

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

**TUESDAY, 26 JANUARY 2010
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DAVID AMBURN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

David Amburn, Chair
Shawn Evans
Nan Gutterman
Suzanne Pentz
John Cluver

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

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association
Dan Bosin, Dan Bosin Associates
Mike Swiszczy, University of Pennsylvania
Rich Russell, University of Pennsylvania
Terence Brooks, University of Pennsylvania
David Hollenberg, University of Pennsylvania
Frano Violich, KVA
Stewart Lim, BSI
Bill Harlan, BSI
Norma Van Dyke
Jon Fritch
Myra Eskin, Society Hill Civic Association
Jonathan Broh, JKR Partners
Ben Weinraub
Alon Barzilay

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Amburn called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman and Pentz and Messrs. Evans and Cluver joined him.

1504 PINE STREET

Owner: Jennie Rubenfeld

Applicant: Michael Sher

History: Lewis' Row, 1849, T.U Walter, architect

Individually designated, 1971, Significant to Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District, 1995

Project: Legalize vinyl windows in basement and fourth floor

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to legalize the installation of a vinyl sliding window at the basement and vinyl windows with sandwiched muntins at the fourth floor of the front facade. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation for this alteration on 21 January 2009. The applicant appealed the violation directly to the Board of License & Inspection Review. The Board remanded the matter to the Historical Commission for its review. The application materials are so scant as to make it difficult to understand the details of the proposal. The applicant claims that the windows that were installed are similar to other windows in the row. The Commission approved-replacement windows as well as the originals in this row are four-over-four with a beaded, wider, vertical muntin. The sliding window hides a window, which sits inside of it, effectively becoming the new exterior appearance.

The staff's request for the violation included the patching of the masonry walls with unpainted grey cement. However, that was included the violation, nor is it part of the applicant's proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6

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

For the record, Mr. Baron noted that the review was scheduled for 9:00 a.m. and began 9:05 a.m. He recorded that no applicant was present as of 9:05 a.m. He summarized the applicant's contention that the windows matched others on the block and that the basement window is a storm window. He displayed photographs of other windows on the block to show that the correct windows are 4-over-4 with a wide vertical mullion.

Mr. Amburn pointed out potentially non-compliant windows at other floors of the building. Mr. Baron replied that the other floors still have their original windows, but they are obscured by exterior storms. He stated that there does appear to be a basement window with muntins behind the recently-installed sliding window. He opined that a single-light storm window set deeper in the opening would be preferable to the sliding storm window that was installed.

Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Amburn agreed with the staff recommendation. Mr. Cluver asked for a general discussion of exterior versus interior storm windows. Mr. Baron stated that, for years, the staff has approved exterior storm windows that have a thin frame colored to match the window and set into the frame so that the brick mold is visible. The meeting rail of the storm must align with the meeting rail of the window. Interior storms have been encouraged.

Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association reported that he received many approvals for exterior storm windows in the 1980s.

The Committee members agreed that the fourth-floor windows do not match the historic windows in material, profile, muntin width, shadow lines, and other details.

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

136 N. 3RD STREET

Owner/Applicant: Dan Bosin Associates/136 N. 3rd Street L.P.

History: c.1830 storefront altered

Individually designated, 1984; Contributing to Old City Historic District, 2003

Project: Reconstruct historic storefront in alternative material

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconstruct an historic granite storefront in an alternate material, wood. The applicant is proposing to replicate the appearance of the historic storefront in wood because later structural changes to the building, which would be difficult to undo, prevent the installation of granite. Additionally, the granite would be very expensive.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff does not offer a recommendation, but looks forward to a full discussion at the Architectural Committee meeting. Replicating the appearance of the granite in fiberglass may be an option. Standard 6 recommends matching the historic material when possible.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Dan Bosin represented the application.

Mr. Bosin explained that the existing steel structure is too close to the front façade to allow the installation of a thick cladding like granite. He originally proposed wood, but he is open to fiberglass as well. He stated that the staff suggested replicating the bay seen in the historic photograph and, although not critical for him, he would like to replicate it. Mr. Baron noted that the Historical Commission reviewed and denied a proposal for the same building that proposed a contemporary style metal storefront. The Commission instructed that applicant, the former owner, to use the historic photograph as a guide. The staff provided that information to Mr. Bosin. Mr. Baron stated that, although there had been an even earlier Greek Revival storefront, no records of it survive to use as a basis for restoration. Mr. Baron suggested that it would be easier to restore to the period shown in the photograph, especially in light of the fact that Mr. Bosin is applying for the federal tax credits.

