

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

**TUESDAY, 21 JUNE 2011
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, Chair
John Cluver
Rudy D'Alessandro
Nan Gutterman
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

Brett Harman, Harman Deutsch Architects
Mark Wallace, Harman Deutsch Architects
Vincent Wolk, Longo Architects
Jeffrey Leonard, Longo Architects
Ross Bagely, Wells Fargo Bank
Anita McKelvey, Authentic Philadelphia
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance
Lorna Katz Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Joe Serratore, Serratore & Co.
Brian Phillips, ISA
Andrew Hohns
Frank Mallas, Friday Architects
Eric Hirschberg
Rachel Schade, Schade & Bolender Architects
Francis Dolan
Guy Aiman, Center City Residents Association

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman and Pentz and Messrs. Cluver and D'Alessandro joined her.

ADDRESS: 14 S 03RD ST

Project: Construct building on site of demolished building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Binyan 14 South 3rd St. LLC

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch

History: 1894; Henry D. Dagit, architect; demolished after fire, 2004

Individual Designation: 5/5/1977

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a building on a vacant lot in Old City. A three-story, roman-brick, Renaissance Revival building stood on the lot. It was built in 1894 by architect Henry D. Dagit for John M. Doyle. In 1977, the building was individually listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. It was listed as contributing to the Old City Historic District in 2003. The building was destroyed by fire and demolished in January 2004. The lot has remained vacant. The Commission has plenary jurisdiction, not review-and-comment jurisdiction, because the lot is not “undeveloped.”

The application proposes the construction of a five-story building. The first-floor front façade would be an aluminum and glass storefront and the second floor would have four one-over-one aluminum clad grouped windows. The first two stories of the front facade would be clad with metal panels. The third and fourth stories of the front façade would be clad in brick veneer and have one-over-one aluminum clad windows. A composite cornice above the fourth story is proposed. The fifth story would be a metal standing seam mansard with two dormers with one-over-one aluminum clad windows.

Stucco, sliders, and balconies are proposed for the rear façade. The north or side façade would be parged in stucco with scoring. Aluminum clad one-over-one windows are proposed for this façade as well.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Brett Harman and Mark Wallace represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins stated that mansard roofs are not common in Old City. She noted that they are common in Spring Garden and West Philadelphia, but not in this area. She suggested that a mansard is not appropriate to this context. Mr. Harman explained that his co-worker Rustin Ohler, who was unable to attend this meeting, had designed the building in consultation with Randal Baron of the Commission's staff. He stated that the mansard was used to step back the upper story, reducing the massing of the building. The new building would have the same number of stories as the adjacent building to the south, but it would be taller, owing to the greater floor-to-floor heights. Mr. Cluver stated that a true five-story building may be appropriate for the block, but it is difficult to make that judgment without seeing the proposed building in its context. Ms. Hawkins asked why the floor-to-floor heights are so great. Mr. Wallace explained that their client also owns a building on Market Street, which would abut the rear of this building. The owner may want to connect the buildings in the future. Therefore, the floor-to-floor heights of the proposed building were designed to match those of the extant building. Mr. Hawkins rejected that justification and contended that the floor-to-floor heights were too great. She asked if there was any other reason for the floor heights. Mr. Harman again stated that they designed the new building to match the floor heights of the historic building at 306 Market Street so that they could be connected in the future.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the choice of the metal panels for the storefront area. Mr. Harman responded that Mr. Baron had suggested that they employ contemporary materials while recreating some of the aspects of the historic façade that was lost. Ms. Hawkins asked how far the metal panels would protrude from the face of the masonry portion of the building above. Mr. Wallace answered that they would protrude four inches.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the uses on the various floors. Mr. Harman stated that the building would house commercial space on the first floor and residential on the second to fifth floors. Ms. Hawkins stated that she did not understand the reasons for referencing the historic building with the double-height storefront element, especially since the proposed building above the storefront looks nothing like the historic building. She suggested a contemporary building with a one-story storefront that is compatible with the historic district instead of the building as proposed, which awkwardly refers to the lost building. She stated that that building is gone and should not be partially recreated.

Mr. Cluver asserted that the proportions of the façade would be very ungainly. He contended that the building would look like someone with his pants pulled up to his chest. The proposed building has an awkward feel. He agreed with Ms. Hawkins and her suggestions. Ms. Hawkins again stated that the mansard roof was not appropriate for Old City. She observed that the fifth-story could be set back. Ms. Gutterman asked about visibility from Market Street. The architects showed photographs of the views from Market Street.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the applicants should provide more information about the context. Ms. Gutterman stated that they should be more concerned about the 3rd Street or front elevation; they seem to be primarily concerned with the connection to the Market Street building at the rear. Ms. Hawkins suggested looking for other ways to connect the new building and the old. For example, they could employ an elevator that would stop at different floor heights in the two buildings. She stated again that the storefront should be a single story tall, not two. Mr. Cluver stated that they should not base their design on the lost building, but on the buildings that exist around the site.

