

**THE MINUTES OF THE 605TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 11 JANUARY 2013
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Anuj Gupta, Esq.
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Gary Jastrzab, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
JoAnn Jones, Esq., Office of Housing & Community Development
Rosalie Leonard, Esq., Office of City Council President
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Joseph Palantino, Department of Public Property
Dan Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Robert Thomas, AIA
Betty Turner

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

ALSO PRESENT

Elizabeth Coppola
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Co.
Sandy Brown, United Sign
Rick Sconyers, Hard Rock Café
Dan DeSalvo, T.N.W. Company
Sam Stretton, Esq.
Amy Rosenberg, Inquirer
John Gallery
Deidre DeAscenis, JKR Partners
Sarah McEneaney, Callowhill Neighborhood Association
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Phillip Scott, KSK Architects Planners Historians
Johnette Davies, KSK Architects Planners Historians
Todd Curry, Emerald Windows
Peter Crimmins, RPC
Mike Black-Smith
Thaddeus Squire, CWGP
Paul Boni, Esq.
Mathew Grubel
Michael Murray, Murray Development
Sarit Kadakia, Grossman Furniture
Adam Montalbono, Moto Design
Joseph Serratore, Joe Serratore & Company Architects

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:44 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, Gupta, Hawkins, Jastrzab, Jones, Leonard, Merriman, Palantino, Quinn, Thomas, and Turner joined him. Gary Jastrzab, the executive director of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission, served as the designee of the chair of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission in place of David Schaaf.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Sherman announced that the Historical Commission had met in executive session to address the Board of License & Inspection Review's request to the Commission of 8 January 2013 to provide its opinion regarding Appeal #19463, 1123-33 Spring Garden Street, which is currently before the Board. Mr. Sherman stated that the Commission unanimously agreed that, inasmuch as the financial data relevant to the Commission's consideration of the demolition application for the church building at 1123-33 Spring Garden Street under §14-2007(7)(j) pertained to the property and not the applicant, the approval of the demolition would remain in effect for a purchaser of the property.

MINUTES OF THE 604TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 604th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 14 December 2012. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 18 DECEMBER 2012

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included two applications, 1516 and 1518 Spruce Street and 1616-26 Walnut Street. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments.

ACTION: Ms. Jones moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 1516 and 1518 Spruce Street and 1616-26 Walnut Street. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 4231 AVENUE OF THE REPUBLIC, MEMORIAL HALL

Project: Apply waterproofing system to dome

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Phillip E. Scott, KSK Architects Planners Historians

History: 1876; Memorial Hall, Herman J. Schwarzmann, architect

Individual Designation: 7/6/1978

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in-concept, provided that an in-field inspection of a sample of the material demonstrates its appropriateness before any final approval is granted.

OVERVIEW: This application in-concept proposes to install a non-reversible coating on the outer dome of Memorial Hall in Fairmount Park. The outer dome has been experiencing water infiltration for years. The inner dome was temporarily wrapped during the rehabilitation of the building for Please Touch Museum in 2004. That intervention was a temporary solution, which protected the interior plaster finishes from further water-related damage. The current proposal is a long-term solution. The proposed material would be applied to the exterior of the outer dome. The material, known in the trade as Decothane, is a translucent mesh-reinforced epoxy. It can be tinted to match any substrate. The application includes manufacturer's specifications for the product. However, the application does not include samples of the material. The applicant should provide samples to allow for an assessment of its impact on the appearance of the building.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architects Phillip Scott and Johnette Davies represented the application.

Mr. Scott stated that the project has a tight schedule with a completion date of winter 2013. He understands that the field mock up is a necessary step but he hopes that once that mock up is reviewed and if it proves satisfactory the project could be approved to meet its projected schedule. Mr. Scott passed a sample of the product applied to a sheet of glass. He explained that the framing members of the dome would be covered with a mat impregnated with the epoxy and the glass areas would be covered with the clear epoxy. The areas over the structural members would be tinted to match the patina of the metal.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee understood the technical challenges of the application. She added that the sample shows the finished product as the Committee understood it to be. She reiterated her support for a conceptual approval.