Mr. Baron stated that fragments of the original granite storefront survive in the basement. Mr. Cluver opined that the granite could potentially be reinstalled. The applicant stated it would increase his cost by more than \$30,000 to \$50,000 over the fiberglass or wood options. Mr. Baron observed that the fiberglass might better replicate the look of granite than wood. He said the wood would require a seam at the column, but the fiberglass could be manufactured monolithically. He noted that wood ages differently than fiberglass.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the wood or fiberglass could have a faux finish to replicate the stone. Mr. Bosin stated he would paint it a variegated color to give it more the look of granite. He also explained the cornice construction to Ms. Pentz. Answering Mr. Cluver, Mr. Bosin explained that he did investigate granite veneer but that it would project too far out from the façade. He said that the wood or fiberglass veneer allows him to stay within the build-to line and allows the doors to be set back behind the columns, where they originally were placed. Mr. Cluver agreed that the doors should be located at the original plane. He acknowledged that the storefront had been changed many times over the years and contended that, if granite is not possible, then

wood detailed appropriately would be acceptable. Mr. Amburn objected to the idea of molding fiberglass to mimic the shape of the granite to eliminate seams. Ms. Pentz found both methods acceptable.

Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association stated that his organization just wanted the storefront to be restored.

The Committee members discussed the other aspects of the application and decided that they agreed with the proposals to install a single pane of glass in the storefront bay and to cover over the unused basement stair.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application with the wood storefront as submitted.

1326-28 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: 1326 Chestnut Street Associates; Barzilay Development

Applicant: Jonathan Broh, JKR Partners

History: Keystone National Bank, 1887, extended to Sansom Street, 1891, Willis Hale, architect
storefront altered c. 1900, c. 1920, c. 1940, c. 1960

Designation: Individually designated, 12/6/1973

Project: Rehabilitate front façade, construct entranceway

OVERVIEW: In December 2009, the Historical Commission approved an application to rehabilitate the Keystone National Bank building at 1326-28 Chestnut Street as a hotel with restaurant at the first floor. During that review, the Commission elected not to approve the proposed restoration of the Chestnut Street façade and installation of a glass canopy at the Chestnut Street storefront, but instead asked the applicants to submit a revised design for that section of the project. This application proposes the revised design for the front façade.

The building was designed by famed architect Willis Hale and constructed in 1887 for the Keystone National Bank. In the early 1890s, Hale added to and extended the building to south to Sansom Street in the same style. The storefront on Chestnut Street, which served as a barometer of prevailing taste for a century, has been replaced numerous times. The building originally had a rusticated stone, arched entranceway with gable at Chestnut Street that was appropriate for the bank, but not for the building's later retail uses. The original entranceway was removed and replaced with a one-story, balustraded, Beaux-Arts storefront about 1900 by Hale when he built the Garrick Theater to the west. The Garrick was stylistically related to the Hale Building and created an ensemble with the central stair tower or turret linking the two buildings. The c. 1900 storefront was removed and replaced with a two-story, Renaissance storefront with tile roof about 1920. The c. 1920 storefront was removed and replaced with a streamlined, Art Moderne storefront matching the neighboring Woolworth Building when the Garrick was demolished about 1940. The c. 1940 storefront was removed and replaced with a Modern storefront about 1960. Although altered, the c. 1960 storefront remains in place today.

In general, the Commission objected to two aspects of the design for the front façade that was proposed with the initial application: the entranceway and the stair tower restoration. First, some Commissioners claimed that the proposed glass and metal entranceway was not compatible with the masonry building. Other Commissioners contended that the entranceway materials and style were compatible, but that the design was not fully developed and should be more

integrated into the façade. Second, most Commissioners contended that the proposed restoration of the masonry for the stair tower or turret at the western edge of the front façade was not well defined. They requested that the applicant better define the proposed material, color, texture, and rustication for the stair tower.

An unknown photograph of the c. 1900 storefront was discovered during the review of the first application and provided to the applicants. Many contend that the photograph provides clues to a compatible design for the front façade. The new design for the front façade proposed in the current application is based on this c. 1900 storefront. An image of the c. 1900 storefront would be represented on the entranceway in laser-cut stainless steel, etched glass, or a graphic installed inside the glass. The glass canopy would replicate the location and dimensions of the c. 1900 storefront. The restored stair tower would be finished to match the surviving historic cladding, with the staff to review the details.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the stair tower restoration, pursuant to Standard 6, with the staff to review details; denial of the glass canopy, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jonathan Broh and developer Ben Weinraub represented the application.

Mr. Farnham explained that the staff expressed differing opinions on the proposed glass entranceway. Although a majority voted to recommend denial of the proposed entranceway, they were not necessarily opposed to an entranceway with contemporary styling or materials such as glass. He noted that some on the staff had voted against the proposal because they did not consider the provided documentation sufficient to grasp the final appearance of the entranceway. Others expressed concerns that the proposed entranceway would be little more than a parody of the c. 1900 storefront. However, none either rejected the proposed concept completely or advocated for a full reconstruction of any of the lost masonry entranceways. Mr. Farnham concluded that the applicants should provide the Architectural Committee with a better understanding of the proposal than is conveyed in the drawings.