Anita McKelvey of Authentic Philadelphia asked if the new building would have a basement. The Committee members asked about the relevance of the question. Mr. Harman responded that it would have a full basement, but that it would be relatively shallow, about 7'-6" deep.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

ADDRESS: 340-50 S 02ND ST

Project: Construct addition for ATM
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Ross Bagley
Applicant: Ross Bagley, Wells Fargo Bank
History: 1868
Individual Designation: None

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a small building to house an accessible ATM. This ATM building would be located along Pine Street adjacent to a non-historic addition that houses an ATM. The addition would be clad in a painted brick veneer to match to existing addition. A Fypon cornice and trim are proposed to allude to the historic building.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Bank property manager Ross Bagely and architect Vincent Wolk represented the application.

Mr. Wolk stated that they are attempting to comply with a federal requirement to provide an ATM that is accessible. He stated that there is an ADA ramp at the rear of the building, but no space for an ATM at the ramp. Therefore, they are proposing a small building to house the ATM. He explained that the overhang off the front of the building will provide some shelter to the ATM users. The overhang includes a code-required down light.

Ms. Gutterman asked if they had considered streamlining the building by deleting some of the ornament like the cornice. Mr. Wolk stated that he would gladly remove some of the ornament. He stated that he could use a much simpler cornice from the rear of the historic building. Mr. Cluver cautioned him against copying a cornice from a much larger building. Mr. Wolk stated that he could adjust the size to ensure the appropriate scale. Mr. Cluver questioned the use of the cornice on the overhang. He suggested limiting the cornice to the building and building a separate overhang without a cornice. Mr. Cluver stated that the arch and the cornice conflict. Mr. Wolk agreed to simplify the design. The Committee members suggested removing the arch, simplifying the cornice and limiting it to the building itself, and adding a separate canopy that does not have a cornice. They noted that the building would cost less without all of the unnecessary ornament.

Lorna Katz Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that the neighbors are upset by the brightness of the signs that were installed recently at the bank building. She stated that her "community is very angry." She stated that she is "very disappointed with Wells Fargo." She stated that she had not had an opportunity to review the plans for the accessible ATM, but contended that the current ATM is already accessible. Ms. Hawkins noted that there are different definitions for "accessible." She stated that people in wheelchairs need to be able to access ATMs. Ms. Lawson countered that the people in wheelchairs should use the existing ATM. Ms. Hawkins responded that its height does not satisfy the federal ADA regulations. Ms. Lawson again stated that she had not reviewed the plans for the proposed ATM. Mr. Bagley explained that he was not involved with the sign replacement or the reviews for it. He stated that the U.S. Justice Department is requiring Wells Fargo to provide an ADA-accessible ATM. Mr. Wolk stated that there would be no lighted signage on the new ATM. Ms. Hawkins asked if they were proposing signage. Mr. Wolk stated that they are proposing non-illuminated signage, but noted that the signage design would change slightly with the redesign to simplify the building. Ms. Hawkins remarked that the Committee had reviewed the earlier signage package for the

building when it became a Wells Fargo Bank. Ms. Lawson asked why Wells Fargo needed two ATMs. Mr. Wolk explained that they need to provide an ADA compliant ATM and the number of transactions at this site warrants two ATMs. Ms. Hawkins asked about the signage on the ATM. Ms. Gutterman observed that it would be Mylar letters applied to the canopy. Ms. Hawkins asked why they needed the bank name on both ATM canopies. Mr. Bagely stated that the simple Mylar letters on the canopy would point out the location and purpose of the machines to users. Ms. Hawkins stated that there is “a lot of signage” on this building. Mr. Cluver suggested that they design appropriate signage while redesigning the little building to house the ATM.

Mr. Cluver asked why they were retaining one of the two non-historic brick piers adjacent to the new ATM structure. He commented that it seemed like an odd remnant. Mr. Wolk stated that they were seeking to limit the changes to the site for historic preservation reasons. He stated that they would be glad to remove the second pier. The Committee members agreed that this would be appropriate.

The applicants asked if they could revise the design for presentation at the Historical Commission meeting. Mr. Farnham responded that they could present a revised design to the Commission that complied with the Committee’s suggestion to simplify the building and finalize the signage.

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

ADDRESS: 506 S 07TH ST

Project: Rehabilitate first-floor front façade, replace windows, add balconies

Owner: Jorge Mosquera

Applicant: Joseph Serratore, Joseph Serratore & Company Architects

History: 1860

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: None

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the ground floor of a mid nineteenth-century building. The building was constructed between 1860 and 1876. It is highly likely that the ground floor was originally used for commercial purposes with the upper stories reserved for residential use. As originally proposed, the rehabilitation of the building into a single-family residence would remove the extant non-historic storefront and create a more residential ground-floor. The original proposal includes the creation of an arched entrance with a four-panel door and a bay window with three double-hung windows. The storefront cornice, dating from the turn of the twentieth century that currently delineates the ground floor from the second floor, would remain. The new ground-floor façade would not recreate a typical residential ground floor, since it is highly unlikely that one ever existed historically. Instead, the design would clearly read as a new ground floor. The application also proposes the installation of appropriate two-over-four windows in the elongated second-floor openings and the installation of “plant balconies” at the second and third floors. The building would not have had “plant balconies” originally.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the application except the plant balconies, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Joseph Serratore represented the application.