Mr. Thomas asked if the repair would reduce the glass area of the dome. Mr. Scott answered that the glass would only be covered by a clear epoxy, and that the metal members that make up the dome would be the only elements that would be covered by the tinted epoxy. Ms. Hawkins noted that the dome is visible from the ground at a considerable distance, and that the nuances of the material would not be all that clearly visible to the pedestrian from the ground. She reiterated that a field mock up would give a better sense of the material and its impact on the dome.

Ms. Merriman asked to what extent would the dome be covered. Ms. Scott answered that the dome would be covered in its entirety, and that the epoxy would extend from the base of the Columbia statue at the top of the dome to the gutter system at the base of the dome's drum. Ms.

Merriman asked about the life of the product. Mr. Scott answered that the manufacturer provided a twenty-year life for the first application, which can then be recoated with a new primer that would extend the life. The total life span is not known. He reminded the Commissioners that the removal of the epoxy at a later date would not be a possibility. Ms. Merriman expressed concern with the application of a non-reversible product that has a finite life expectancy without knowing how many years it would perform. Ms. Hawkins noted that the alternative would be the reconstruction of the dome, which would include significant removal of original fabric. She stated that the current proposal extends the life of the original fabric, while a reconstruction of the dome can take place at any time in the future.

Mr. Farnham requested comments from the representatives of Philadelphia Parks & Recreation, who were in the audience. Theresa Stuhlman addressed the Commission. She stated that Parks & Recreation generally supports the project. She expressed, however, certain hesitation regarding the recoating campaigns and the effect those added layers would have on the translucency of the glass dome. She noted that the review of a mock up in the field is very important.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application in-concept, provided that an in-field inspection of a sample of the material demonstrates its appropriateness before any final approval is granted. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1516 AND 1518 SPRUCE ST

Project: Restore exterior

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: R & S Realty II L.P.

Applicant: Adam Jeckel, Agoos Lovera Architects

History: 1865

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the EFIS system on the east wall of 1516 Spruce is held back a minimum of ten feet from the front façade, the mechanical units are set back as far as possible from the front façade, and the emergency light electrical box is removed and the wall properly patched, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes restoration and alterations to a pair of brownstones in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. The ground floors of both brownstones were modified in the early twentieth century; 1516 Spruce in 1922, and 1518 about 1940. The upper stories of both houses retain their mid nineteenth-century facades. The application proposes to restore the ground floor of 1516 to its 1922 configuration; while 1518 would retain its 1940s alteration. The masonry on both facades would be patched and restored. Front façade windows would be replaced with true-divided-light wood windows in the original mid nineteenth-century light patterns. The front door for 1518 would be replaced with a single-light door.

The proposed alterations would mostly take place at the rear of the properties. The rears of the properties face a small street that has the character of a service alley. Additions are proposed for both rear ells. The rear ell of 1516 would be extended with an addition that would respect the half gable and remain below the cornice level, thus retaining this important historic massing.

The rear ell at 1518 was altered in the 1940s. It does not retain its original configuration. The ell would be altered with a small addition at the third floor. This addition would square off the rear façade of the ell. The side yard would be redesigned with plantings, an ADA ramp, and paving. All windows in the rear and side facades would be replaced with metal windows that would restore the original light configurations from the mid nineteenth century. Balconies would be installed where fire escapes are currently present.

Lastly, the eastern and western elevations of the houses, which were historically party walls, would be parged. The western elevation of 1518, facing the Tourrain Apartments, is currently stuccoed. The wall would be restuccoed in areas where that parging has failed. The eastern wall of 1516, facing the Drake, would be covered by an EFIS system. The proposed system would be installed up to the edge of the façade on Spruce Street. The staff suggests that an EFIS system should be kept back a minimum of 10 feet from the edge of the front façade so as not to disturb the return of the elaborate wood cornice.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 1113 MARKET ST

Project: Replace doors and signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Headhouse Retail Associates, L.P.

