could not slide back further. Mr. Evans asked about the material of the step. Mr. Barsi replied that it is concrete. Ms. Hawkins stated that the adjacent property has a protruding step and suggested adjusting the height of the sidewalk. He stated that the ADA requirement is 3%, which is 1/48 and the current slope of the sidewalk is much steeper. He explained that if the ramp protrudes straight out it will become much longer. He added that, if they raise the sidewalk, then it will be one foot to eighteen inches above the street level. Mr. Evans claimed that, owing to the building's historic designation, the applicant is not required to meet ADA requirements. He stated that a good faith effort must be made. He stated that, if it is

demonstrated that this is the only alternative, then he would not be opposed to this proposal. Mr. Barsi asserted that they made efforts to be sensitive to the building.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the floor framing was concrete slab. Mr. Barsi stated that it a wood floor and that the concrete along the front is the foundation. Ms. Hawkins argued that she believes that with additional investigation the ramp could probably be reduced in size.

Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Sell why the staff recommended denial. Ms. Sell responded that the staff requires a demonstration that installation on the interior is infeasible. Mr. Baron added that the Commission does regularly require internal ramps, even if floor reframing is necessary.

Despite their concerns, the Committee members concluded that the proposal is acceptable in light of the constraints.

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

ADDRESS: 526 S 11TH ST

Project: Cut new openings and install windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Graeme Newman

Applicant: Rick Blyler, MacIntosh Construction

History: 1833; John Lindsay, carpenter

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to cut four windows into the side elevation of this building. Currently, the elevation is stuccoed. According to an 1895 atlas, the side of this building faced an alley and was never a party wall. The applicant proposes to install windows to match those on the façade. However, no information has been provided regarding the windows locations or how they would fit proportionally between or around the two existing chimneys.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Contractor Rick Blyler and property owner Graeme Newman represented the application.

Mr. Byler acknowledged that he does not have a drawing of the side elevation. He explained that there will be two windows on each floor: one in front of the chimney and one between the two chimneys. Ms. Pentz argued that the chimneys may not be aligned and might flare toward the bottom.

Ms. Hawkins asked when the arched window at the top of the building was installed. Ms. Sell suggested that it may have been uncovered during an earlier stucco removal. Ms. Hawkins asked if he proposed to replicate the windows on the façade. Mr. Byler stated that he proposes to install historically appropriate windows and work with Danner Windows, a company familiar with the Commission's requirements. Ms. Hawkins asked if he knew whether the chimneys are straight. Mr. Byler stated that he will look at them in the basement level to determine if they are straight. Ms. Hawkins cautioned him to be sure that he will not be cutting into the chimneys. Ms.

Sell stated that, in order for the staff to review and process the application, an elevation drawing will be required.

Mr. Evans stated that the plans show that there will be a masonry lintel installed. Mr. Byler stated that it would be a double masonry lintel and would subsequently be restuccoed. He added that there will be steel rebar in the lintel.

Ms. Hawkins asked the Committee members if there were conceptual concerns about new windows cut into a wall that was never a party wall. Ms. Pentz noted that the wall was meant to be load-bearing and the contractor should be careful to not compromise the stability of the wall. Mr. Evans asked if the owner also owns the adjacent driveway. Mr. Byler stated that Mr. Newman also owns the driveway.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the concern of the Committee is location and confirmation that the window sizes, alignments, and heights are the same as those on the main façade.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the new windows are wood, six-over-six, double-hung windows and that they are horizontally and vertically aligned with one register of windows between the chimneys and the other between the front chimney and the front façade, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 1014 PINE ST

Project: Alter windows and doors, construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: David H. Naylor

Applicant: David Naylor, Ablemart

History: 1840; storefront added, c. 1900

Individual Designation: 11/24/1959

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the modification of this house and store for a café on the first floor. The applicants propose to modify the fixed storefront with operable café windows. The plans seem to show the alteration of the proportion of the transoms as well. A greenhouse addition would be constructed in the yard, hidden by the single-story structure at the rear. The existing cinderblock rear structure would be modified with a new roll-down garage door.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the existing storefront transoms are retained with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Elizabeth Naylor, the business owner and the daughter of the property owner, and architect Richard Nevius represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained the staff recommendation regarding the transoms to the applicants. Mr. Nevius stated that he would retain and restore the transoms.

