

**THE MINUTES OF THE 570TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**12 FEBRUARY 2010
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
David Amburn
Leslie Benoliel
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Robert Murray, Department of Public Property
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

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

Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Ken Karlan
Victor Brubaker
Dan Bosin
David Hollenberg, University of Pennsylvania
Jonathan Broh, JKR Partners
Jerry Roller, JKR Partners
Ben Weinraub
Alon Barzilay
Lorna Katz-Lawson

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:17 a.m. Commissioners Amburn, Benoliel, Mattioni, Merriman, Murray, Quinn, Schaaf, Thomas, and Wilds joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 569TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the minutes of the 569th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 January 2010. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JANUARY 2010

David Amburn, Chair

1504 PINE STREET

Owner: Jennie Rubenfeld

Applicant: Michael Sher

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

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

Project: Legalize vinyl windows in basement and fourth floor

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

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 wide, beaded, vertical muntin. The sliding window hides a window, which sits inside of it, effectively becoming the new exterior appearance.

The violation request to the Department of Licenses & Inspections included the patching of the masonry walls with unpainted grey cement. However, that was not included the violation that was issued, nor is it part of the applicant's proposal.

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

Mr. Baron explained that the applicant, Michael Sher, the attorney for the property owner, had been very late to the Architectural Committee meeting and had missed his time slot. The Committee had conducted the review without him. He noted that Mr. Sher had been apprised of the time of the Architectural Committee's review in writing. The Commissioners asked Mr. Baron if Mr. Sher or anyone else was in attendance to represent the application at today's Commission meeting. Mr. Baron called out the address of the property and no one responded. Mr. Sherman called out the address and no one responded. The Commissioners reviewed the application and agreed that the Architectural Committee had reached the appropriate conclusion.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Amburn seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconstruct an historic storefront using wood for the missing granite, which was removed many years ago, before designation. 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.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner and architect Dan Bosin represented the application.

Mr. Bosin explained that he had originally intended to replace the missing granite storefront with new granite to match. However, when he investigated the conditions at the storefront, he discovered that steel structural members had been inserted in the storefront close to the property line, preventing him from installing the granite. He is therefore proposing to replicate the appearance of the original storefront in wood, not granite.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application with the wood storefront as submitted. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1326-28 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: 1326 Chestnut Street Associates; Barzilai 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

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

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 a 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.

The current application proposes to restore the masonry on the stair tower to its original color and texture. It also proposes to construct a glass entrance canopy that would refer to the c. 1900 storefront. The glass canopy would include an image of the storefront in laser-cut stainless steel, etched glass, or a graphic installed in the glass.

The Architectural Committee discussed the proposal at length at its meeting on 26 January 2010. Central to its discussion was the Storefront Guideline in the Rehabilitation Standards, which states that

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.

The Committee members agreed that the historic entrance area is completely missing. Therefore, either a reconstruction of the historic storefront or a new, compatible storefront would equally satisfy the Standards. A majority of Committee members contended that the proposed storefront is compatible and therefore satisfies the Standards. However, they suggested that some details should be refined. For example, they suggested enclosing the canopy space, which is shown in the revised drawings included in the Commission packets. They suggested that the design merited an in-concept approval, but not a final approval. The applicants agreed to convert their application to an in-concept application at the Architectural Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architects Jonathan Broh and Jerry Roller and developers Ben Weinraub and Alon Barzilay represented the application.

Mr. Broh stated that they are proposing to construct a frameless, structural, glass storefront with graphics integrated within the laminated glass. It would be based on the c. 1900 storefront. He stated that they had revised three aspects of the design since the Committee meeting. They adjusted the proportion slightly, to be more in line with the historic storefront. They also included recessed doors to create an airlock as the Committee had advised. He stated that they are now carrying the stair tower down to grade, but only down to the storefront, to be more in keeping with the c. 1900 storefront. Steel would carry the masonry of the tower.