Applicant: Daniel DeSalvo, T.N. Ward Company

History: 1893; Reading Terminal Headhouse and Market; Wilson Brothers and Francis Kimball, architects

Individual Designation: 2/5/1981

District Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install signage and alter doors and storefront systems at the Hard Rock Café in the Reading Terminal Headhouse building, located at the northeast corner of 12th and Market Streets.

A 36-inch by 34-foot LED sign is proposed to wrap the corner entrance under the large guitar-shaped sign, replacing the existing channel letter signage.

In January 2012, the Commission's staff approved alterations to the corner entrance and the installation of a door in a non-historic storefront system in the bay to the east of the corner along Market Street. The details of the replacement corner entrance and new doorway were specified to match the details of the existing storefront systems along Market Street. That work was partially executed, but not entirely in compliance with the approval. This application proposes to amend the staff approval and install frameless glass doorway systems at the corner and in the storefront system in the bay to the east of the corner. The new doors would not match the existing storefront systems.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented to application to the Commission. Rick Sconyers of the Hard Rock Café chain, contractor Dan DeSalvo, and sign manufacturer Sandy Brown represented the application.

Ms. Sell clarified that the applicant is not proposing a seamless glass storefront system as shown in the rendering. She explained that only the signage portion of the proposal is under consideration.

Mr. Sconyers introduced a revised signage application that reduces the message center to smaller panels located between Hard Rock logos and open-face, neon, channel-letter signage to read "Hard Rock Café." He explained that the staff approved LED backlit acrylic signage in January 2012 that included a message board on the marquee. He explained that they proposed a digital signage to wrap the entire marquee in October 2012. He stated that the Architectural Committee unanimously recommended denial of the application. In response to the Committee's concerns and comments during the meeting, they revised their design. He described the revised design and added that there are two proposals for the message center; a backlit, acrylic, Duratran message board, previously approved in January 2012 and a digital message center to display only static images. He stated that the digital message center is a higher quality product than the Duratran message board, which might sag and would be susceptible to water infiltration over time.

Mr. Brown distributed copies of the revised application to the Commission members. He described each page of the revised submission. He explained the Hard Rock Café wishes to re-clad the marquee in stainless steel. He displayed a photograph of an existing historic channel-letter neon sign on the Reading Terminal Market building that reads "Reading Terminal Market." He referred to the drawings that were approved in January 2012 and highlighted the note "new polished aluminum trim and face with LED backlit acrylic signage." He explained that LEDs can be used as a lighting source, but also individual pixels of a message center. He showed a photograph of LED message boards by the vendor Watchfire. He pointed out the type of signage they have proposed in the vendors specifications. He stated that they responded to the Architectural Committee's and public's comments and incorporated neon channel letters into the revised submission. He explained that the only other change to the marquee would be the addition of the message centers. He described the two options, the Duratran and LED digital displays. He explained that the digital display would be computer-controlled, it would have a better appearance, and it would be more convenient for the restaurant. He described the subsequent pages of the submission, which provided further detail and additional elevations of the proposed signage. He concluded that their revised design responds to what they learned at the Architectural Committee meeting and added that they believe this proposal is a more appropriate retrofit of the existing marquee.

Mr. Sherman asked Ms. Hawkins if she would recommend that the revised proposal be referred back to the Architectural Committee for review. Ms. Hawkins opined that the revised submission is more of a compromise than the design that was initially presented to the Architectural Committee. She acknowledged that the applicant did respond to some concerns raised at the Committee meeting. She stated that, personally, she is not comfortable with the compromise, but that other Committee and Commission members may have different opinions. She thanked the applicant for a degree of responsiveness.

