

**THE MINUTES OF THE 553RD STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**12 SEPTEMBER 2008
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
David Amburn, AIA
Della Clark
Rosalie Leonard, Office of Council President
Michael Maenner, Department of Licenses & Inspections
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Department of Commerce
David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Robert Thomas, AIA
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner I
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor

ALSO PRESENT

Sabra Smith, Preservation Alliance
William Kane, Kane Woodworking Company
Janice Woodcock
Gay Walling, Art Alliance
Mark Ueland, UJMN Architects
Felix W. Penzarella
Mark Hankin, Arsenal Associates
Brooke Weese, Arsenal Associates
Donna DeStefano
John Orsini

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Amburn, Clark, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Schaaf, Smyler, Thomas, and Wilds joined him. Michael Maenner of the Department of Licenses & Inspections substituted for Deputy Commissioner Eileen Evans.

MINUTES OF THE 552ND STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 552nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 August 2008. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 AUGUST 2008

David Amburn, Chair

15 BOATHOUSE ROW

Owner: The Sedgeley Club

Applicant: Kiki Bolender

History: 1903, designated January 1984.

Project: Install aluminum windows in subframes

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the new windows fit within and are appropriately located within the openings, with installation details to be included in the shop drawings, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace non-original windows on the river facade of the Boathouse. The Commission's files do not include designation photographs of that facade. It is unknown whether the existing windows were in place at the time of designation. The windows in question are part of an extension of the original porch. The original porch columns remain in the interior. The applicant proposes to install double-hung, clad windows.

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

The Commissioners discussed the windows and determined that they are acceptable.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the new windows fit within and are appropriately located within the openings, with installation details to be included in the shop drawings, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2010 SANSOM STREET

Owner: John Ciccone

Applicant: Gianluca Demontis

History: Altered c. 1920

Project: Install casements with transoms in storefront

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of bi-fold windows, provided the door configuration is retained and the existing jambs and transoms are retained or replaced in kind if their conditions warrant, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the plate glass in the storefront with two sets of café windows with transoms. The café windows will fit within the existing masonry openings. The proposed railing would be steel.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Bill Kane of Kane Woodworking represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked if the extant transom is original. Mr. Danta stated that it is original to the 1920s Mediterranean Revival refacing of the building. It is not original to the building, but has historic significance. Mr. Kane distributed revised architectural drawings and stated that the new storefront would be a precise replica of the existing storefront, excepting the bi-fold storefront windows. He would match the existing frames exactly. He displayed a photograph of the deteriorated conditions of the existing storefront. The Commissioners agreed that the storefront was in poor condition and could be replaced in kind. Mr. Schaaf asked about other photographs in the application package, which were not labeled. Mr. Kane replied that they are of nearby, similar storefronts. Mr. Thomas commended the application.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application including the bi-fold windows, provided the door configuration is retained and the existing jambs and transoms are retained or replaced in kind if their conditions warrant, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

535-537 N. 22nd Street

Owner: Diane Eigner

Applicant: Anthony Miksitz

History: c. 1860

Project: Replace and construct roof decks.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the engineered design does not require any new penetrations in the parapet walls, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct two decks that were removed for roofing work on this property. The decks were present at the time of designation. The proposed decks would be of the same dimensions and at the same location as the previous decks. The applicant proposes to install a hot tub with a trellis. The railing would be fabricated from steel cables. The railing would be taller around the hot tub.

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

Mr. Wilds acknowledged that the decks were present before designation and were therefore grandfathered. He noted that decks occasionally need to be temporarily removed for roof maintenance.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the engineered design does not require any new penetrations in the parapet walls, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

251 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: Philadelphia Art Alliance

Applicant: Janice Woodcock

History: 1906, Day & Klauder; significant in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District

Project: Replace front doors

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace non-historic entry doors with new doors that would not replicate the original doors. The original doors were not present at the time of designation, but their design is known from the original design documents. The applicant proposes two-leaf, metal doors with horizontal push bars. This building is classified as Significant in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. It is one of the best examples of Renaissance Revival architecture in the city.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Janice Woodcock and Gay Walling, the executive director of the Art Alliance, represented the application.

Mr. Danta stated that he had discovered historic photographs of the doorway, but, owing to a computer network problem, was unable to provide copies of those photographs to the Commission today. He explained that the iron doorway was old, but not original. He noted the historic blueprint of the doorway and stated that the jambs and other remnants of the historic doorway depicted in the blueprint survive.