Mr. Broh explained that he and his client had not yet selected a technology for applying the image of the 1900 storefront to the proposed glass canopy. He reported that it could be accomplished in laser-cut stainless steel, etched glass, or a graphic installed inside the glass. He submitted an illustration of a similar storefront, which was used at the Mill City Museum in Minneapolis. Mr. Evans asked why Mr. Broh considers the etching the least desirable alternative. Mr. Broh responded that etching presents maintenance problems. He also stated that the techniques that allow for the image to be installed within the glass itself avoid the maintenance problems. Mr. Weinraub stated that the stainless steel material would provide a “richer” look.

Mr. Evans asked if the glass enclosure was an airlock or was open to the street. Mr. Broh answered that it would be open. Mr. Evans posited that it would collect trash and attract nuisance behavior. Mr. Broh stated that the depth of the space did not allow for the required ADA room if it was enclosed. Messrs. Cluver and Evans contended that the ADA complexities could be overcome.

Mr. Cluver asked the applicants why they were not proposing to rebuild one of the four historic entranceways that this building once had. Mr. Weinraub explained that this building has had five different storefronts, each of which was constructed in the style of its day. He asserted that

recreating any one of them would be arbitrary. He stated that, instead, the best solution from a historic preservation perspective was to create a compatible storefront in the style and materials of the current time. He contended that that would be more in keeping with the history of the building than somewhat randomly selecting and recreating one of the several earlier storefronts. He stated that that was the instruction that they received from the Commission at their first review.

Mr. Evans asked the applicants to explain their plan to illuminate the glass entranceway. Mr. Broh explained that it would be bottom or LED lit and would provide a “punch” at night. Mr. Broh added that they would mock up possible lighting schemes to tests their effectiveness. Mr. Weinraub stated that the illumination would be installed in the interior of the glass. Mr. Evans suggested that etched glass would work best. Mr. Weinraub remarked that the lighting will depend on the material. Stainless steel would be lighted differently than etched glass.

Mr. Cluver asked the applicants to explain why they preferred an image of the 1900 storefront rather than a reconstruction of the 1900 storefront. He asserted that the 1900 storefront would provide them with the transparency, entrance, and signage possibilities that they need. Mr. Weinraub stated that their storefront would be more open and welcoming. He stated that they wanted a transparent corner at Juniper and Chestnut. Mr. Cluver responded that historic buildings typically have solid corners. He contended that they wanted the entrance to be a beacon.

Mr. Evans stated that this is the most important unused building in the city. He stated that the Commission should allow the building “to sing as a transformed place” with the glass entranceway. He stated that the glass concept is “clever” and could be “elegant.” He stated that the changes in storefronts are an important part of this building’s history and to recreate any one of them would be random. Mr. Cluver pointed out that the 1900 storefront was designed by the original architect, even if it was not original. Mr. Evans stated that the 1900 storefront was the least interesting of the many storefronts. He stated that the history of change gives the Commission the opportunity to allow something very interesting at this site.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance advocated for denial of the storefront. He stated that the history of change at the storefront does not justify the construction of a new storefront when the historic storefronts are documented. He asserted that the Commission has a policy of requiring the reconstruction of a missing feature when sufficient documentation is available. He contended that the 1900 storefront should be reconstructed. He stated that the 1900 storefront would meet the needs of the hotel. He claimed that the proposed storefront is “so deliberately in contrast with the character of the building.” He suggested something that would be in harmony with the building. He objected to a glass enclosure that would be lit at night. He also objected to a design that is in “the commercial vernacular of Chestnut Street.” He stated that the proposal is imaginative, but inappropriate. He stated that this is one of the buildings in the city that should be restored to its original character.

Mr. Evans objected to Mr. Gallery’s claim that this would be an additional “butchering” of the building. He asserted that it cannot be considered a butchering because the application does not propose the removal of any historic fabric. Mr. Broh confirmed that any historic fabric uncovered would be restored, not removed. Mr. Weinraub stated that the 1900 storefront was added when Hale constructed the theater to the west of this building as a twin to this building. He asserted that the 1900 storefront design was dependent on the neighboring theater design, which no longer exists. Mr. Cluver objected to the glass storefront proposal because a

subsequent owner 30 years from now will want to remove and replace. He advocated for something permanent. Mr. Weinraub observed that that is exactly the history of this building. The storefront has always been changed with changing uses and tastes. He claimed that it would be perfectly appropriate to remove and replace this storefront in 30 years. Mr. Evans stated that he would fully support the recreation of the original 1887 entranceway, if the owner proposed its reconstruction. He stated, however, that he did not consider it appropriate to require the owner to reconstruct the original 1887 entranceway. He stated that the history of this building has created an opportunity for flexibility. He asserted that the proposed entrance accounts for the history of the building. Mr. Farnham observed that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards explicitly provides for this choice as Mr. Evans has stated. He read from the Rehabilitation Standards, which he noted is the appropriate set of Standards for this project:

Recommended

Design for the Replacement of Missing Historic Features

Designing and constructing a new storefront [is recommended] when the historic storefront is completely missing. It may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.