Mr. Gupta asked how often the signs might change. Mr. Brown stated that they have not decided on the change frequency and are open for that discussion. Mr. Sconyers explained that if they were a backlit plastic Duratran signs, they would change on a weekly basis to advertise upcoming shows. Ms. Hawkins noted that the Commission has no jurisdiction over the content on the sign. She stated that the Committee members agreed that a digital proposal at this location would be problematic. She acknowledged that the applicant has greatly reduced the size of the sign and therefore has been responsive to the comments. She pointed out that the

business owner would have complete control over the content and frequency of change of a digital sign. She added that the iconic nature of the historic building, particularly its relationship to the PSFS Building across the street, the Committee agreed that a digital sign is not an appropriate alternative. Mr. Gupta recalled a previous Commission review of digital signage for the Lit Brothers Building and the claim made at that time that a sign that changes at a high frequency detracts from historic character of the building. Mr. Sherman noted that the difference between the Lit Brothers proposal and this application is that this proposal is meant to tag the building and advertise upcoming events rather than general advertisement that does not relate to the Hard Rock Cafe. Mr. Sconyers agreed that co-branding is against his company's policy. Ms. Hawkins argued that, once the sign is installed, the sign can be used in the future in different ways than currently anticipated. Mr. Dilworth contended that the size of the proposed sign would be less obtrusive than a flashing police light.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the revised application should be referred back to the Architectural Committee. She also asked if the signage proposed in the revised application is appropriate for the historic building. She explained that she believes that it should be referred back to the Committee and it is not appropriate. Mr. Dilworth asked Ms. Hawkins if her opinion would change if the signage would only display static messages. Ms. Hawkins argued that, if a year from now Hard Rock vacates the building and only removes the guitar and branding, there would be no way to control the future use or content of the digital message board. Mr. Sconyers argued that a backlit Duratran can also be switched out frequently as well. He added that the Zoning Board may limit the content. Mr. Sherman stated that the Art Commission must also review and approve this application. He asked if it is more inclined to place restrictions on the content than the Commission. Mr. Farnham added that, while he agrees with Ms. Hawkins that it is difficult to regulate the use of a digital sign, a new business could not simply use it in any way it chose. For example, a new business could not use an accessory sign as a non-accessory sign without a new review and approval.

Mr. Sconyers explained that they are seeking final approval because they spent a great deal of money on renovations and want to announce to the public that the Hard Rock Café is different, new, and polished. He stated that their original proposal approved in January 2012 included the Duratran backlit sign and they would like to pursue that design. He explained that they believed the digital LED static image would be a higher-quality image than the Duratran. He continued that if there is sensitivity to the LED proposal, they could revert back to the backlit Duratran. Ms. Sell interjected to clarify that the Duratran proposal was not included in the original approval from January 2012. She read the note on the approved plans and explained that what was approved was a metal-faced sign with LED backlit acrylic signage. She continued that what is shown in the new proposal is a cabinet that was not part of the original approvals. Mr. DeSalvo referred to a small rendering in the approved drawings that illustrates a colored square and argued that the illustration was the message center proposal. He acknowledged there may have been an oversight or a misunderstanding on the content. Ms. Sell explained that the Commission's staff reviews plans and measured drawings. She argued that it is impossible to decipher what the rendering was showing as it was not called out on the drawing that was approved.

Mr. Sherman suggested the applicant submit this revision for the Architectural Committee meeting on 22 January 2013. Mr. Sconyers explained that they would prefer to move forward with the original approval. Ms. Hawkins agreed that they may move forward with staff's approval. However, the applicant must confer with the staff and adhere to the staff's understanding of that approval.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1616-26 WALNUT ST

Project: Install signage and awnings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1616 Walnut, L.P.

Applicant: Jonathan Broh, JKR Partners LLC

History: 1929; 1616 Walnut Street Building; Tilden, Register & Pepper, architects

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the letters are no larger than 12 inches on the top bar and eight inches on the bottom bar and that there is a minimum of a three-inch reveal of glazing around the top and sides of the lettering and logo, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install awnings and signage on the façade of this Art Deco building.

The building has two original storefronts, which flank the main entrance. The building was an office building, but is being converted to residential use. However, the two ground-floor spaces will be continue their commercial uses. The storefronts each have a doorway directly to the sidewalk and a large, ornate Art Deco window. The storefront windows are comprised of transoms over large plate glass windows. They have decorative metal frames and transom bars. The storefront window at the east appears to be entirely original. Its twin to the west has been slightly altered but retains most of its original features.