Mr. Serratore explained that the owner would like to restore the building to a single-family residence. It has been a candy store for about 60 years. The primary exterior work would take place at the first-floor front façade. Mr. Serratore stated that Randal Baron of the staff had advised him about renovating the storefront area. He said that Mr. Baron suggested the projecting bay window and the arched doorway. Mr. Cluver asked if there was any evidence for the arched doorway or if it was purely speculative. Mr. Serratore replied that it was purely speculative on Mr. Baron's part. The Committee members rejected Mr. Baron's suggestion. They contended that the storefront area was very rectilinear and not compatible with an arch. The Committee members asked if other buildings in the area provided any clues. Mr. Serratore stated that they did not.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the proposed two-over-four window configuration, which is unusual. Mr. Danta explained that two-over-four windows are common in very tall window openings in the Spring Garden area and other parts of the city with buildings of the age of the one in question. Mr. Cluver asked about the projecting bay. Mr. Serratore explained that Mr. Baron had suggested it to refer back to the large storefront window that would have been in that location. The Committee members found the composition of the arched door, bay window, and storefront cornice to be very odd. They suggested that Mr. Baron's advice was ill conceived. They suggested to Mr. Serratore that he select one type of ground-floor façade, storefront or residential, and restore to that type rather than mixing the commercial and residential. Mr. Cluver asked if the projecting bay would meet the building code. Mr. Serratore responded that the Streets Department allows box bays. Ms. Hawkins suggested large windows with transoms at the plane of the façade rather than a bay. Mr. Serratore stated that that would be acceptable to his client. He had proposed the bay at Mr. Baron's urging. Ms. Hawkins suggested a design that had the feeling of a storefront, without being a true storefront. A rectangular doorway with a transom aligning with the window transoms would be appropriate.

The Committee members stated that the "plant balconies" would not be appropriate.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she would move to deny the application. Two Committee members agreed with her; two advocated for the staff recommendation of approval. Ms. Hawkins broke the tie, stating that she would vote for denial. Mr. Farnham asked the Committee to provide the applicant with clear guidance if they were intending to recommend denial. The Committee members responded that, given that no information about the historic appearance of this building is available, Mr. Serratore should develop a first-floor front façade design that is either residential-like or storefront-like, but not an awkward hybrid of the two as Mr. Baron had urged. The arched doorway should not be combined with a storefront-like window and cornice. The Committee members agreed that the storefront cornice, which is old but not necessarily historic, could be removed if the first floor was restored to a residential appearance with punched openings, but should be retained if it was restored to a storefront appearance. Mr. Serratore asked if he could revise the plans for the Commission meeting. Mr. Farnham responded that he could revise the plans for the Commission meeting based on the Committee's suggestions or he could withdraw this application and submit a new application with the revisions.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 3 to 2 to recommend denial.

ADDRESS: 231 SPRUCE ST

Project: Construct deck on rear ell

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Andrew Hohns & Leah Popowich

Applicant: Brian Phillips, Interface Studio Architects LLC

History: 1763; third floor added, c. 1813

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to replace an existing deck with a new deck. This property is a significant house in the Society Hill Historic District. It was built in 1763. The existing deck is a typical pressure-treated lumber deck and is located on the roof of the rear ell. The rear ell is visible from Locust Street through a large gated parking lot. The application proposes the replacement of the extant deck with an unconventional deck. The building's rear elevation conveys its original eighteenth-century massing and spatial relationships. The building has a typical half-gable rear ell, rear dormer on the back slope of the gambrel over the main block, and exposed brick rear walls.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Brian Phillips and property owner Andrew Hohns represented the application.

Mr. Phillips explained that he and his client had proposed a contemporary addition to the rear ell last year, but had withdrawn the application after receiving comments from the Architectural Committee. He stated that they are now proposing a deck in the same location. He contended that it would be "a fine piece of furniture" and asserted that, although differentiated from the eighteenth-century house, would fit in the "tradition of craftsmanship" in Society Hill. He stated that there is "a long history of contemporary experimentation" in Society Hill. He stated that if this design is denied, they will propose a standard pressure-treated lumber deck, which he finds entirely inappropriate to this house. He stated that the proposed deck would be entirely detachable. He asserted that his design is "in the spirit of the moment."