Mr. Farnham observed that the Standards explicitly provides for either a reconstruction or new design when the historic storefront is completely missing, which it is in this case. He also observed that the only limitation on a new design is whether it is compatible with the historic building. He suggested that the Committee focus its discussion on the compatibility of the proposed storefront. Mr. Weinraub reminded the Committee that the state and federal reviewers had deemed the design of their first glass storefront to be compatible with the historic building. He contended that this design was even more compatible.

Mr. Evans stated that some of the design details should be refined. Mr. Cluver suggested that the space between the glass canopy and the building should be handled differently if the glass canopy is accepted. He suggested extending the interior space out into the glass canopy. Mr. Evans stated that he did not understand how the stone at the base of the stair tower would be restored and how this stone would connect to the canopy. Mr. Broh promised that they would restore the missing stone on the tower. Messrs. Cluver and Evans concluded that the relationship of the stone and glass has not been resolved at the west end of the canopy, where the stair tower is located. They expressed confidence in Mr. Broh's ability to resolve that issue.

Ms. Gutterman stated that the 1887 stair tower base and 1900 storefront never existed together. Mr. Evans suggested enclosing the space within the glass canopy and making it an interior space. He stated that the enclosure will make the restoration of the tower easier. Mr. Weintraub noted that their proposal will result in the restoration of the third-floor front façade. Mr. Evans stated that this was an excellent resolution of old and new, restoration and new construction. He observed that it would not be a false restoration. Mr. Cluver disagreed.

Mr. Amburn stated that he approved of the proposal, which would restore existing historic fabric and then install a transparent storefront that alludes to the historic storefront. He rejected arbitrarily selecting and reconstructing one of the many storefronts. Mr. Amburn asked if the applicants were seeking in concept or final approval. Mr. Farnham stated that the application proposes final approval. Mr. Broh offered to amend it to approval in concept if the Committee had lingering concerns about the unresolved details.

Developer Alon Barzilay, one of the partners, introduced himself. He stated that he has been working on this project for more than two years. He stated that the restaurant must have an open, welcoming façade that also references the history of the building. He stated that they are seeking general guidance today. He said that they will make a clear distinction between old and new. The proposal makes reference to the past.

Ms. Pentz stated that the Standards clearly allow for either a reconstruction or a new storefront that is compatible. She stated that she would prefer an approval in concept because there are outstanding details to be resolved. Messrs. Amburn and Evans agreed.

Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Cluver opposed an approval. Mr. Cluver suggested incorporating the space in the canopy into the interior space.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the application, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Storefront Guideline.

115-117 N. 3RD STREET

Owner: Olde North Third LP

Applicant: James M. Francis

History: 1855, individually designated on 31 December 1984, contributing in the Old City Historic District on 12 December 2003.

Project: Demolish and reconstruct rear facades

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the rear facades and reconstruct the elevations in a modern design using a series of aluminum awning windows, Hardieboard panels, and balconies.

The applicant provided an engineer's report explaining that the facades are pulling away from the building. Bracing supports have been installed to prevent from collapse.

The rears of these buildings are not visible from the public right-of-way or the Betsy Ross House courtyard. The rears are highly visible from a large private courtyard accessed by a condominium complex to the east.

These properties are part of a row of eight Italianate buildings that contribute to the historic significance of Old City. Not only are these buildings important because of their age and architectural style, but they are exceptionally well-preserved and have retained their original design, configuration, and materials. The consistency in the row is demonstrated best in the front facades, but also in the rears, where the original brick, window openings, lintels, and sills survive.

While the rears are not currently publically visible, the staff contends that these rear facades merit retention or restoration owing to the significance of the row.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer James Francis represented the application.

Ms. Sell distributed copies of the engineering report to the Committee members.

Mr. Evans questioned the level of visibility from the Betsy Ross House and referenced the staff photograph that shows a small section of the rears of the buildings.

Mr. Amburn noted the potential visibility from Bread Street and the condominium complex. Mr. Francis stated that the rears are visible from three or four stories up on the adjoining property to the east. Mr. Evans questioned if the rears would be visible from the south side of Arch Street. Ms. Sell referenced an aerial photograph showing that the rears are landlocked. She also claimed during a site visit that the rears were not visible from the south side of Arch Street. She clarified that there is a building and wall that is along the north boundary of the Betsy Ross site that cuts off the view to the rears of the buildings. The photograph that shows the small piece of the buildings was taken from the far northeast corner of the courtyard.

Ms. Pentz inquired if the sills and lintels were stone. Mr. Francis responded that they were all deteriorating and were a masonry material. Ms. Pentz noted that the photograph in the packet shows scaffolding rather than shoring. Mr. Francis claimed that the scaffolding was erected prior to installation of the shoring. Ms. Pentz asked if there was a photograph of the shoring. Mr. Francis responded that there was not. He explained that the shoring is connected to the interior of the building and is holding the rear façade elevations tied back to the rest of the building.