Mr. Wilds asked about the proposed storefront in comparison to the extant, c. 1960 storefront. Mr. Broh stated that they would be revealing more of the front façade. Their exploratory work had indicated that the window openings survive behind the upper story of the current storefront.

Mr. Broh showed drawings of the earlier storefront proposal in comparison to the current proposal. Mr. Roller explained that the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission reviewer had requested that the new storefront height be limited, in case any original features were discovered behind the c. 1960 storefront. Mr. Roller explained that they now know with some certainty that the front façade at the lower floors is entirely gone. Therefore, he believes that the state reviewer would accept a taller storefront, such as the one they are now proposing. He noted, however, that they would need to submit any revised design to the Pennsylvania Museum & Historical Commission and the National Park Service for review as part of their tax credit application. He concluded that they will continue to investigate the front façade to determine how much fabric survives. If they discover anything new, they will report that to the Commission during subsequent reviews. Mr. Roller stated that he will continue to work with the Commission as the design and the understanding of the building evolves.

Mr. Wilds asked about the masonry at the base of the tower. Mr. Roller explained that there is no masonry cladding at the base of the tower. He stated that it appears that it was removed below the third floor and supported at that point with steel. Mr. Broh stated that, although the masonry has been removed, they plan to use the stair as an egress stair. The new storefront would cover the base of the tower.

Mr. Sherman noted that the graphics in the glass in the rendering does not appear to match precisely the masonry seen in the historic photograph. He stated that the rendering shows a much more random masonry. Mr. Broh stated that the graphics are only loosely represented in the rendering. He stated that, if the Commission approves the proposal, he would work very closely with the staff to replicate precisely the masonry, pane patterns and other details of the historic storefront. Mr. Schaaf asked if the missing stone would be restored on the base of the tower. Mr. Broh stated that it would. Mr. Schaaf asked if the stone would be visible through the glass of the storefront. Mr. Broh stated that it would.

Mr. Wilds asked the applicants to explain why they are not proposing to reconstruct one of the several storefronts that this building has had. Mr. Roller explained that the building represents the history of Chestnut Street, which is a fashionable retail street. The Building has had several storefronts, each of which reflected the fashion or taste at the time. He stated that reconstructing any one of the many storefronts would “mask” the important history of the site. He asserted that restoring any one of them would not reflect the history. A well-designed contemporary storefront would participate in this history, rather than cover it. The glass façade would join in that history. He added that, except for this storefront area, which is entirely non-historic, the entire building is being restored according to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

Mr. Wilds asked if any of the historic entranceways or storefronts would satisfy the programmatic needs of the hotel. Mr. Roller conceded that some of the storefronts would meet their needs including the current storefront, but reiterated his contention that the history of this building would best be served by added a contemporary, well-designed storefront. Recreating any one of the earlier storefronts would, in a way, negate the later storefronts and the later history.

Mr. Sherman asked if the storefront would be lighted. Mr. Broh stated that it would, but the details had not yet been developed. Mr. Roller noted that they are requesting approval in concept. They would present the final details including lighting details at a later date.

Ms. Merriman asked about the stair tower and suggested that the masonry should be pulled back from the glass. Mr. Broh stated that they would improve the design, pulling the stair back from the glass. Mr. Roller agreed that the suggestion to move the masonry back was a good one. He assured the Commission that they would refine the details once they took possession of the building and conducted their investigation of the existing conditions.

Mr. Wilds asked if they would need an exterior door from the stair tower. Mr. Broh stated that they stair could exit into the first-floor interior. Mr. Schaaf thought a window would be appropriate. Mr. Roller promised that they would work out the details when they had more information.