Mr. Cluver rejected the claim that the only other option will be a crass, pressure-treated deck. He contended that it is possible to design a deck that would be both contemporary and contextual. He asserted that this proposed deck is designed to stand out in opposition to the historic building. A deck need not be bland or traditional to be contextual. It is not either this deck or a crass pressure-treated deck; there are other options.

Ms. Pentz asked about the history of the building. She stated that it appears that the ell has been modified. Mr. Hohns replied that the house was built in 1763. The ell was built in the 1850s; it was much longer. In the 1950s, when the City condemned and took the property, it demolished the rear half of the rear ell. Mr. Hohns added that the deck seen in the photographs is no longer on the rear ell. He removed it because it was causing structural and water infiltration problems for the building. He stated that he felt obligated to remove the deck immediately, without approvals. He stated that the only responsible action as the owner of a historic property was to remove the deck and shore up the roof. Mr. Hohns stated that he is also replacing all of the doors and windows in the house.

Mr. Hohns stated that the addition proposed last year was rejected because it would have required the removal of some historic fabric. The current proposal is completely reversible. He

stated that he does “abide by the National Historic Registry Standards which do not attempt to create a fake historicity, but instead tries to create a contrasting situation that highlights the historical significance of the property.” He claimed that the deck would be “hardly visible” from Locust Street. He stated that he intends to build a deck that “will be very much within the spirit of the craftsman tradition of the neighborhood that we live in and whose heritage we intend to honor very seriously.”

Ms. Pentz stated that the Historical Commission has justified decks in Society Hill because they mimic the appearance of drying frames that were built on roofs in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Ms. Pentz stated that this does not mimic that appearance. Therefore, her decision will be based on the visibility of this deck from the public right-of-way. Ms. Hawkins asked for information on the public visibility of this rear ell. Mr. Danta stated that he toured the property with the owner and architect. He reported that the rear is visible from the public right-of-way.

Ms. Gutterman objected to the opacity of the deck wall. She contended that it would look like an addition rather than a deck. Ms. Hawkins noted that the deck would stand about 7 feet off the roof. She noted that even though the walls of the proposed deck are 50% open, they will appear solid from the ground, when seen on an angle. She stated that it is not open and transparent like most decks including the one that was removed.

Mr. Cluver objected to the deck because it is an object that calls attention to itself and detracts from the historic building. He stated that a more open deck might meet with a recommendation of approval. He asserted that this would be a sculptural object that would detract from the building and district. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed.

Lorna Katz Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that the association's zoning and preservation committee voted 9 to 2 to oppose the project.

Mr. Hohns stated that he “would like to point out the irony of having *The Story of Progress* as the stand on which we are recording the proceedings of this meeting. [The audio recorder at the Committee meeting was sitting on a book entitled *The Story of Progress*.] We tried very carefully to respond to the feedback we received from this body in a previous setting. At the risk of prejudicing your judgment by anticipating your decision today, I would just like to suggest to you that there is an important dialogue that exists between a contemporary setting and an historic setting. And we have worked very hard to bring some of the best design principles that we know how to research into creating that dialogue in a way that challenges people to appreciate the historic heritage of our city. I don't think that a rote or slavish fealty to rectilinear pressure-treated decks is any more evocative of a clothes-drying facility than what we've proposed, which allows visitors and residents to reflect on the fact that Society Hill is an important living neighborhood that represents values of progress for the City of Philadelphia.”

Mr. Phillips stated that he was disheartened that the Commission would approve a simple pressure-treated deck but not the high-quality deck he is proposing. Ms. Gutterman stated that the proposed deck looks like a wall; it is solid; it looks like an addition, not a deck. Mr. Hohns asked if the Committee would recommend approval of a cantilevered deck. Ms. Hawkins stated that she would support a 70% open deck. Ms. Katz suggested pulling the deck back away from the rear wall of the rear ell. Mr. Cluver and Ms. Pentz stated that they might also be able to recommend approval of a more open deck, depending on the design. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that any deck of this type, even a more open one, would violate Standard 2 because it would adversely alter the character of this important historic building. Several Committee members

stated that they are open to the possibility of a deck that cantilevers beyond the facades of the ell.

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

ADDRESS: 2107 SPRUCE ST

Project: Replace windows

Owner: Philadeline LP

Applicant: Frank Mallas, Friday Architects/Planners Inc

History: 1869; front façade altered in Moderne style, c. 1930s or 1940s

Individual Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to address an outstanding violation for the illegal installation of vinyl windows in the ground and second-floor window openings of this mid nineteenth-century townhouse. The property was significantly altered in the 1930 or 40s with the refacing of the ground-floor façade in a Moderne Style and the addition of a second-floor bay. The Moderne Style façade showcased steel casement windows at ground and second floors. The steel casement windows were illegally removed in April 2010 and a violation issued soon after.