Ms. Pentz inquired about the purpose of the scaffolding. Mr. Francis indicated that the scaffolding was erected for the shoring installation. He claimed the shoring installation was suggested by the engineer.

Mr. Evans asked the Committee members if there is sufficient information to justify the demolition of the existing wall and, if so, what would be an appropriate replacement. Mr. Amburn stated that, whether visible or not, the loss of historic fabric is the central issue.

Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Francis why he opted to replace the brick and historic windows with the Hardiepanel system and modern window pattern. Mr. Francis responded that it was the least expensive and most sympathetic to the interior design. It allows more light and air into the building.

Ms. Pentz stated that the engineer observed the need for additional star bolts. Mr. Francis stated that the building is falling down and would be happy to provide photographs to support that claim. He explained that the rear elevation is separating from the party wall. Ms. Sell presented a previously-approved building permit application for the rear wall demolition with attached photographs showing the interior deterioration.

Mr. Evans and Ms. Pentz noticed a brick arch that was constructed at the base of the building, causing some misalignment. Ms. Pentz inquired if the arched opening could be infilled to stabilize the structure. Mr. Francis responded that the rear facades of both buildings are pulling away and that infill would not work. Ms. Pentz stated that the rear should be rebuilt in the same materials according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Mr. Amburn clarified that the staff has already approved the demolition. Ms. Sell stated that the walls must be taken down and rebuilt because they are unstable. The staff did not oppose

taking them down to overcome the structural flaw, but did oppose their reconstruction in a different design with different materials.

Mr. Evans opined that, based on the photographs, the likely problem is the arch and the wall can be stabilized another way. Mr. Francis argued that this condition is not contributing to the whole problem. Mr. Evans countered that more information is needed to make that determination. Mr. Francis reminded the members he is also an architect and that addressing the arch would not work because of the position of the joists and the separation from the party walls. Ms. Pentz described the function of star bolts and their installation through floor joists. Mr. Francis argued that installing more star bolts will not work and invited Committee members to walk through the building. He stated that the condition of the building is dangerous and described the metal bracing system that was installed to prevent a collapse. Ms. Pentz explained that the documentation of the condition would have been helpful.

Ms. Pentz reiterated that the walls should be rebuilt in a similar material according to the Secretary of the Interior Standards. Ms. Gutterman added that the window pattern should be replicated as well, per the Standards. Mr. Francis opined that the historic window pattern does not work for modern living. He stated that he would like to have more than one window in the living room space. Mr. Evans explained that if this were new construction he would accept that argument; however, they are discussing an existing historic building. Mr. Francis opposed a reconstruction because the rear wall must be demolished for structural reasons. Ms. Pentz reiterated that the Standards require restoration because the historic fabric is extant.

Ms. Gutterman agreed that walls should be rebuilt in similar materials. Mr. Francis asked if the Committee would consider the design if he used brick, but constructed the modern openings. Ms. Pentz responded that the openings must match the existing openings.

Mr. Evans stated he would entertain something in between the literal reconstruction and something more contemporary, but this proposal is not compatible. He opined that the proposal is over-designed in terms of the patterning, which is not compatible with the Old City Historic District. Mr. Francis stated that the patterning strictly relates to the interior design.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about the uses of the adjoining buildings. Mr. Francis stated that all of the buildings have commercial ground floors and residential upper levels.

Messrs. Amburn and Evans and Ms. Pentz and Gutterman agreed with staff's recommendation and stated the rear elevation should be rebuilt in the same proportions and using the same material as the existing elevation, per the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Evans stated that there is room for flexibility in that regulation, but this proposal is not compatible.

Mr. Cluver noted that the applicant could propose a restoration that could be approved at staff-level. Ms. Sell reiterated this point. Mr. Cluver stated that, if the situation time-dependant, then the applicant can expedite the application by proposing a restoration. Ms. Pentz also opined that the rear could be rebuilt in block and stucco. Mr. Evans disagreed.

Mr. Francis revealed that his ultimate intention is to propose an enlarged building. He stated that, if he had known that staff was not intending to support the proposal, he would have gone a different direction.

Mr. Francis stated that he would withdraw this application in writing. His stated his intent is to have a taller and longer building.

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

2047 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: Fujian Investment Group LLC

Applicant: Rustin Ohler

History: 1883, G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, architects

Significant to the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Legalize brownstone removal and install cast concrete

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of brownstone removal from the rusticated base and the approval of installation of cast concrete over the remaining brownstone to match the original in size, shape, texture, block pattern, and color. This application also proposes the removal of the brownstone belt course and installation of cast concrete to match the original in size, shape, texture, and color.