Illuminated channel-letter signage is proposed for both storefronts. The signage at each storefront would be attached to a metal structure that would span the window opening and attach within the opening to the jambs. The structure would be located above the transom bar in the transom area. The signage attached to the structure would be metal lettering with internally illuminated faces. The proposed signs are currently generic, but would be customized based on the tenants' branding. The Historical Commission approved similar signage for the storefront windows in January 2012, but it was not installed. Awnings are proposed over each entryway to the retail space. The awnings would be fabric with closed sides and would be installed within the opening below the decorative masonry detail. Brass plaques are also proposed for the building façade between the entrances and storefront windows.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 3431 W PENN ST

Project: Install aluminum-clad windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Debra and Edward Homentowski

Applicant: Todd Curry, Emerald Windows, Inc

History: 1930

Individual Designation: None

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

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove deteriorated original steel windows from the front façade of the house and replace them with aluminum-clad windows. The new windows are a reasonable match for most of the dimensions of the historic windows except the central vertical mullion. The existing French casement windows have a central vertical dimension that is three and one-quarter inches wide. The new vertical element with the added post will be five inches wide. The staff has been working with another homeowner on options that may better match the historic dimensions and is awaiting additional information. Although new steel windows could be fabricated to match the historic dimensions exactly, they would likely be quite expensive and therefore infeasible. Other options include restoring the original sash and retrofitting them with a second layer of glass for added efficiency as well as other manufacturers' aluminum or clad units that may have thinner vertical mullions. The staff will present additional information at the Architectural Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Window salesman Todd Curry represented the application.

Mr. Curry explained that the Commission approved the window proposed in this application for a similar, nearby house. He noted that, in that instance, the original steel window had been removed and replaced with a vinyl window before the historic district was designated. In this instance, the original steel window survives and would be removed if this application is approved. Mr. Curry stated that he is seeking clarification regarding acceptable replacement windows for this block. He suggested that the Commission should be consistent. Mr. Curry explained that there are some minor dimensional differences between the original and proposed windows, but he asserted that the proposed window is compatible with the Tudor Revival style homes.

Ms. Hawkins stated that it is technically challenging to replace the original steel windows, which has slim profiles, with an energy efficient window that replicates the appearance of the original window. She stated that operability adds to the challenge. She explained that it is difficult to make a window that looks like the old, trim steel window, yet is energy efficient and fully operable. She stated that the proposed window is "one of the trimmer options that is out there, maybe the trimmest." She stated that the question posed by this application is similar to the terracotta roof question posed by Girard Estate. The historic windows are at the ends of their lives and need replacement. Is there an acceptable replacement that replicates the appearance, provides the desired functionality, and is reasonably priced?

Mr. Curry stated that there are a few options. The original steel windows can be refurbished, but they will not be as efficient as a new window. Also, the old windows can be replaced by commercial-grade aluminum windows, which provide slightly better dimensions. He noted,

however, that commercial aluminum windows cost three times as much as residential-grade windows and are not as energy efficient.

Mr. Sherman asked if the Commission approved this window for the house across the street because the original window had already been removed. Mr. Dilworth asked why the fact that the existing window was not the original window had any bearing on the review. Mr. Farnham responded that the staff was authorized to and did approve the replacement of the window at the neighboring house at the staff level because the proposal did not include the removal of any historic fabric. In this instance, the application proposes removing an historic window and replacing it with a new window. He stated that there are two questions before the Commission. First, does the removal of the historic window comply with the review standards? And second, does the installation of the proposed window comply with the review standards? He stated that, given that the staff approved the proposed window for a very similar building, one can safely assume that the answer to the second question is yes, the proposed window does comply with the review standards. Therefore, the real question before the Commission is whether the historic window can be reasonably retrofit. He asked the Commission to consider whether the historic window can be feasibly retained and retrofit to be more efficient.

