

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

**TUESDAY, 22 MARCH 2011
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, chair
John Cluver
Rudy D'Alessandro
Shawn Evans
Nan Gutterman
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Paul Steinke, Reading Terminal Market
Tony Bracali, Friday Architects
Lucy Strackhouse, Fairmount Historic Preservation Trust
David Groverman, Centennial Café
Steve Balin, AMC Delancey
Scott Donahue
David S. Traub, David S. Traub Associates
Ron Sheldon, Kimpton Hotels
Ken Reynolds, Kimpton Hotels
Jack Paruta, Gensler
Matt Wolfe, Gensler
Cindy Hamilton, Heritage Consulting
Robert Koochagian, O'Donnell & Naccarato, Inc.
Monsignor Arthur Rodgers, Rector Primus, Cathedral of Sts. Peter & Paul
Antonio Fiol-Silva, Wallace Rogers & Todd
Martin J. Rosenblum, MJRA Architects
Arthur Willson, Foster-Willson, Inc.
Nadine Biles
Tim Kerner, Terra Studio
Ken Saul
Jose J. Hernandez, JKR Partners
James Campbell, Campbell Thomas Architects
John Christinzio, Quest Design Services
Tim Lu

Rachel Matkoski
Lisa Deats, Historic Philadelphia, Inc.
Amy Needle, Historic Philadelphia, Inc.
Michael Williams, Hill International
Lorna Katz Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Louis Castelli
Francisco Carreno
Ed Kinderliter
Vasily Kolesnik, Lifeway Baptist Church

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 433-41 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Alter and replace storefronts, install canopy and signage
Type of Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: KHP II Chestnut, LLC
Applicant: Jack Paruta, Gensler & Associates
History: 1907, James H. & John T. Windrim, architects, Lafayette Building
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Significant, 12/12/2003

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a combination of restoration and alterations to ground-floor windows and doors and the installation of a canopy, awnings, and signage. The building is being renovated as a hotel. The Commission has reviewed and approved other applications for other aspects of this renovation.

Most of the ground-floor windows would be retained and restored; louvers and other alterations would be removed. The window and door openings near the corner of 5th and Chestnut were altered from their historic conditions before designation. The corner space will be occupied by a restaurant. New windows and doors that are compatible with the historic windows and doors would be installed in those bays. A single-leaf door and windows would be installed at the 5th Street bay. A revolving door and windows would be installed at the Chestnut Street bay. Awnings would be installed at several corner bays to differentiate the restaurant from the remainder of the hotel.

The main entrance to the building, on Chestnut Street, has a vestibule that is enclosed with a non-historic metal and glass storefront system. The applicant proposes to replace the non-historic system with a glazed wall that provides more transparency. The proposed glazed wall would not alter the masonry opening. A canopy would be installed at the entrance, projecting from the glazed wall. The canopy would not attach to any historic fabric. The canopy would be entirely supported by a structural frame within the proposed glass enclosure.

Flag poles would be installed on Chestnut Street flanking the main entrance to the building. Two banners are proposed, one on 5th Street and the other on Ranstead Street. A third sign is proposed for the pediment along 5th Street. This pediment is undecorated and the installation of the proposed sign would not obstruct or destroy any architectural decoration.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Jack Paruta and Matthew Wolfe represented the application.

Mr. Paruta provided an overview of the application. He stated that the interior of the building would be completely refurbished with the retention of the historic elevator lobby and original stairs. He explained that the corner of the building at 5th and Chestnut would be occupied by a restaurant. The restaurant would be located at the ground floor and on the mezzanine.

Mr. Paruta stated that the extant storefronts are in various states of disrepair. He specified that many of the bays retain original storefronts and that those would be repaired. Mr. Paruta explained that the bays occupied by the restaurant will have awnings to differentiate the restaurant space from the hotel area.

Mr. Paruta explained the modifications to the main entrance on Chestnut Street. The non-historic glass and metal vestibule wall would be removed and a new glass wall installed in its place. A canopy would be installed within the glass wall in the two-story vestibule.

Signage would be installed at various points on the building to identify the hotel. He explained that signage would consist of two flat banners and one illuminated sign at the pediment.

Mr. Wolfe explained the awnings at the restaurant space. He noted that the design team considered situating the awnings at many different heights within the bays and settled at located them at the tops of the bays. He explained that the structure of the awnings would be tubular steel. Ms. Hawkins asked how high the awnings would be off the sidewalk. Mr. Wolfe answered that they would be about 18' to the highest point and 14'-6" to the lowest point including the skirt. Mr. Paruta explained that they had considered lowering the awnings to create a more intimate atmosphere at the sidewalk level, but felt that, at a lower location, the awnings did not work as well with the proportions of the windows. He noted that the awnings would cut the window in half if installed at a lower level. Ms. Hawkins stated that the awnings would not block the sun or rain at the height proposed. Mr. Wolfe stated that the primary function of the awnings was to give the restaurant space its own identity and distinguish it from the hotel, which occupies the remainder of the building. He acknowledged that the awnings are not proposed as functional elements to protect people outside from the elements. He reiterated Mr. Paruta's earlier comments regarding the awkward proportions and visual obstruction the awnings create at a lower level. He reiterated that they are certain that the proposed location is the most appropriate location for the awnings.