Mr. Nevius offered to answer questions. Ms. Hawkins asked about the material of the new storefront windows. Mr. Nevius responded that they would be wood and would match the

existing storefront as much as possible. Ms. Hawkins noted a conflict between the elevations and the plans. One shows a three-light storefront window; the other a four-light window. She asked Mr. Nevius to clarify. He responded that he would base the casement design on the historic transoms above. Mr. Evans asked if the air conditioner would be removed. Mr. Nevius confirmed that it would. Mr. Baron suggested that a metal window, instead of a wood window, might be more appropriate. A metal window would allow for thinner mullions, rails, and stiles. Mr. Baron suggested that a window of the proposed dimensions might not be able to be manufactured in wood. Ms. Hawkins agreed. Mr. Baron also noted that the storefront has many metal elements, including the cornice. Metal windows may be more compatible. Mr. Baron confirmed that the applicants would retain the existing storefront base and transoms.

Mr. Nevius directed the Committee to the design of the rear addition. Ms. Hawkins asked if the addition would be visible to the public. Mr. Nevius stated that it would not be visible from the street. Ms. Hawkins asked about the so-called greenhouse. Mr. Nevius described it as a glass enclosure on wheels and stated that it too would not be visible from the street. A track would mount to the side of the building. Ms. Pentz stated that the details of the greenhouse need to be worked, but those details are not significant from a preservation perspective.

Mr. Nevius also explained that they are proposing to alter a door and window at the rear of the main building. Neither would be visible to the public.

Mr. Nevius discussed the change to the rear garage. He stated that the door would be replaced with something more appropriate. He stated that it is currently a metal door. The garage is cinder block without stucco.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the existing storefront transoms are retained, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 7406 GERMANTOWN AVE

Project: Remove rear shed, construct garage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: New Covenant Church of Philadelphia

Applicant: Van Strother, New Covenant Church of Philadelphia

History: 1800; PA School for the Deaf; New Covenant Church; altered c. 1850

Individual Designation: 4/30/1986

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a garage to the rear of a stone house that sits of the grounds of the former Pennsylvania School for the Deaf. The plans call for removing a wood shed from the rear and adding a large garage structure. The garage would mirror the scale and design of the house. It would be clad in fiber cement boards to appear as clapboards.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Van Strother represented the application.

Mr. Strother stated that the house in question is located on the campus of the New Covenant Church. He explained that the addition would include a garage and the renovated house would provide lodging for visitors to the church.

Ms. Hawkins objected to the size of the addition. She contended that it was not appropriately scaled for the historic house. She asked if it could be reduced in size. Mr. Strother responded that the garage will include some much-needed storage space and therefore cannot be reduced in size without a reduction in program. Ms. Hawkins again stated that the proposed addition was "very large." Ms. Gutterman contended that the proposed garage was "too large" for the house. She asked if it could be reduced in size. Mr. Strother asserted that the garage was in proportion with the historic house. Ms. Hawkins objected to the fact that the garage addition would be larger than the section of the house that would connect the garage to the main block of the house. She suggested that accommodations for two cars as well as some storage may be excessive. Mr. Strother asked the Committee to judge his project based on how it would appear at the location and not on the basis of an elevation drawing that does not show the context. He asserted that the garage would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, owing to grade changes and other features of the site. He asserted that the addition was massed appropriately. Ms. Hawkins stated that she disagreed with the applicant's assertion. Mr. Evans agreed. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the garage should be a separate building.

Mr. Strother displayed a site plan. He stated that the site is 19 acres. He noted that the wall along Germantown Avenue is 1300 feet long. He contended that this garage building is dwarfed by the site. He stated that the claim that the garage is too large is not supported by the facts about the site. Mr. Evans reiterated that the proposed garage was too large.