Mr. Wilds stated that he stills believes that it is possible to put a modern, exciting function into this building with one of its several storefronts restored. He noted that the Loew's and Bellevue are high-end hotels in historic buildings. He objected to what he called a "1970s glass curtain wall." Mr. Roller countered that Mr. Wild's objections were aesthetic, not preservation based. He stated that restoring any one of the facades would be detrimental to the essence of this building's history as an indicator of the latest fashion on Chestnut Street. He asserted that his proposed storefront would relate to that important aspect of this building's history. Reconstructing one of the older storefronts arbitrarily would create a false sense of history.

Mr. Sherman asked if the rendering accurately depicted the proposed color of glass. Mr. Broh said that it did not. He would work with the Commission to find an appropriate color for the glass.

Mr. Wilds asked what one would see behind the glass at the eastern corner. He asked what would support the front façade. Mr. Broh stated that steel columns exist that support the front façade above the storefront. Those would be retained. He noted that the federal reviews had suggested that the missing masonry at the Chestnut and Juniper corner should be replicated, providing a visual support for the masonry above.

Mr. Sherman asked about the drainage of the glass storefront. Mr. Broh said the back of the storefront would be supported by a steel channel. At the back of the glass roof at the channel, a drain would tie into an internal drainage system that would not be visible from the street.

Ben Weinraub stated that the proposed storefront is entirely consistent with the history of the building. Excepting the first few years, when the building operated as a bank, the building has had a commercial presence on the first two floors and other uses above. This proposal will continue that history. He stated that the building has had five storefronts since 1900, always in the style of the day. Their proposed storefront would respect that tradition and continue that history in a way that rebuilding any one of the storefronts would not.

Ms. Merriman asked the developers why they are alluding to the 1902 storefront if they want to create a contemporary storefront. She asked if there was a flaw in the logic they had presented as their justification for the design. Mr. Schaaf noted that they had proposed a sleek glass storefront without the allusions to an earlier storefront at the December 2009 meeting and the Commission and John Gallery had pushed for a storefront that alluded to the earlier designs. Ms. Merriman stated that she objected to the blank wall at the west in the first design; she noted that that blank wall is now behind glass. She suggested that the new storefront should reactivate the entire street frontage along Chestnut Street. Mr. Schaaf suggested a very clean, all-glazed storefront without the representation of the 1902 storefront. He pointed to the Apple

Store in New York as an example. Mr. Roller stated that he could consider Mr. Schaaf suggestion, but noted that the tax credit reviewers will review the proposal again and may not agree with Mr. Schaaf's idea. He reminded the Commission that the design must satisfy both the City as well as the state and federal reviewers, who do not always have the same objectives. Ms. Merriman's and Mr. Schaaf's concerns about street vitality may not coincide with other concerns. He noted that the tax credits are essential to the viability of the project.

Mr. Wilds reminded everyone that the application proposes an approval in concept. He asked Mr. Farnham to define the concept for which the applicants are seeking approval. Mr. Farnham replied that he could not unilaterally define the concept; instead, the applicants and Commission should seek a mutually acceptable understanding of the concept through their discussion. He stated that the Commission should consider the massing, materials, design, and detailing as it seeks to enumerate a concept. For example, does the Commission approve of the embedded representation of the 1902 storefront. He contended that both the Commission and applicants must have a clear understanding of the bounds of any approval in concept.