The application does not propose to restore the fenestration to the Moderne Style, or to the original Second Empire style of the townhouse. Instead, the applicant proposes a completely new fenestration pattern. The application proposes to install two types of windows; wood double-hung windows in a one-over-one pattern at the ground floor and single-light wood casements in the second-floor bay. These windows would be installed in openings that were created in the 1930s or 40s with the Moderne alteration. The proposed windows do not recreate the pattern, proportions, or dimensions of the steel windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Frank Mallas represented the application.

Mr. Mallas stated that the second-floor windows are wood casements, not steel casements. He reported that the windows are “gerry-rigged or slapped in.” Ms. Gutterman asked if the second-floor windows had been steel casements. Mr. Mallas stated that they had been steel casements at one point, but they had been removed. He stated that they are currently wood casements and they are proposing new wood casements. Mr. Danta stated that the steel casements were removed illegally recently. Mr. Mallas replied: “Not by us.” Mr. Mallas stated that steel windows are not efficient; they do not have thermal breaks. Ms. Hawkins responded that steel windows with thermal breaks are available but expensive. Ms. Gutterman stated that the wood casements would not be compatible with the 1930s or 40s rehabilitation that this building underwent. Mr. Mallas stated that the staff has approved new Marvin wood windows for the upper floor, which are similar to the windows approved for the neighboring building. Ms. Gutterman noted that the permit application proposes replacing first-floor vinyl windows. She asked when the steel windows were removed and replaced with vinyl windows. Mr. Mallas stated that the illegal vinyl windows were installed before he became involved with the project. Mr. Danta stated that the steel windows were removed illegally in April 2010, one year ago. The

ownership has not changed since that time. Mr. Mallas stated that he was not aware of the removal of the steel windows. He added that there was a fire in January 2011. Mr. Mallas stated that he did not know when the windows were replaced. Ms. Hawkins replied that the exact timing was irrelevant because the windows have clearly been replaced since the designation without reviews or approvals. The current owner is responsible, whether or not that owner undertook the replacement.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she agreed with the staff that the building either needed to be restored to its original condition or to its Moderne condition, but not rehabilitated to some hybrid or third condition. Ms. Pentz agreed. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the proposed windows would not be compatible with the Moderne door, which has small horizontal panes. Mr. Mallas stated that it would look odd to introduce small horizontal panes into the proposed double-hung windows. The Committee members agreed, but stated that the proposed non-historic double-hung windows, not the pane sizes and orientations, are the problem. The proposed windows are not compatible with the Moderne alterations to the building. Ms. Hawkins stated that the new windows should be compatible with the Moderne vocabulary established in the 1930s or 40s. Mr. Mallas disagreed and pointed to a photograph that showed windows with larger, vertical panes. Ms. Hawkins pointed out that the building referred to by Mr. Mallas was not his client's building, but a neighboring building that has no bearing on this case. Mr. Mallas agreed. He then asked if he could add horizontal muntins to the proposed windows. The Committee members agreed that the proposed windows were not appropriate, even if altered. Mr. Cluver suggested that the Moderne windows could be replicated in cast aluminum and would have the requisite energy efficiency.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9.

ADDRESS: 1801 DELANCEY PL

Project: Restore exterior, add mechanical equipment, insert garage

Owner: Mi'kimonki Trust

Applicant: Rachel Simmons Schade, Schade & Bolender Architects, LLP

History: 1867; Joseph William Bates House; Fraser, Furness & Hewitt, architects; T.P. Chandler Jr., alts, 1876

Individual Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a combination of restoration work and minimal alterations to this significant house in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. The house is a grand Second Empire corner residence built in 1867. The application proposes the restoration of windows, metal work, and wood work throughout the exterior of the building. Several minor alterations that are not restorations of historic elements are also proposed. The application proposes the installation of one-over-one windows in two ground-floor openings along the Delancey Street façade of the house; the installation of HVAC units on the roof, the installation of new doors in an existing non-historic opening facing an enclosed garden, and the creation of the a garage opening along Cypress Street. The HVAC units would be mostly inconspicuous, although a site visit to review a mock up would be advisable. The garage along Cypress would alter a secondary elevation with little architectural character. This section of Cypress Street is a service alley. The proposed garage door would complement the house. The Commission has approved similar garage doors to other significant houses in Rittenhouse Square; for example, the Jayne

Mansion at 19th and Delancey Streets. The garage would not be overtly visible to the public and it would not affect any of the principal facades of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the proposed windows on the ground-floor openings along Delancey Street match the historic two-over-two pattern of the rest of the house, and a mock-up shows limited visibility of roof-top HVAC units, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Rachel Schade and property owner Eric Hershberg represented the application.

Mr. Danta stated that the applicant had revised the application to show two-over-two windows in the ground-floor openings facing the enclosed garden, as the staff had recommended. He noted that, originally, all ground-floor openings would have been two-over-two and that the applicant now proposed to restore them all. He clarified that the staff recommendation would now be approval as revised.