Mr. Wilds noted that the Commission has routinely approved alterations to historic doors that allow them to satisfy contemporary functional requirements, provided they retain their historic appearances.

Ms. Woodcock stated that her client is willing to work hard to produce the appropriate doors. She reported that she has found a fabricator who can make the doors. She noted, however, that the Art Alliance is facing challenges. Walling, the executive director, described the many challenges facing her non-profit organization. She said that she is seeking grants for capital improvements. She explained that she has some money in a restrictive account for the doorway improvement, but it will be a challenge to stay within the budget. She reported that the extant door is in very poor condition. She cannot have new keys made for it. She concluded that she would like to replicate the historic door, but must stay within her budget.

Ms. Woodcock commented that the extant door dates to the 1960s. She asked if it should be retained. She noted that the non-historic door documents the evolution of the building. Mr. Wilds replied that the door is not historically significant and should not be replicated. Ms. Woodcock stated that she could undertake additional research to identify the historic doors. However, she expressed the need for expediency, citing security issues. She requested a quick resolution. Mr. Thomas informed her of the Keystone Preservation Grant program, which may provide assistance. Mr. Sherman noted that the staff has the authority to approve a restoration; if she proposed replacing the doors with replicas of the historic doors, the staff could approve her application immediately. Mr. Mattioni suggested tabling the application to allow the applicants time to revise their proposal.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to table the application for one month to the October 2008 meeting. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

618 S. FRONT STREET

Owner: Felix Panzarella

Applicant: Felix Panzarella

History: c. 1835; individually designated, 6/24/1958

Project: Construct three-story building

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application as documented in the architectural drawings, not the photomontages, provided the brick patterning is more subtle, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story brick building on Howard Street at the rear of this property. The building would have a garage on the first floor and studio space on the second and third floors. The building would not be visible from Front, South, Bainbridge, or S. Hancock Streets. The photomontages provided with the application differ in details from the architectural drawings. The staff prefers the design details in the drawings, not the photomontages.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Felix Panzarella represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked if the construction would be visible from a public right-of-way. Mr. Amburn responded that the building would be constructed at the rear of the historic building and would face onto a public street, albeit a narrow, dead-end one. Mr. Sherman asked the applicant to explain the brick patterning in the proposed design. Mr. Panzarella assured the Commission that the building would not sport a brick pattern. It would be clad in one type of brick. He remarked that his architect had employed "creative license" when he produced the rendering with the pattern.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application as documented in the architectural drawings, not the photomontages, provided the brick patterning is more subtle, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1401 ARCH STREET

Owner: AFIAA U.S. Investments

Applicant: Karen Loveland

History: 1897-99, added to 1926; storefronts altered from arches to square-head by 1917

Individually designated, 6/24/1987

Project: Install entrance

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Commission's in-concept approval of 8 August 2008.

OVERVIEW: The Committee and the Commission reviewed a similar in-concept application last month. The Commission approved, in-concept, a street-level entrance at the northern outermost bay of the Broad Street façade. This application for final approval proposes to remove the stone base and the glass below the top horizontal mullion of the northern outermost bay and install a new storefront system with double glass doors to match the existing main entrance.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. Karen Loveland represented the application.

The Commissioners reviewed the application and determined that it complied with their in-concept approval.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Commission's in-concept approval of 8 August 2008. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1903, 1909, 1915, AND 1917 DIAMOND STREET

Owner/Applicant: Todd Joseph

History: c. 1889, Diamond Street Historic District, 1/29/1986, contributing

Project: Legalize exterior alterations

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend:

- denial of the application for 1903 Diamond Street, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9;
- denial of the application for 1909 Diamond Street, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9;
- denial of the application for 1915 Diamond Street, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9; and,
- denial of the application for 1917 Diamond Street, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9.

1903 DIAMOND STREET OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of windows, a metal door, glass block in basement windows, and mailboxes on the front facade, application of cement and paint over the brownstone base and stair on the front façade, demolition and reconstruction of the rear bay, and installation of stucco, a door, and vinyl windows at the rear.