Mr. Broh stated that he would define the concept as a frameless glass storefront across the full width of the front façade and of the height and depth as shown. He stated that he would not necessarily include the balustrade in the concept because they are willing to modify that portion of the design. He would include the pair of frameless glass door and the steel columns supporting the masonry above in the concept, but not the etched representation of the 1902 storefront or the other decorative elements. Mr. Schaaf stated that the etching could be much more contemporary. Mr. Roller stated that they are willing to discuss many of the aspects of the design, but need to set the basic parameters. He also reminded the Commission again that the state and federal reviewers must also evaluate any design that arises from these discussions.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance showed a Powerpoint presentation to support his assertion that the Historical Commission should deny the application. Mr. Gallery displayed a photograph of the building at 110 S. 18th Street, which is not designated as historic. It is brick rowhouse converted to commercial use in the early twentieth-century building with brick and limestone at the upper floors and a stucco and glass storefront with a large plastic sign and pink awning. He cautioned the Commission against approving anything like this vernacular storefront. Mr. Gallery then displayed a photograph of the Italianate building at 723 Chestnut Street, which was designed by Stephen Button and is not designated as historic. A stucco storefront was recently added for a Japanese restaurant; Mr. Gallery called it a "fashion statement" and a "disaster." He then displayed photographs of the Integrity Trust Bank by architect Paul Cret at 715-717 Chestnut Street, which is designated as historic. He reported that the non-historic cladding at the ground floor was recently removed to reveal the historic base, which had survived behind the non-historic storefront. He then displayed photographs of the Isaac Miller Store at 1606 Chestnut Street, which is designated as historic. The Commission approved the removal of non-historic infill, masonry cleaning, and the installation of a new storefront window in 2001. Mr. Gallery stated that the storefront modifications were appropriate. He noted that the Commission did not approve the installation of a new non-historic storefront for this property. Mr. Gallery then showed a photograph of the building at 1716 Chestnut Street, which is not designated. He pointed out the glass and metal storefront at the first floor, which he asserted is inappropriate. Mr. Gallery then displayed a photograph of the Alexander Martin Store at 1728 Chestnut Street, which is designated. He noted that the Commission had approved new doors and a window at the storefront as well as new windows above several years ago. Mr. Gallery then displayed a recently constructed glass and metal infill building at 1224 Chestnut Street, which is not designated. He asserted that the glass is inappropriately

reflective. It was noted that the glass on the adjacent historic building is also very reflective in the photograph. Finally, Mr. Gallery displayed a photograph of 1610 Locust Street. The Commission recently required the restoration of the first-floor window including masonry surround in this rowhouse in exchange for allowing the demolitions of all but the front façade of this and another building as well as the entirety of the adjacent building. Mr. Gallery stated that replacement storefront at 1326 Chestnut Street should be compatible. Mr. Gallery asserted that the 1902 storefront should be rebuilt. He claimed that people would be heartbroken if the historic storefront is not recreated. He urged for a restoration or a compatible storefront. He opposed any storefront with too much glass.

Mr. Thomas stated that the program could be accommodated in a storefront that was more compatible. He stated that he does not believe that the proposed storefront satisfies the Standards. Mr. Mattioni said his opposition to the proposed storefront was immediate and visceral. He stated that it was jarring. He reported that he does not like the appearance of the proposed storefront.

Mr. Weinraub responded, asserting that the buildings Mr. Gallery showed and their circumstances are not at all analogous to the current situation. Some involved minor replacement of storefront elements such as windows and doors. Others involved removing inappropriate cladding. He stated that many of the buildings were townhouses and did not pose the same issues as this building. He also noted that the state and federal reviewers have already indicated that a glass storefront would satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

FAILED MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to deny the application in concept. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which failed by a vote of 5 to 5. Ms. Merriman and Messrs. Amburn, Quinn, Schaaf, and Sherman dissented.

Mr. Farnham explained to the Commission that, with the failed motion, it had not taken any action. He said that, in general, when the Commission takes no action on an application, it is deemed approved in 60 days. However, this application is an in-concept application and a deemed approval of an in-concept application is essentially meaningless because the Commission is not bound by an in-concept approval. He suggested that the Commission work to find a motion that a majority can vote to approve. Mr. Sherman asked for a motion that would guide the applicants.