Ms. Hawkins concluded that the Committee is not opposed to the removal of the current addition or the construction of a garage at this location. She also stated that She stated that the proposed garage is too large. She suggested that the program should be reduced to allow the addition to be reduced in size. Ms. Gutterman suggested a smaller pantry. Ms. Hawkins suggested separating the garage and pantry functions into two volumes to reduce the mass of the addition. Mr. Strother asked if the footprint of the garage was too large, or if only the volume was too large. Ms. Hawkins replied that the footprint was acceptable, but the volume was too large. Mr. Evans suggested small reductions in size with an altered roofline. Ms. Hawkins suggested lowering the ceiling height in the garage. Mr. Strother noted that the staff had recommended approval. The Committee members suggested that Mr. Strother revise his design. Ms. Hawkins noted that he could argue for approval as submitted at the Commission meeting, but she would be in attendance to advocate for the Committee's recommendation.

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

ADDRESS: 1800-04 SPRUCE ST

Project: Add dormer and louvers for HVAC system

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Temple Beth Zion-Beth Israel

Applicant: Richard Winston, BWA Architecture + Planning

History: 1895; Church of the Covenant; Temple Beth Zion-Beth Israel; Thomas P.

Lonsdale, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to modify the existing HVAC system in this building. New condensing units and an access stair would be installed at a location on the west side of the building not visible to the public. Two existing vents in the roof of the former rectory building would be expanded into ventilation dormers. The dormers, both of which would be visible from the street would require cutting into the roof. The dormers would be designed to look like window dormers but with louvers installed in place of glass.

Although not addressed by this application, it is noted that vinyl basement windows were installed at this building without the Historical Commission's approval.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. D'Alessandro recused himself, owing to a professional relationship with the congregation.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Michael Sklaroff, a member of the congregation and an attorney, and architects Richard Winston and Thomas Kirchner represented the application.

Mr. Baron displayed photographs of the roof in question. Ms. Gutterman noted that sections of the roof are visible from 18th and Cypress Streets.

Mr. Winston stated that the extant air conditioning system is 60 years old. He stated that the replacement system will require significant intake and exhaust capabilities. The existing air handlers are and the replacements will be located in the attic above the administrative wing, which is located at the south end of the complex. A ventilator would be located on the roof at the south. An intake would be located at the west. A maintenance access hatch will be located on the north face of the hipped roof of the rear section; it will not be visible to the public. Also, a second hatch will be created to allow equipment to be placed into and removed from the attic. Mr. Baron displayed photographs of the roofs taken from Cypress Street. Mr. Winston added that one would only get a "momentary glimpse" of some of the alterations from 18th Street. He also noted that there are significant constraints regarding where the equipment can be placed.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the new roofing material would match the existing roofing material. Mr. Winston stated that it would match. Mr. Baron reported that the roof was originally slate, but is now an asphalt shingle. Ms. Hawkins asked about the louvers. Mr. Winston answered that they would be painted metal with tern-coated stainless surrounds. They will all be the same gray color as the roof.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants if they wished to discuss the illegal vinyl windows, even though they are not part of the application. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the window openings were modified prior to designation. He added that the exterior metalwork has been preserved.

Ms. Pentz stated that she approved of the application.

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

ADDRESS: 1021 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Add storefront door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mercantile Associates, LP

Applicant: Michael Ryan

History: 1953; Mercantile Library; Martin, Stewart & Noble, architects

Individual Designation: 9/12/1990

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the restoration and adaptive reuse of this Modernist library building for an architect's office. The architects who will utilize the space propose to add a second entry door and extend the sign band across the front facade. They intend to restore all other elements of the building.

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. Property and business owners Michael Ryan and Randee Spelkoman Ryan represented the application.