Mr. Cluver asked if the opening that would be restored into a window was originally a window. Ms. Schade answered that the opening has evidence of shutter hardware and that the brick is not altered, which leads her to believe that it was originally a window. She also noted that a door there would not have made sense on the floor plan.

Mr. Cluver noted that, aside from the HVAC work and the garage door, everything else would be a restoration. Ms. Schade agreed and added that a set of non-original doors would be replaced on the Delancey Street elevation facing the enclosed garden. Ms. Gutterman asked if the masonry opening would be modified. Ms. Schade answered that the opening would be altered, but that it is not original. She stated that the history of the room behind the large opening is very murky. It may have been a space for a carriage or it may have been where the original owner stored his photographic equipment. The Committee members agreed that the proposed door system is appropriate and is not visible from the right-of-way because it is behind a tall brick garden wall.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the staff to review all restoration details and the HVAC mock up, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 507 S 15TH ST

Project: Infill side window, stucco side wall and addition, install fence, and demolish brick shed

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Broad Bay Investors LP

Applicant: Vincent Mancini, Landmark Architectural Design

History: 1840, second-floor side addition constructed after 1922

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 infill a side window, stucco the side wall and addition, demolish a brick shed, and install a privacy fence. The small rowhouse has a non-historic, second-floor side addition that stands on columns.

Currently, a window in the side wall of the main block is boarded up. The wood lintel over the window rotted and collapsed and the window was boarded. The application proposes to infill the opening with brick and stucco.

The application also proposes to remove the asphalt shingles covering the non-historic side addition and stucco it.

A dilapidated brick shed stands below the side addition. A wood bracing system currently holds the structure in place. The applicant proposes to demolish the structure and install HVAC condensers in its place. To hide the condensers, a privacy fence would be installed below and in the plane of the front façade of the side addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

Mr. Danta explained that a gate separates the side yard from the sidewalk. There is a partially collapsed shed that may have been a privy in the side yard, under the second-floor addition. Mr. Farnham clarified that there is no indication on the interior of the shed that it was a privy. If it was a privy, the pit has been filled and the fixtures removed. He stated that the interior of the shed now houses a series of pipes and cables for the condenser installation.

Mr. Cluver noted that the application proposes three options for the privacy fence that would block views of the condensers from the street.

Mr. Farnham stated that the staff attempted to date the addition, but could not find any solid information. He explained that the addition does not appear in a 1922 atlas and therefore must have been constructed after 1922.

Mr. Cluver asked why the applicant proposed infilling rather than replacing the window. Ms. Gutterman stated that the infill be recessed to create a shadow line and not be flush with the building.

The Committee members agreed that the fence should be wood and compatible with the streetscape.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided the fence is wood and the infill in the window is slightly recessed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 3301 HAMILTON ST

Project: Replace slate roofing on mansard with synthetic shingles
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Laszio & Margaret Gyulai
Applicant: Joseph Loonstyn, Loonstyn Roofing
History: 1865; Henry E. Wrigley, engineer
Individual Designation: 4/30/1963
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove existing slate shingles on this mansard and install synthetic slate shingles.

The existing slate shingles have exceeded their 125-year life span and are in need of replacement. The applicant researched roof replacement with natural slate and determined it to be cost-prohibitive. The estimates ranged from \$50,000 to \$60,000. The proposed simulated synthetic slates shingles would match the shape, colors, and appearance of natural slate.

This property was one of 30 buildings in Powelton Village designated in April 1963 upon recommendation by the Preservation Committee of the AIA.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Margaret Gyulai and roofing contractor Joseph Loonstyn represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants if they brought a sample of the roofing material with them to the meeting. The applicants showed two samples of the synthetic shingles to the Committee members. Mr. Loonstyn explained that one sample is made by EcoStar and the other by DaVinci. He asserted that the DaVinci product retains its color longer and is more durable. He acknowledged that the DaVinci shingle is wider than the existing slate. Mr. Cluver added that it is also thicker. When asked by Mr. Cluver, Ms. Cote stated that the property is individually designated and is not within a district. Ms. Gyulai stated that the building does not look like any other that she has seen. Mr. Cluver opined that the existing slate is likely a second generation and not the original slate. He asked the applicant for the cost estimate for synthetic slate. Ms. Gyulai asserted that it was half the cost of natural slate. Mr. Cluver claimed that the life span of synthetic slate is less than half that of natural slate. He stated that he was involved with a slate roof replacement in which the roofer claimed the synthetic material does not last for more than 15 to 20 years. Mr. Loonstyn noted that, in his experience, he has not seen any problems with the synthetic slate. He stated he installed a synthetic slate roof eight years ago and observed that it has weathered but is not deteriorating. Mr. Cluver restated that synthetic slate will not last as long as natural slate. Ms. Gyulai agreed, but explained that the footprint of the house is very small and therefore the value is appraised low for the area. She continued that, if roof replacement costs 10% of the value of the property, it is excessive and poses a hardship. She added that she would install natural slate if she could afford it. Ms. Gutterman noted differences in the thicknesses of the natural and various synthetic slates. Mr. Loonstyn explained the installation process and noted areas that will need flashing, namely the dormer and ridgeline. Ms. Pentz stated she prefers the EcoStar sample, but added that either proposed option would be appropriate for replacement.