Mr. Barzilay, the developer, addressed the Commission. He stated that the building is a masterpiece, but is also a challenge. It has been vacant above the first floor for 50 years. He stated that it has been a challenge to work with several regulatory agencies, not all of whom agree. He asked the Commission to provide its best direction to him and his design team. He stated that the overwhelming majority of the building is being restored. He stated that he selected this building for its architectural appeal. He noted that he is worried about becoming a "ping-pong ball" between regulatory agencies. He claimed that, for the restaurant and hotel to be successful, the establishment must have a presence on Chestnut Street. He stated that they must have visibility into the interior. He contended that, unless his team takes pro-active steps to save this building, it will continue to deteriorate. He requested that the Commission provide a clear direction to his team. He asked the Commission to take into account his need for visibility and to accommodate other regulatory agencies.

Mr. Sherman stated that he thought that Mr. Barzilay could achieve his goals with a design that was acceptable to preservationists. He suggested a storefront that was not a reconstruction, but

that did include some masonry. Mr. Sherman asked the Commissioners to offer a motion that would provide guidance to the applicants.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the Planning Commission promotes transparent facades on Chestnut Street. A transparent façade allows the passerby to know immediately what is happening inside and thereby improves the pedestrian experience. He disagreed with Mr. Gallery regarding the question of reflectivity. He stated that this storefront, which faces north, would not be highly reflective, but would be transparent. Mr. Thomas agreed that maximum transparency is important for street life. He contended a transparent façade should be combined with something that is compatible architecturally. He suggested a transparent façade framed in masonry. Mr. Schaaf noted that the 1902 storefront shows that the definition of the corner of Juniper and Chestnut with the masonry piers is important. Mr. Barzilay reminded the Commission that the view from a vehicle moving on Chestnut Street is as important as the pedestrian view.

Mr. Roller commented on Mr. Gallery's presentation. He objected to the relevance of the examples provided by Mr. Gallery. He asserted that there is one important difference between the buildings in the examples and their building. The examples all had surviving historic storefront fabric, but their building does not. He stated that, if any portion of an original storefront survived at their building, then they would not be seeking approval for a new storefront, but would be seeking to restore the existing storefront. However, they cannot restore the storefront because it is complete missing. He stated that the historic fabric at the corner at Chestnut and Juniper was lost in 1939. Shifting to discuss the new storefront, he stated that they would be receptive to adding some masonry, but do not want to arbitrarily recreate something that is long lost. He stated again that the history of the storefront of this building is a history of change. To rebuild a long-lost storefront would negate that important history.

Messrs. Wilds and Schaaf suggested that the applicants propose to reestablish the masonry frame of the storefront. Mr. Schaaf stated that he would support an entirely glazed storefront as long as it is framed in masonry. Mr. Barzilay again asserted that good pedestrian and vehicular visibility as well as a strong retail presence is important to him. He stated that he is willing to compromise. He asked the Commission to guide him to a mutually acceptable design. He conceded that he is willing to add masonry to the design. He asked the Commission to confirm that it is not requiring a complete restoration of one of the storefronts. He asked the Commission to opine on the acceptability of etched glass. Mr. Sherman acknowledged that there is disagreement between Commission members and asked the Commission to formulate a compromise that would allow this project to move forward.

Mr. Mattioni asked Mr. Thomas to comment. Mr. Thomas stated that he would advocate for a large amount glass that would create an open, welcoming feeling. He suggested a glassy storefront with masonry at the ends. Mr. Thomas contended that the storefront area need not be restored in order for the application to meet the Standards; a compatible storefront would be acceptable. Mr. Thomas acknowledged that the Historical Commission is not the only regulatory agency reviewing the design. He stated that the Commission needs to be flexible to allow the developer to also satisfy the other agencies including the Planning Commission and federal tax credit reviewers.