The Committee members applauded the effort to rehabilitate this very deteriorated but important example of Modernist architecture. Mr. Baron asked if the Mercantile Library sign that hung on the front façade has survived. Mr. Ryan stated that it has not survived. Only the window mullions have survived on the front façade.

Mr. Evans noted that the original sign band was limited to the two bays of the east side of the front façade. The application proposes a sign band that would run across the entire façade. He objected to the change to the sign band, but stated that he found the addition of the second door acceptable. Mr. Ryan explained that the interior space will be subdivided. He stated that the tenant will need signage. Mr. Ryan stated that they are also considering signage behind the glass, but they are convinced that the tenant will need signage on the exterior to make the space viable commercially. Ms. Ryan agreed. Ms. Hawkins asked whether they could limit the space devoted to their signage to two bays. Mr. Ryan stated that the staff had already approved a sign band running across the entire façade with a previous restoration application that proposed to retain the single original door. The Ryans explained that, since that approval, they have conferred with several potential tenants, all of whom have insisted on a separate door to the tenant space. None of the potential tenants has expressed a willingness to accept a door to their space in the vestibule; all want direct access to the street. And all tenants will want a sign on the exterior. Mr. Ryan explained that one sign band running across the entire façade with

signage for both his business and that of the tenant is the best solution. Mr. Evans asked if the original doors survive. Mr. Ryan stated that they are lost but would be replicated.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the color of the original glass. Mr. Ryan displayed a sample of the original glass. Mr. Ryan explained that the new low-E glass would be slightly more blue than the original glass. He showed a sample of the glass. Mr. Baron asked about the changes resulting from the installation of double-pane glass. Mr. Ryan explained that the plane of the glass would shift outward slightly, about $\frac{3}{4}$ inch. New "closure strips" would be fabricated to accommodate this change. Mr. Ryan stated that the façade would have the appearance of the original façade, even with the glass change. He reported that all of the missing window components will be fabricated to match surviving remnants.

Mr. Evans asked the applicants if they would accept signage for their business that was located behind the glass and signage for the tenant that replicated the look, dimensions, and location of the original Mercantile Library signage. The Ryans stated that they must have the name of their business on the exterior of the building. Ms. Ryan stated that "it is the whole reason for doing the building." Ms. Hawkins noted that the Ryan's business would be entered through the new door, while the tenant's business would be entered through the historic door, where the historic signage was located. She asked if the Ryans could redesign the interior layout of the building, relocating their entrance to the historic entrance, thereby allowing their signage to occupy the location of the historic signage. The Ryans responded that that would not be possible because of the location of the original interior stair. They objected to redesigning the entire building merely for the sake of the location of a small sign. Mr. Evans countered that the façade is very simple and elegant and very much depends on the location and design of the sign. Mr. Evans asserted that it must be two bays wide, like the original, not three. He strenuously objected to deviating from the historic sign. Ms. Ryan observed that the staff already approved the full-width sign when he sought a permit to restore the façade with the single, original door opening. Ms. Hawkins responded that the applicants are now proposing a second non-historic door for the façade; therefore, it is a new application and the signage can be reconsidered despite the earlier approval. Ms. Ryan stated that they are only applying for the door, not the sign, which has already been approved. Ms. Hawkins stated that the signage should be limited to two bays, either at the historic door at the east or the new door at the west, but it should not run across the entire façade. The Ryans stated that there would be a break between the signs at the middle of the building. Mr. Evans stated that he feels very strongly that the historic sign is "integral to the architecture." Ms. Hawkins asked for a motion. Ms. Ryan questioned why the Committee had not discussed the proposed door. Ms. Hawkins responded that there is no opposition to the door. Mr. Evans stated that he would move to limit the signage to either the left two or right two bays. The applicants strenuously objected to this recommendation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided the sign band above the horizontal mullion is limited to either the left two or right two bays of the front façade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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

Standard 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.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs—their functional and decorative features—that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. This includes the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features such as cupolas, cresting, chimneys, and weathervanes; and roof material such as slate, wood, clay, tile, and metal, as well as its size, color, and patterning.