Mr. Cluver asked if the Committee has the authority to recommend approval of a synthetic replacement material for natural slate. Mr. Farnham clarified that, if the Committee believes the replacement material is appropriate, it may recommend approval of it. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Farnham if the Rules & Regulations require the replacement of slate mansard roofs with real slate. Mr. Farnham explained that the Rules & Regulations specifically do not authorize the staff to approve the replacement of existing slate on mansards or turrets with anything but slate, but the Rules & Regulations in no way restrict the Committee and Commission, except that the Rules & Regulations state that they must be guided by the Standards. He remarked that the Commission has the discretion to approve an alternative material for slate. He recalled that the Commission has had several discussions about the replacement of slate with slate-like materials. He explained that, after the designation of the Girard Estate Historic District, the Commission discovered that, in some cases, it would cost half of a building's total worth to install a new slate roof. The Commission realized that it was not feasible to require the replacement of all slate roofs in kind. The Commission authorized its staff to approve the replacement of slate roofs with alternate materials, except in the cases of mansards and turrets. The Commission developed an acceptance of artificial slate materials in some instances during those discussions.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant if the existing exposures of slate (the amount of overlap) were comparable with the synthetic slate. Mr. Loonstyn stated that they were. Ms. Gyulai explained that EcoStar makes an eight-inch slate, the width of the existing slate, and DaVinci makes a seven and nine inch slate. Ms. Hawkins noted that this is a very small house and, if the slate material does not match in size and scale, it can have an adverse effect on the appearance of the roof. Mr. Loonstyn stated that he had replaced three roofs on St. Albans Street with this material that were approved at staff-level. Mr. Farnham explained that those were likely instances where the slate was not extant and asphalt had already been installed before designation. Ms. Pentz recalled the Girard Estate discussions and asserted that the Committee has recommended approval of synthetic slate in the past. Mr. Cluver stated that the roof of this house is very prominent and differences in the materials will be obvious from the ground. Ms. Gyulai stated that EcoStar can be produced different gradations of grays to match the natural colors.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of roof replacement with a synthetic slate, provided it is dimensionally similar to the existing slates in thickness and size, with the same exposures and the same variegated colors, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 3400 W QUEEN LA

Project: Install windows and door at front porch

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: James R. Multari

Applicant: James Multari

History: 1930

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Tudor East Falls Historic District, Contributing, 10/9/2009

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install windows and a door at the front porch. In an effort to use the porch year round, the owner proposes to insulate from the interior, install vinyl sliders in the existing window openings, and install a pre-hung steel entry door in the existing door opening. The proposed materials are not compatible with the building or the district and

these installations would alter the special relationships that characterize the property. The staff contends that this porch could be weatherized with the installation of compatible windows and door.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Francis Dolan, the father-in-law of the applicant, represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee cannot recommend approval of vinyl windows. Mr. Cluver concurred with the staff that this porch can be appropriately converted for year-round use, but not as proposed. Mr. Dolan stated that wood windows would not match the vinyl windows in the house. Ms. Hawkins explained that the existing vinyl windows were grandfathered in with the designation, but, should the owner propose to install new ones, the Commission would likely require that the new windows replicate the historic windows. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the door should be less opaque and glassier with a narrower frame. Mr. Cluver opined that the appropriate door would not likely be found at a home improvement warehouse store. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the new door and windows should be made of wood.

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

ADDRESS: 827-31 WALNUT ST

Project: Replace doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Walnut Street Theatre Corp.

Applicant: Mark Sylvester, Walnut Street Theatre

History: 1808; new front façade, 1828, John Haviland, architect; restored, 1971; Walnut Street Theater

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the main entrance doors of the Walnut Street Theater, a National Historic Landmark. The existing doors are metal frame with full glass and were installed as part of the 1971 renovation. The applicant proposes to replace the doors with a six-light double door with three-part transom. The applicant submitted two design options. Option H-A1 is a black aluminum system with molded muntin profiles. The framing of the double door would be thicker than the muntins. Option H-B1 is a black steel system with flat muntin profiles, stiles, and rails. The steel system is thinner. The staff met with the applicant to discuss the proposal. At the time, the architect proposed a bronze finish on the framing.

Currently, there are no known images of the historic doors. The exterior was altered from the original design in 1920 and then restored in 1971 to the 1828 design by architect John Haviland. Although the historic door design is not known, doors on similar Greek Revival buildings were typically wood paneled doors.