Mr. Sherman stated that he knows the neighborhood well. He asserted that the Commission should not establish two standards for the district and require one replacement window for those who have already removed their historic windows and require a second replacement window for those who retain their original windows. He contended that the replacement either is or is not good enough for all of the houses in the district, regardless of whether they retain their original windows. He stated that the Commission should decide during this review whether it will allow owners to remove and replace the steel windows or will require them to retain and retrofit them. He stated that the Commission should not “rethink” this question every time it receives a window application for East Falls. It should establish a standard and then apply it consistently in the district.

Mr. Baron paraphrased Standard 6 of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, which instructs that original windows should be repaired rather than replaced when possible. When retention is not possible, then the replacement should match the original as closely as possible. Mr. Baron stated that he is aware of some owners in the district who have repaired their steel windows, rather than replacing them. He contended that the steel windows are character-defining features in the district and should be preserved. Ms. Merriman countered that steel windows cannot ever be retrofit to be as efficient as new windows. She stated that, given the current environmental situation, the trade-off of the loss of historic fabric for a window that replicates the historic appearance and has high efficiency is a worthwhile one. She asserted that the match is close enough, even if the profiles are slightly wider. Ms. Hawkins explained that interior storm windows can be installed to achieve higher energy efficiency without adversely impacting the exterior appearance. She stated that she has lived with steel windows for almost 20 years and knows all of their faults. Ms. Jones asked if the property owner attended the Architectural Committee meeting. Mr. Baron stated that the owner did not attend. Ms. Jones commented that the owner may be unaware of the retrofit options. Mr. Curry responded that he also sells interior storm windows and discussed other options with the owner. He stated that it is his understanding that the owner did not want an interior storm window because it is inconvenient. He added that storms do boost efficiency, but an original steel window with a storm window will never be as efficient as a typical replacement window. He stated that he offered storms as an option to his client. Mr. Curry noted that his company does not repair windows and therefore he is unable to comment on the cost to repair or the efficiency of a repaired window.

Mr. Thomas stated that, if the Commission approves a replacement window, it should set a standard for the district. He asserted that the Commission must be consistent. He noted that window standards have been set for specific areas and window types in the past. Mr. Sherman contended that the Commission should not penalize owners who have original windows and reward those who do not. It should be consistent for all owners. Mr. Sherman stated that the Commission must create predictability and avoid confusion for the homeowners. Mr. Dilworth stated that the Commission should establish the proposed window as a standard for the Tudor East Falls Historic District.

ACTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details, and to adopt this window as a standard replacement window for the steel casement windows of this type in the Tudor East Falls Historic District. Mr. Quinn seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 74 N 02ND ST

Project: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: PSNU Dhangela Properties

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto Designshop Inc.

History: 1920

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the banner spanning the parking lot, but approval of all other aspects of the application, provided the horizontal sign bands are no more than 24 inches tall, the stucco is painted a light-grey color, and the rooftop billboard is removed, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a design that has been revised since it was reviewed by the Architectural Committee last month. The application proposes adding signage to this corner property. A furniture store occupies several connected structures on the property. The project seeks to visually link the various structures with signage. Six banners lit by wall sconces would be added to the building. A metal channel with metal letters and indirect lighting would be installed across the facades of the building. The transoms above the windows would be restored with clear glass. A banner, painted signs, and a metal sign would be added at the side and rear. Large signs would span the parking areas on Arch Street and Little Boy's Way. Since the Committee reviewed this application at its November meeting, the proposal has been revised. On the corner building, the horizontal sign would be thinned down at the vertical piers to avoid disrupting those vertical elements. In addition, the application now proposes to remove the billboard on top of the building. The staff still has concerns about painting the stuccoed party walls a dark grey color. However, if they must be painted, then a cream or beige to match the underlying stucco material would be preferable.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Adam Montalbano and store manager Sarit Kadakia represented the application.

Mr. Montalbano distributed a revised proposal that accounted for the Committee's recommendations. Mr. Baron explained the changes. The Commissioners reviewed it and

concluded that the revised proposal was consistent with the Committee's comments. Ms. Hawkins congratulated the applicants for proposing to remove the billboard.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 11 January 2013. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2201 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Replace metal cornice in fiberglass

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Coronado Condominium Association

Applicant: Eric Larsen, Larsen & Landis

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

Individual Designation: None

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

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposed replacement in fiberglass, but approval of the replacement of the cornice in pressed metal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a deteriorated pressed metal cornice and replace it with an identical cornice in fiberglass. The staff met with the engineer to discuss the possibility of restoring the existing cornice or, failing that, to replace the cornice in its original material. The engineer is investigating both options and will discuss them with the Committee.