On 12 November 2009, a staff member observed contractors drilling and chiseling the brownstone base and stair of the building without the approval of the Historical Commission or a building permit from the Department of Licenses and Inspections. A stop work order was immediately issued. Subsequently, a representative of the owner met with the staff and provided photographs illustrating the delamination and cracking of the brownstone surface. The representative also showed a photograph of a mock-up installation of the proposed replacement material. The staff requested an on-site meeting with the mason to inspect the condition of the remaining brownstone and mock-up installation; however, the representative did not contact this office and the meeting never occurred.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the applicant and mason demonstrate to the staff at an on-site inspection that the remaining brownstone is delaminating, and provided the belt courses are replicated in cast stone, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

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

Mr. Evans asked if concrete had been installed. Ms. Sell confirmed that only the mock-up had been installed. Mr. Cluver asked if the material was a Portland concrete. Ms. Sell responded that no specifications for the replacement material had been submitted for review. She explained that this information could have been gleaned from the requested on-site meeting. Mr. Cluver stated that there are replacement materials that have the properties of brownstone that would be appropriate for the repair. Ms. Gutterman stated that this application lacks information regarding the details of the brownstone removal, the installation details, information on the replacement material, and the contractor's skill and experience in use of the material. Mr. Amburn agreed with Ms. Pentz and reinforced that an on-site meeting is important. He stated that information provided with the application is insufficient for an approval. Mr. Cluver stated that, although the information is lacking, the Committee is in favor of a restoration.

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

3400-50 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: Trustees, University of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Richard Russell

History: 1899-1900, Cope & Stewardson, architect

Project: Construct bridge connecting new building to Silverman Hall

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a bridge between Silverman Hall and a new building along Sansom Street at the Law School at the University of Pennsylvania. The new construction does not fall under the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission, but the bridge, which connects to the historic building, does. Both buildings will house Law School faculty offices. The bridge will provide a direct physical link between the two buildings. It is intended to foster an academic community between the Law School's staff and students, who would otherwise reside in two separate buildings. The proposed bridge will span over a service and delivery driveway and penetrate Silverman Hall through a second-floor window on the west façade of the building. The bridge will be located at the bay that is the furthest from Sansom Street. The existing conditions at Silverman as well as the requirements of the delivery driveway force the bridge to be located at the second floor and do not permit it to align with the floor height at Silverman, thus it is slightly higher than the interior floor height. The bridge would not disturb the limestone cornice that delineates the ground-floor from the second-floor at Silverman Hall.

The applicant proposes two alternatives for the connection of the bridge to the limestone jambs of the window. In both alternatives, the design of the bridge itself is the same. It would be of a contemporary design clad in glass and standing seam metal panels. In both alternatives the bridge will connect above the sill of the window. The sill would be maintained in both options. Alternative One proposes to insert the bridge within the limestone jambs of the window. This option preserves the most amount of historic fabric in situ. The segmental arch that terminates the window and the roundel that sits above it would be removed. The arch would be removed at the spring point. Both of these elements would be salvaged and reinstalled in the antechamber that leads to the bridge inside Silverman. The space between the bottom of the bridge and the sill would be infilled with metal panels divided by a vertical limestone element. Alternative Two proposes to insert the bridge at the brick edge of the window, thus removing the limestone jamb in its entirety from the sill up. The lower portion would be infilled with metal panels. The applicant proposes to display the arch and roundel in the interior of Silverman in this option as well.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Frano Violich and university architect David Hollenberg represented the application.

Mr. Violich explained the challenges associated with this project. He focused his explanations on two key points that affect the design of the bridge. He noted the difference in floor heights between the two buildings linked by the new bridge. He also noted the need to maintain a specific height clearance along the driveway to allow delivery trucks to drive underneath the bridge. He then explained his design approach and the two proposed options that evolved. He

noted that Option A is his preferred option, which is also supported by the University. He stated that his goal is to maintain the rhythm and proportions established by Cope & Stewardson while, at the same time, minimizing the impact of the bridge on historic fabric.

Mr. Cluver inquired whether it was possible to move the bridge further north, allowing it to avoid the three windows on the end pavilion altogether. Mr. Violich answered that such an approach had been considered early in the design process, but then abandoned after further studies. He explained that, if the bridge were placed at that location, then it would block the windows that illuminate the landing of the grand staircase inside Silverman Hall. He opined that such an approach would create a far greater adverse effect than either of the two proposed alternatives. Mr. Hollenberg concurred and stated that the University would not support altering the grand stair hall. Mr. Cluver inquired whether the proposed alternatives would disturb elaborate window trims or other interior decorative details. Mr. Cluver acknowledged that the Commission does not have jurisdiction over interior changes, but asked the question out of personal curiosity. Mr. Violich answered that the interior was rather plain and that the windows did not have elaborate interior jambs, but only smooth plaster that appeared original.

Ms. Pentz stated that she was in favor of either option, but voiced her reservations to the design of the bridge. She referred to the bridge as an “airport people mover.” Mr. Violich explained that they had strived for neutrality and noted that the proposed materials relate to the adjacent new construction.