The 1986 designation photograph shows one-over-one, wood windows with original brick molds, built-down door, transom, louvered basement windows, and damaged brownstone base. A 2003 aerial photograph shows the rear ell and two-story bay intact. Photographs from March 2008 also show the rear ell and two-story bay intact, although in poor condition.

The appropriate historic features are as follows: windows on the first, second, and third stories should be one-over-one, wood, double-hung, sash; the basement windows should be six-light, wood, true-divided-light sash; the front door should be a wood, double-leaf paneled door with transom and historic moldings as shown in the designation photograph of 1909 Diamond Street; the first story window sills and base should be unpainted brownstone maintaining the historic block design; and the stair should be unpainted brownstone.

Although the current windows were approved by the Historical Commission in June 2008, they were installed incorrectly and protrude dramatically from the window openings. The frames should be recessed within the openings.

As depicted in the March 2008 photographs, the rear ell should be brick with a two-story wood bay with four one-over-one, wood, double-hung windows and wood cornices at the second and third stories. The first story should have a one-over-one, wood, double-hung window and paneled wood door.

In April 2008, the applicant was informed that the Historical Commission staff would not approve the installation of stucco on the rear elevation or bay windows and an approval from the Historical Commission and permits from the Department of Licenses and Inspections must be obtained prior to any alterations on historically designated buildings. A staff member also met in the office and on-site with the applicant on several occasions and informed him of Historical Commission requirements and application process. In July 2008, a staff member observed the rear bay demolished and reconstructed with stucco and vinyl windows as well as several illegal alterations to the front facade. In July 2008, violations were issued for the illegal alterations.

1909 DIAMOND STREET OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the removal of door and door surround, installation of windows, a metal door, glass block in basement windows, and mailboxes on the front facade, application of cement and paint over the brownstone base and stair on the front façade, demolition and reconstruction of the rear bay, and installation of stucco, a door, and vinyl windows at the rear.

The 1986 designation photograph shows one-over-one, wood windows with original brick molds, historic door, door surround, and transom, six-light wood basement windows, brownstone stairs, and damaged brownstone base. A 2003 aerial photograph shows the rear ell intact and not stuccoed.

The appropriate historic features are as follows: windows on the first, second, and third stories should be one-over-one, wood, double-hung sash; the basement windows should be six-light, wood, true-divided-light sash; the front door should be a wood, double-leaf paneled door with transom and historic moldings as shown in the designation photograph; the first story window sills and base should be unpainted brownstone maintaining the historic block design; and the stair should be unpainted brownstone.

Although the current windows were approved by the Historical Commission in June 2008, they were installed incorrectly and protrude dramatically from the window openings. The frames should be recessed within the openings.

The rear ell should be brick with a two-story wood bay with four one-over-one, wood, double-hung windows and wood cornices at the second and third stories. The first story should have a one-over-one, wood, double-hung window and paneled wood door.

In April 2008, the applicant was informed that the Historical Commission staff would not approve the installation of stucco on the rear elevation or bay windows and that an approval from the Historical Commission and permits from the Department of Licenses and Inspections must be obtained prior to any alterations on historically designated buildings. A staff member also met in the office and on-site with the applicant on several occasions and informed him of Historical Commission requirements and application process. In July 2008, a staff member observed the rear bay demolished and reconstructed with stucco and vinyl windows as well as several illegal alterations to the front facade. In July 2008, violations were issued for the illegal alterations.

1915 DIAMOND STREET OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of windows, a metal door, glass block in basement windows, and mailboxes on the front facade, application of cement and paint over the brownstone base and stair on the front façade, painting of the façade, and installation of stucco, a door, and vinyl windows at the rear.

The 1986 designation photograph shows one-over-one, wood windows with original brick molds, built-down door, transom, closed basement windows, and damaged brownstone base. A 2003 aerial photograph shows the rear ell intact and not stuccoed.

The appropriate historic features are as follows: windows on the first, second, and third stories should be one-over-one, wood, double-hung sash; the basement windows should be six-light, wood, true-divided-light sash; the front door should be a wood, double-leaf paneled door with transom and historic moldings as shown in the designation photograph of 1909 Diamond Street; the first story window sills and base should be unpainted brownstone maintaining the historic block design; and the stair should be unpainted brownstone.

Although the current windows were approved by the Historical Commission in June 2008, they were installed incorrectly and protrude dramatically from the window openings. The frames should be recessed within the openings.