An application for door replacement was first proposed to the Architectural Committee in April 2011. That application proposed to adapt the design of the existing eight-light casement

windows on the second story for the new door design. The proposed doors would be metal-frame, double doors with four glazed panels on each leaf. At the meeting, the Architectural Committee members suggested that the dimensions and framing should be larger to give the doors appropriate proportions. They recommended that the applicant use compatible materials and appropriate relationships of solid to glass. A Committee member suggested that a heavier wood door with glazing in the center similar to the door on the 9th Street side in a 1957 photograph would be more appropriate. The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6. The applicant subsequently withdrew the application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Jonathan Broh and Blake Krevolin represented the application.

Mr. Broh distributed drawings of four door options. He introduced the project and explained that there are four proposed options: two material options and two mullion options. The property owner prefers Option 2 in aluminum with thicker frames. He explained that the design was developed based on comments from the previous Architectural Committee review at which the Committee recommended that the doors should be designed to be compatible with the historic building, but not intended to mimic the historic doors. He explained that he designed the door within the opening, but added a transom and vertical elements so as not to emulate the windows above. He stated that they prefer the aluminum door with the larger stile, as a narrower stile would require they use a steel door.

Mr. Cluver asked if these doors are used for both entrance and egress and if the doors would be ADA compliant. Mr. Broh replied that the doors are used for egress and they do not need to be ADA compliant, owing to the two steps leading up to them. Mr. Cluver stated that the door shown in the 1957 photograph appears to be more substantial and compatible. Mr. Broh explained that the existing doors do not allow much light into the space and to close down the opening further would have a negative impact. He added that they propose to use a powder-coated finish and not the standard anodized finish.

Ms. Pentz asked the applicant why he did not propose wood doors. Mr. Broh explained that the existing doors are metal and glass and the client would like to stay in that vocabulary. Ms. Hawkins asked if they explored the possibilities for wood doors. Mr. Broh acknowledged that wood could work in the openings, but the client's preference is for metal. He added that the doors will be used as egress for masses of people and metal doors would be the most durable.

Ms. Gutterman stated that the bottom rail does not look substantial enough for the opening and that thickening it would not dramatically decrease the light entering the building. She added that the transom looks unbalanced and the divisions should be changed or eliminated. Mr. Broh stated that they could comply with thickening the bottom rail and removing the transom. Ms. Gutterman stated that the crash bar creates an additional horizontal element that was not worked into the design. Mr. Broh responded that the proposed glass is not transparent and therefore one would not see the crash bar. He explained that they propose to install dark glass, similar to the existing. Ms. Hawkins agreed with Ms. Gutterman's comments and added that installing the same glass conflicts with the argument to increase light into the space. She contended that tinted glass could be achieved with a wood door as well. Mr. Broh replied that there is difference between a smaller opening with clear glass with narrow direct light and open glass with diffused light. Ms. Hawkins stated that the space is mostly used at night and therefore tinted glass would not be necessary. Mr. Broh countered that they do have matinees. Mr. Cluver

stated that the proposed panels of glass are long and attenuated while the upper window panels are square. Mr. Broh explained that they intentionally diverted from the window proportions based on previous Committee comments about the initial proposal. Ms. Gutterman clarified that the Committee opined that copying the window design was not appropriate for the door openings. She added that Committee recommended that the applicant propose a custom-designed wood door, rather than a prefabricated metal door.

Mr. Cluver introduced a sketch, "Option 5," of a possible door design using Option 1 in aluminum as a template. His sketch showed a three-light door with thicker bottom rail and two-light transom. He explained that raising the bottom rail would get the horizontal pattern closer to the horizontal of the crash bar. He suggested eliminating the verticals. Ms. Pentz asked if Option 5 could be made in wood. Mr. Broh stated that wood is not preferred because the other building connected to the theater has a black metal storefront system. Mr. Cluver stated that wood is more appropriate than metal on the theater. Mark Sylvester of the Walnut Street Theater replied that Option 5 is similar to the design that the Committee recommended denial of at the last meeting. He requested feedback from the Committee members that he can bring back to the Board of Directors. He added that the lobby space is used throughout the day and night for various functions. Mr. Broh stated that the glass often breaks on the doors, which is easier to replace with a metal system. Ms. Gutterman responded to Mr. Sylvester and explained that the first door proposal had proportions that were too tall and wide for the opening. This new design reduces the scale of the door. Mr. Sylvester asserted that the theater does not want solid panel doors. Ms. Gutterman stated that she would like to see glass and framing system samples. Mr. Sylvester stated that they prefer the black metal to match the other building connected to the theater. Ms. Hawkins clarified that the Committee is charged with determining whether the proposal satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Other issues should be raised with the Commission. Ms. Gutterman stated that she believes metal is appropriate, but not the divisions in the glass as proposed. Mr. Cluver agreed and added that he is in favor of Option 5. Mr. Broh asked if clear or smoked glass is more appropriate. Ms. Gutterman suggested the applicant bring in samples and take photographs of the existing conditions inside the glass. Mr. Cluver stated that the metal molding should have a more historic profile.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 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.