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

Ms. Hawkins stated that the metal components of the replacement metal cornice are a "kit of parts." It is therefore important to review the details very carefully to ensure that the pieces align and turn corners correctly. She stated that the applicant was unable to guarantee at the Committee meeting that all of the necessary pieces for the cornice would be available. Mr. Baron said he spoke to the fabricator who thought that he could source the egg and dart molding to match the existing. He ensured the Commission that he would review the details for an accurate match. He stated that, if the cornice cannot be accurately replicated in metal, they will again consider replicating it in fiberglass. Ms. Hawkins stated that one of the concerns of the fiberglass is the necessity of seams, which will be visible. She stated that the cornice can be duplicated exactly in fiberglass, but it will have seams. The metal replacement will be seamless, but it may be impossible to replicate some of the details exactly.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the proposed replacement in fiberglass, but approve the replacement of the cornice in pressed metal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 516 CYPRESS ST

Project: Construct rowhouse

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: 513 Delancey Street LLC

Applicant: Joseph Serratore, Jos. Serratore & Co. Architects

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Non-contributing, 3/10/1999

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that Scheme Two would be more compatible with the district. The windows should be wood or aluminum clad with exterior muntins. The window guards and garage transom should be eliminated from the design.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story, single-family dwelling on a vacant lot in the Society Hill Historic District. The lot is “undeveloped” and the Commission’s jurisdiction is Review-and-Comment only. The 500-block of Cypress is a narrow street lined with a mix of rowhouses and garages.

Two schemes are proposed for the front façade. Both schemes propose four-inch veneer brick cladding. Both include solid-wood entrance and garage doors with transoms at the first floor. They propose double-hung windows, decorative window guards, and composite trim and moldings. Scheme One is preferred by the property owner. Scheme One includes a second-floor projecting bay and a third-floor terrace on the bay. Scheme Two offers a flat façade with traditional row house fenestration pattern at the second and third floors. Two decks are proposed. One would be located on the two-story rear portion of the building. It would have an open spiral stair to access a roof deck on the main block. The roof deck would be set back 10 feet from the front façade and have metal railings.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Commission. Architect Joe Serratore and developer Michael Murray represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins thanked the applicant for implementing the Architectural Committee’s suggestions to remove the window grills and garage-door transom. She recommended that Scheme 2 is more appropriate. Mr. Thomas concurred with the Architectural Committee, stating the Scheme 2 would be more appropriate for the street and the historic district.

COMMENT: Mr. Thomas moved that the Historical Commission comment that the revised Scheme 2 as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 11 January 2013 is compatible with the Society Hill Historic District. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

COMMENT ON NOMINATIONS TO THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

2917 N. BROAD STREET, JOE FRAZIER GYM

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the nomination to the National Register of Historic Places for the property located at 2917 N. Broad Street. The Commissioners discussed the nomination. No one in the audience commented on the nomination.

COMMENT: Ms. Hawkins moved that the Historical Commission endorse the listing of 2917 N. Broad Street on the National Register of Historic Places. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3737 MAIN STREET, JOHN WILDE & SONS MILL

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the nomination to the National Register of Historic Places for the property located at 3737 Main Street. The Commissioners discussed the nomination. No one in the audience commented on the nomination.

COMMENT: Ms. Hawkins moved that the Historical Commission endorse the listing of 3737 Main Street on the National Register of Historic Places. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Quinn announced that he was retiring from his position at the Department of Licenses & Inspections and would be stepping down from his seat on the Commission as the designee of the Commissioner of the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The Commissioners, staff, and public congratulated Mr. Quinn on his retirement and thanked him for his service to the Commission and City.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adjourn at 10:50 a.m. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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 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.