The rear ell should be brick with a two-story wood bay with four one-over-one, wood, double-hung windows and wood cornices at the second and third stories. The first story should have a one-over-one, wood, double-hung window and paneled wood door.

In April 2008, the applicant was informed that the Historical Commission staff would not approve the installation of stucco on the rear elevation or bay windows and that an approval from the Historical Commission and permits from the Department of Licenses & Inspections must be obtained prior to any alterations on historically designated buildings. A staff member also met in the office and on-site with the applicant on several occasions and informed him of Historical Commission requirements and application process. In July 2008, a staff member observed the rear bay demolished and reconstructed with stucco and vinyl windows as well as several illegal alterations to the front facade. In July 2008, violations were issued for the illegal alterations.

1917 DIAMOND STREET OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of windows, a metal door, glass block in basement windows, and mailboxes on the front facade, application of cement and paint over the brownstone base and stair on the front façade, and installation of stucco, a door, and vinyl windows at the rear.

The 1986 designation photograph shows one-over-one, wood windows with original brick molds, the historic door stripped of its pediment moldings, transom, grated basement windows, and a damaged brownstone base. A 2003 aerial photograph shows the rear ell intact and not stuccoed.

The appropriate historic features are as follows: windows on the first, second, and third stories should be one-over-one, wood, double-hung sash; the basement windows should be six-light, wood, true-divided-light sash; the front door should be a wood, double-leaf paneled door with transom and historic moldings as shown in the designation photograph of 1909 Diamond Street; the first story window sills and base should be unpainted brownstone maintaining the historic block design; and the stair should be unpainted brownstone.

Although the current windows were approved by the Historical Commission in June 2008, they were installed incorrectly and protrude dramatically from the window openings. The frames should be recessed within the openings.

The rear ell should be brick with a two-story wood bay with four one-over-one, wood, double-hung windows and wood cornices at the second and third stories. The first story should have a one-over-one, wood, double-hung window and paneled wood door.

In April 2008, the applicant was informed that the Historical Commission staff would not approve the installation of stucco on the rear elevation or bay windows and that an approval from the Historical Commission and permits from the Department of Licenses & Inspections must be obtained prior to any alterations on the historically designated building. A staff member also met in the office and on-site with the applicant on several occasions and informed him of Historical Commission requirements and application process. In July 2008, a staff member observed the rear bay demolished and reconstructed with stucco and vinyl windows as well as several illegal alterations to the front facade. In July 2008, violations were issued for the illegal alterations.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the applications for 1903, 1909, 1915, and 1917 Diamond Street to the Commission. No one represented the application.

Ms. Sell explained to the Commission that applicant had undertaken significant work to the buildings without the Commission's approvals or building permits, but with full knowledge of the Commission's jurisdiction and application processes. The applicant had worked extensively with the staff on the buildings, but ultimately chose to alter the buildings without any approvals or permits. Ms. Sell noted that two of the four buildings have been sold since the illegal work was undertaken; the applicant claims to have the authorization of the new owners to file the legalization applications. The Commission noted for the record that the applicant was not in attendance. Mr. Mattioni stated that the applicant should have attended the review.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application for 1903 Diamond Street, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9; deny the application for 1909 Diamond Street, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9; deny the application for 1915 Diamond Street, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9; and deny the application for 1917 Diamond Street, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2275 BRIDGE STREET, FRANKFORD ARSENAL, BUILDING 11

Owner: PAID/Arsenal Associates, Mark Hankin

Applicant: Mark Hankin

History: 1820, added to in 1850; individually designated, 11/29/1960

Project: Legalize doors

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application to legalize the existing illegal doors, but approval of the doors shown as revised Alternate Three on drawing S1d, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This building at the Frankford Arsenal is now used as a school. The applicant has exceeded a permit for interior renovations and installed fire safety doors without the Commission's approval. Wood and glass mid twentieth-century double-doors were removed and aluminum-and-glass-single doors were installed in their place. A photograph shows a paneled and glazed double-door on the south façade of the building. We do not have an equivalent picture for the north façade; however the applicant has provided 1957 renovation drawings showing a wider doorway with wood and glass panels matching the sidelights.