Mr. Sherman suggested an outdoor presence. Mr. Thomas stated that café windows might be appropriate. Mr. Barzilay stated that they are interested in outdoor activity, but that that part of the program is relatively minor. He asked the Commission to focus on the primary question, providing his design team with a direction for the design of the storefront. Messrs. Thomas and

Wilds stated that the storefront should be framed in masonry. Mr. Wilds added that the east and west ends of the storefront including the corner at Juniper should be masonry, not glass. Mr. Roller asked them to clarify. He noted that the main façade of the building sits about five feet back from the property line along Chestnut Street, except at the stair tower, where it extends out to the Chestnut property line. He asked if the Commission was suggesting that the corner of the main building at Chestnut and Juniper, which is back from the property line, should be masonry, or if the corner of the storefront itself, which will be at the property line and will be about two stories tall, should be masonry. Mr. Wilds stated that he, personally, would like to see masonry at the corner of the storefront. Ms. Merriman stated that the massing of the proposed storefront is appropriate, but it should include some masonry. Mr. Thomas stated that the storefront should have a solid base, but it does not need to be masonry.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the application in concept with a glazed storefront of the proposed massing, provided that masonry elements that are compatible with the historic masonry of the building are introduced at the base, east corner, and west end of the storefront. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2047 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: Fujian Investment Group LLC

Applicant: Rustin Ohler

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

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

Project: Legalize brownstone removal and install cast concrete

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of brownstone removal from the rusticated base of this building and the approval of the 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 & 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 test 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 test installation; however, the representative did not contact the staff and the meeting never occurred.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Historical Commission. No one represented the application.

Ms. Sell explained that the applicant had submitted additional materials since the Architectural Committee meeting. Mr. Wilds asked if the staff considered the application complete with the submission of the additional materials. Ms. Sell answered that it did. The Commission reviewed the application and determined that the proposed work was appropriate, given the deterioration.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the application as submitted at the Commission meeting of 12 February 2010, with the staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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

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

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.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Frano Violich and University Architect David Hollenberg represented the application.

Mr. Violich presented a detailed Powerpoint presentation summarizing the project and the options. He noted the need for connecting faculty offices in the two buildings. He stated that there are significant level differences between the buildings to be connected. He stated that the

Law School receives daily deliveries in the service entrance between the two buildings. The bridge must allow these deliveries. He pointed out that the bridge will be constructed at the bay furthest for the street, limiting its public visibility.

Mr. Wilds asked about the decision to remove the stone arch entirely rather than cut through the stone arch and leave portions of it in place, especially in light of the fact that one option proposes to leave the decorative stone jambs in place. Mr. Violich explained that it would look unresolved to leave portions of the arch in place. He also noted that it would be risky to cut the stone arch; it might break apart. Mr. Hollenberg stated that they have studied the issue of how to terminate the opening above the existing window opening. Some thought that a simple, unmolded piece of limestone should be inserted. All opposed a simple brick termination.

Mr. Wilds asked why the window base would not be retained in Option B. Mr. Violich stated that they would be amenable to retaining it. Mr. Hollenberg asserted that their preference is Option A, which preserves more fabric in place. Mr. Violich stated that, even though Option B would provide a wider bridge, he believes that Option A offers a better solution from an architectural standpoint. Mr. Hollenberg noted that bridge will be used by faculty only, not students. The traffic volume will be limited.

Mr. Schaaf asked if the reinstalled medallion and arch can be installed at its original elevation, not lower, as currently proposed. Mr. Violich answered that it may be possible to install it at its original height.

Mr. Thomas suggested that they avoid the addition of new limestone molding above the historic window opening in such a way that would confuse the viewer. Mr. Hollenberg stated that they would work out that detail with the staff. He thanked Mr. Danta for his efforts.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the Option-A version of the application, with the staff to review details. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3600-90 WALNUT STREET

Owner: Trustees, University of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Richard Russell

History: 1913, Walter Mellor & Arthur Meigs, architects

Project: Infill fire stair

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

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.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Troy Hill represented the application.

Mr. Wilds noted the revision to infilling with glass. He asked if the revised design satisfied the applicant and met all fire codes. Mr. Hill stated that it does.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the openings are infilled with glass, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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

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.

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.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Historical Commission. No one represented the application.