Mr. Evans questioned the extension of the jamb in Option A, which creates an awkward condition. He inquired as to the reason for such an approach rather than something more in line with the contemporary materials and design of the bridge. Mr. Violich answered that again they wanted the bridge to be simply framed and neutral. He opined that connecting the bridge to the historic building with any sort of added frame seemed a disruptive of the rhythm and proportions of the facade. Mr. Violich further stated that changing materials at that point would create a cluttered appearance. Mr. Evans opined it would be more honest if another material could be used that would clearly separate the historic limestone jamb from the extension. Mr. Violich stated that changing materials three times along such a small vertical element may be too visually disruptive. Mr. Hollenberg noted that Mr. Evans voiced a good point. Mr. Violich agreed to consider it.

Mr. Cluver stated that he preferred Option B. He also stated his preference for the proposal to remove the entire window ensemble as an intact artifact while providing the users of the bridge more space. Mr. Hollenberg disagreed and stated that Option B would disrupt the rhythm of the façade. Mr. Violich noted that it would be best to disturb the least amount of historic fabric not only because it is proper preservation practice, but also because it diminishes the need to tooth-in any bricks. The rest of the Committee members agreed with Mr. Violich and rejected Mr. Cluver’s opinion.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Option A, with the staff to review details.

3600-90 WALNUT STREET

Owner: Trustees, University of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Richard Russell

History: 1913, Walter Mellor & Arthur Meigs, architects

Project: Infill fire stair

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter an existing fire stair. The fire stair is located at the rear of a fraternity house along Locust Walk. The existing stair is wood and does not comply with current fire safety codes. The applicant proposes to replace the existing wood fire stair with a new stair constructed of concrete and metal. The access doors at every floor would have to be widened to meet code. The open-air landings of the fire stair at each floor would be enclosed with brick to match the rest of the building. The brick would be inset from the edge of the original masonry by three and a half inches.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz excused herself from the review of this project owing to Keast and Hood's involvement as consultants on this project.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. University architect David Hollenberg and architect Troy Hill represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she was concerned about matching the brick color and coursing of the historic building. Mr. Evans opined that such a concern would be eliminated if the openings were infilled with windows instead of masonry. Mr. Hollenberg stated that it was not their intent to match the brick exactly and that they wanted the viewer to notice that the infilled arched openings had once been open. Mr. Hill noted that windows would be a possibility, but that he and the client had deemed brick a more appropriate material.

Mr. Cluver inquired whether the stair location could be changed. Mr. Hill noted that the proposal is to rebuild the stairs in their existing location and not to alter the floor plan. Mr. Cluver inquired why the openings need to be blocked if the stairs are being rebuilt in the same location. Mr. Hill noted that the access doors are not code compliant and must be removed thus opening the space to the exterior. Therefore, the openings must be infilled.

Mr. Amburn opined glass would be a better material choice because it would allow for natural light to illuminate the stairs and give the sense of the original open space. He added that a railing could be installed in the interior, but it should be simple and minimal to retain the sense of openness. Mr. Hill accepted the suggestion.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of infilling the openings with glass, with the staff to review details.

221 PINE STREET

Owner: Beta Software and Technologies

Applicant: Stuart Lim

History: Built between 1813 and 1824, contributing to the SHHD

Project: Demolish rear ell, rear roof, and rear dormer and construct new ell and roof deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the historic rear ell and construct a wider two-story stucco addition. The historic rear ell is shown on the earliest detailed property atlas for the city, 1860. The property atlases also show that sometime between 1910 and 1922 the rear ell was extended. The application claims that the rear ell is deteriorated and must be demolished, but no conclusive evidence has been presented. Likewise, no financial hardship or public interest claim is made to justify the demolition in significant part. This application also proposes to demolish the rear dormer and roof for a roof deck.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(j) of the Philadelphia Code and Standards 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner William Michael Harlan and Stuart Lim represented the application.

Mr. Lim stated that he wanted to restore the property, which is vacant, and at the same add value for the tenants that will rent the apartments. He described the deteriorating conditions of the rear ell resulting from termites and water infiltration. He noted the narrowness of the rear ell, which is only 11 feet wide. He said that they are seeking to “tear down” the rear ell and construct a wider rear addition. He said that the rear ell does not provide the level of amenities that they would like to provide to their tenants. He explained that they would like to follow the Commission’s guidelines, but they also want to add value to the property. Mr. Harlan echoed Mr. Lim’s statements. Mr. Lim said that their plans were based on the neighboring property. The rear ell would be the same height and length. Mr. Cluver asked about the interior width of the current ell. The applicants estimated that it is 7’-4” to 7’-8” wide inside. Mr. Cluver noted that the windows proposed for the new rear ell on the property line would not be allowed by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. If the walls of the historic ell were retained, the windows may be able to be retained. The applicants stated that they were unaware of the windows regulations, but they would seek to comply. Ms. Pentz asked about the termite and water damage. The applicants stated that the structure of the rear ell is so deteriorated that it cannot be reused. Ms. Pentz suggested replacing the wood framing, but retaining the masonry walls. Mr. Lim stated that they could replace the framing, but they were hoping to demolish instead because they would like to create more rentable space. Mr. Lim reported that it would cost the same to rehabilitate the rear ell or construct a new larger one.