The application includes three alternate designs. Alternative One, the applicants preferred design, proposes the legalization of the new aluminum doors. Alternative Two proposes the installation of doors based on the 1957 renovation design. Alternative Three proposes a design based on the historic photograph of the building; however, it has been inaccurately rendered.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Mattioni recused owing to his involvement with the Maritime Academy Charter School. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Mark Hankin of Arsenal Associates, the property owner, represented the application.

Mr. Hankin asked the Commission to consider legalizing the aluminum and glass doors he installed. He explained that the doors allow access into a charter school. There are four classrooms in the building. Approximately 100 students use the doors about 600 times per day. He stated that he installed the doors after a City inspector rejected the doors that were in place. He asserted that the current doors are better from a safety perspective. He noted that young school children use the doors. He reported that his attorney has advised him to post a sign warning of the dangers if he is required to install facsimiles of the historic doors. He concluded that he will do whatever the Commission requires.

Mr. Thomas advised that replicas of the historic doors could provide the safety and convenience that the applicant seeks. Mr. Hankin commented that the jambs at the south side are not in good condition and will need reinforcement. Mr. Thomas stated that he has worked on many projects involving reworking historic doors to meet contemporary requirements. He suggested that Mr. Hankin reinforce the jambs with steel channels, which could be located behind the jambs, out of sight. He also noted that heavy doors can be supported appropriately with extra hinges. Mr. Thomas noted that historic double-leaf doors can be adequately replicated as wide single-leaf doors to meet current building codes. Mr. Hankin agreed to install the replicated historic doors as shown as Alternate Three in his plans.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application to legalize the existing illegal doors, but approve the doors shown as revised Alternate Three on drawing S1d, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1330 LOMBARD STREET

Owners: John Orsini & Donna DeStefano

Applicant: John Orsini

History: c.1840, altered 1905, 1990

Project: rehabilitate building for office and apartments.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the stucco height on the side wall is revised and the details for the chimney parapet wall are provided, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This mid nineteenth-century rowhouse was altered into a commercial space about 1905 with bays and a storefront. After 1985, it was stuccoed and had its front bay removed and storefront altered as well as receiving a coat of rough stucco, all without the Commission's approval. The current applicants have just purchased the property and are seeking to restore the building to its 1905 appearance on Lombard Street and put a smooth coat of stucco on the Juniper Street façade. They also propose to reopen the large gable fanlight on Juniper Street and restore the Federal style parapet wall in salvaged brick. The stucco should be removed on Juniper Street down to the base of the gable.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Owners John Orsini and Donna DiStefano represented the application.

Mr. Orsini stated that he agreed with the Architectural Committee recommendation. Several Commission members complimented him on the proposal.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the stucco height on the side wall is revised and the details for the chimney parapet wall are provided, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

412 S. CAMAC STREET

Owner: David Hoffman

Applicant: Paul Stone, Emerald Windows

History: 1830, dormer added late twentieth-century; individually designated

Project: Installation of simulated-divided-light windows

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the windows for the non-historic dormer, but denial of the windows for the front façade, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for the installation of simulated-divided-light windows on the front façade of the building. The proposed pane configuration will match the historic configuration. The existing window frames will be retained. The proposed muntins will be a composite material, not real wood.

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

Mr. Wilds stated that he recalled that the Commission has previously approved windows like those proposed in this application. Mr. Danta replied that the Commission has approved this exact window type. Mr. Amburn noted that the Committee had recommended against this window in the historic openings because the muntin bars are PVC, not wood. Mr. Wilds suggested that the Commission's primary mandate is the protection of the appearance of historic buildings. If this window adequately replicates the appearance of the historic window, then it is acceptable. Mr. Danta noted that the non-wood muntins would be painted. He observed that he had compared a sample of this window with a true-divided-light wood window and could not distinguish between them.

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

1520 RACE STREET

Owner: Friends Center Corporation

Applicant: Mark Ueland, AIA

History: c. 1850, addition c.1985

Project: construct entry vestibule

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes construction of an entry vestibule. At the August 2008 meeting, the Committee asked the applicant to simplify the design with a shed roofline and glass walls. The applicant has complied with the Committee's recommendation.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Mark Ueland represented the application.

Mr. Ueland displayed renderings of the proposed entrance and described the larger project to incorporate green, sustainable technology into the meeting house complex. The Commission members agreed that the revised design is much improved from the earlier designs rejected by the Committee.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Merriman moved to adjourn at 10:25 a.m. Mr. Schaaf 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 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.