Mr. Sherman called for the applicant to step forward. No one responded.

The Commission discussed the application and agreed that it proposed work that would be consider demolition in the legal sense.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(j) of the Philadelphia Code and Standards 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1523 PINE STREET

Owner: Kenneth Karlin

Applicant: Victor Brubaker

History: c. 1865, contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District

Project: Add elevator shaft and roof deck

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

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Cote presented the application to the Historical Commission. Contractor Victor Brubaker and property owner Kenneth Karlin represented the application.

Ms. Cote reported that the applicant had provided additional information just minutes before the hearing. She stated that she had not had an opportunity to review it, but noted that it appeared to address the issues raised by the Architectural Committee. She noted that the elevator shaft would be minimally visible from the public right of way. She also noted that the additional information requested additional approvals for alterations not reviewed by the Architectural Committee. She stated that the applicants now proposed replacing the front door and railing and undertake masonry repairs.

Mr. Brubaker stated that the elevator could function with the existing masonry openings, which would be extended downward from the sill to the floor, but would not be widened or extended upward. Mr. Brubaker stated that he has now stipulated the clearance at the top and bottom for the mechanicals. The plans now show that it is fire rated. He stated that he has added horizontal elements on the exterior of the tower at the Committee's recommendation, but thinks that they should be removed. He stated that he would modify the plan of the shaft to have a flat roof for drainage.

Mr. Wilds stated that the plans are very hard to read. He stated that he was unsure where the shaft would be installed on the rear facade. Mr. Karlin explained that the shaft would run up the east or left bank of windows. Mr. Wilds asked him to indicate the building slated for work in the photographs. He stated that it was not possible to determine whether the work was proposed for the building with the fire escape or the neighboring building. Mr. Karlin stated that the work is proposed for the building without the fire escape.

Mr. Brubaker noted that the roof deck will match the roof deck on the neighboring property 1525 Pine exactly, with access from the new bulkhead. He explained that 1525 has a fifth story. The bulkhead will be built against the party wall of that fifth story.

Mr. Brubaker said beveled cedar siding is proposed to cover all walls of the elevator shaft. He stated that he would also accept German siding. Mr. Wilds asked him to identify the siding he intended to use. Mr. Brubaker said he would use beveled cedar siding.

Mr. Wilds opined that portions of the application are incomplete. All details should have been presented to the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Thomas questioned the design of the elevator shaft. He questioned whether the shaft would satisfy the fire code. He also questioned how the side facing the property line would be maintained. He observed that permission to use the neighboring property would need to be obtained every time the wood siding was painted or stained. Mr. Murray, who was formerly a building code official with the Department of Licenses & Inspections, stated that he did not believe that the shaft would meet the fire code. Mr. Schaaf, who is an architect, questioned the structural design of the shaft. Mr. Thomas stated that the applicants should have provided interior plans and an analysis that proved that the elevator could not be located in the interior. Mr. Karlin responded that the rear of the building faces a dead-end alley with numerous eyesores. He also stated that he considered locating the elevator in the interior, but determined that it was not feasible without severely impacting historic interior spaces. Mr. Wilds stated that he would be willing to approve the elevator because, although there appeared to be many open questions about its design, they were not historic preservation questions.

Mr. Wilds asked the staff if it could review the newly proposed door and railing replacements and masonry repairs at the staff level. Ms. Cote responded that the staff might be able to approve the masonry work, but not the door or railing. She asserted that the door slated for removal is an important Arts & Crafts door. Mr. Karlin reported that the door is unusable. It is so wide, that it swings back to the second set of doors in the vestibule. When groups enter or leave, they are forced to pass through the vestibule one at a time. He asked the Commission to approve the deck and elevator.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the roof deck with stair house as submitted, but deny the remainder of the application including the elevator tower, front door, and railing, owing to incompleteness. Mr. Quinn seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Merriman moved to adjourn at 11:43 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 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.