Mr. Amburn noted that the rear of the building is highly visible from the public right-of-way. He observed that the Commission seeks to protect historic fabric, especially when it is visible from the public right-of-way. He explained that the Commission typically seeks to replace in kind when deterioration prevents reuse. He suggested that the rear ell might be able to be rebuilt on its current footprint. He also noted that the Commission typically rejects roof decks when their installation requires cutting into the historic roof fabric or removing dormers. Mr. Lim stated that he would consider an alternative to the deck like skylights. Ms. Gutterman replied that cutting into an original roof such as this does not comply with the Standards. Mr. Lim stated that the rear roof alterations “are not a priority.” Mr. Cluver made suggestions to redesign the interior plan that would allow the extant ell to be reused. He observed that the plan to create a hallway

in the ell unnecessarily wastes space. He said that the historic ell could be reused and the side windows retained. The new rear addition could not have windows on the side. Mr. Lim now asserted that the interior clearance in the ell was less than 7 feet. Ms. Pentz asserted that, if the rear walls are reusable, then they should be retained.

Mr. Farnham stated that the staff considers the proposed work to be more than an alteration; it considers the proposed work to include demolition in the legal sense. He explained to the applicants that, according to the City's historic preservation ordinance, the Commission cannot approve a proposal that includes demolition without first finding that the property cannot be feasibly adaptively reused or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. He stated that, on its face, there appears to be no public interest argument in this case. Therefore, before the Commission could approve this demolition, the applicant must prove that the property cannot be feasibly adaptively reused or, in other words, that it is financially infeasible to reuse the property without the demolition. Mr. Farnham stated that he is unaware of the financial situation of this property, but he believes that it could be reused profitably without demolishing the rear ell. He stated that the staff would provide the applicants with the requisite information about submitting a financial hardship application if they chose to pursue the hardship route, but he informed the applicants that the Committee could not recommend approval of their project if they deemed the proposed work to include demolition in the legal sense. He asked the Committee to state on the record whether they considered the proposal to include demolition. He also asked the applicants to clarify whether the Department of Licenses & Inspections had inspected the property and determined it to be either Unsafe or Imminently Dangerous.

Mr. Amburn contended that the application proposed demolition in the legal sense. The other Committee members agreed. Ms. Gutterman noted that the applicants had not provided a report from a structural engineer stating that the only solution to the ell's deterioration was demolition. The applicants stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections had not declared the rear ell Unsafe or Imminently Dangerous.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(j) of the Philadelphia Code and Standards 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10.

1523 PINE STREET

Owner: Kenneth Karlin

Applicant: Victor Brubaker

History: c. 1865, contributing to RFRHD

Project: Add elevator shaft and roof deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing an elevator shaft addition at the rear of the building as well as a roof deck with bulkhead. None will be visible from the public right-of-way.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Victor Brubaker, the contractor, represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman claimed that the deck might be visible from 16th Street. She suggested that the applicant construct a mock-up for review. Mr. Evans stated that he is concerned that the

elevator shaft may be visible from the street. Mr. Brubaker explained that the narrow walkway at the rear is gated. Mr. Evans asked the applicant if he had prepared a study to determine if the elevator could be placed in the interior. Mr. Brubaker answered, explaining that his client opted for the exterior elevator to preserve the historic interior. Mr. Evans asked if he was planning to reuse and enlarge the existing window openings for the elevator doors. Mr. Brubaker stated that he was. Mr. Evans then questioned the lack of structural details included with the application. He asserted that the design had not been sufficiently studied. Mr. Amburn found the lack of details problematic and suggested that the applicant supply plans for each floor as well as a better section drawing. Mr. Evans said that his concerns related primarily to structural integrity, not visibility. Ms. Pentz disagreed with her colleagues on the Committee and suggested that the Committee should limit its review to the historic preservation issues and not concern itself with the structural details. She stated that the Department of Licenses and Inspections would review the structural details and withhold a permit if the appropriate details were not provided. Mr. Evans suggested that the water would not drain from the new roof well. Mr. Brubaker disagreed. Ms. Pentz again suggested that her colleagues limit their review to the preservation issues. Mr. Amburn stated that the wall of the shaft near the party wall probably needs to be fire rated. Mr. Brubaker stated that it would be fire rated.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:50 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 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 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.

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.

Storefront Guideline: Design for the Replacement of Missing Historic Features, Recommended: Designing and constructing a new storefront [is recommended] when the historic storefront is completely missing. It may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.