Mr. Wolfe discussed the canopy at the main entrance along Chestnut Street. He stated that the entrance is currently enclosed by a Modern aluminum storefront system that extends the entire two-story height of the vestibule. He noted that the vestibule was originally open, but was enclosed many years ago. It is their intent was to restore a sense of openness to the entrance, but retain the enclosure, which is needed as a thermal break. He stated that, based on that intention, they designed a glazed curtain wall with a free-standing canopy and canopy structure. He specified that the installation of the proposed enclosing wall in place of the extant non-historic wall would not result in the alteration or removal of any historic fabric. Mr. Wolfe described the canopy as a simply articulated box, which is respectful to the architecture of the building. He noted that the decoration of the canopy alludes to the ornamentation of the

building, but it does not compete with or replicate the original design. He also stated that the design of the canopy reflects the owner's desire for the branding of the hotel chain. He characterized the proposed curtain wall as a free-standing element that recreates the original transparency of the vestibule and allows the pedestrian to see the original entrance of the building within the vestibule. He explained that the lighting of the vestibule would also enhance the experience of the pedestrian and again aid in that sense of transparency they aim to achieve. Mr. Evans asked if the canopy structure had been engineered. Mr. Wolfe stated that the canopy is currently in a design phase, but that they know the canopy can extend 14'-6" from the building, which is the proposed cantilever. Ms. Pentz asked if they anticipated the canopy structure to be braced back to the building for additional support. Mr. Wolfe answered that the goal was not to attach the canopy to the historic masonry in the vestibule in any way. He explained that the canopy structure would be embedded one-story down into the basement of the building. He stated that the majority of the structure would be below-ground and would not be visible above ground. He stated that they are confident that no external support would be necessary. Mr. Paruta explained that there is a full basement that extends under the sidewalk, which allows them to bury all the supporting structure below ground. Mr. Evans stated that the canopy looked as if it should not work structurally and that the traditional detailing on the canopy was visually awkward. He stated that if the canopy was very "Mod" one could trust it to work structurally. Mr. Wolfe stated that they are certain the structure would work. He also stated that their primary goal is to be as sensitive as possible to the historic nature of the building.

Mr. Wolfe explained the design of the corner entrance into the restaurant space. He stated that the restaurant would be accessible from the street via a revolving door. He explained that a second pedestrian door would be located around the corner on the 5th Street elevation. This door would be used by patrons as well as support staff serving the sidewalk tables. Mr. Paruta stated that the restaurant is a standalone space and that these street access points are meant to allow for that individuality. Mr. Cluver asked if the storefronts throughout the building were all originals. Mr. Paruta answered that not all were original. He noted that the corner where the restaurant is proposed does not retain its original storefronts. The sills at the corner bays were removed when the space was renovated for a bank many years ago. Mr. Paruta identified which bays retain original storefronts. He also pointed out which bays do not retain original fabric. Mr. Paruta stated that the bays that do not retain their original storefronts would be rehabilitated with new storefronts that replicate the patterns and proportions of the original designs.

Ms. Hawkins inquired about the second bay up from the corner on 5th Street. She stated that the proposed window pane pattern is different from the rest of the bays. Mr. Wolfe explained that the proposed pattern is taken from a similar bay on the Ranstead elevation. He explained that the bay is slightly smaller than the bays surrounding it. He clarified that the storefront on Ranstead from which they took cues is original. Mr. Cluver stated that the Ranstead Street bay is more elongated and slightly different than the bays along 5th Street. Ms. Hawkins stated that the proportions of the proposed pattern looked slightly off. Ms. Hawkins asked why they could not replicate the same pattern on the bay in question with the inclusion of the pedestrian door. She stated that this may be more proportionally pleasing and consistent. Mr. Paruta explained that the knee-wall along the corner bays is much lower than the rest of the elevation. He explained that the disparity in height was the main reason why they did not include the lower bands of divisions on the new storefronts to replicate this specific historic element. Ms. Hawkins stated that visually the new storefronts did not make any sense to her. Mr. Evans inquired if the original condition at these corner bays was known. Mr. Farnham explained that the masonry knee-walls at the corner were altered in the 1970s to accommodate a bank. Mr. Cluver asked if the lower knee-wall that remains is a modification or original fabric. Mr. Farnham answered that

it was not known. He advised against removing historic fabric merely to create consistency along 5th Street.

Mr. Wolfe stated that the building steps down 12 inches at the two corner bays and that those two bays visually should read slightly differently from the rest of the elevation. Ms. Gutterman asked if the lower knee-wall was original material or if it dated from the 1970s. Mr. Paruta answered he did not know and that it was hard to tell. Mr. Cluver suggested that the two facades should be unified and both, the Chestnut and 5th Street facades, should have a continuous stone base. He clarified that the restaurant entrance should be maintained on Chestnut Street but that the 5th Street bays that currently do not have their original stone knee-walls should be restored to create a uniform elevation. Mr. Paruta acknowledged that of course a restoration was possible, but that such an approach was not currently proposed by the owner. He reiterated that the aim was to differentiate the restaurant space from the rest of the building. He also noted that they are not removing any historic fabric and that they are working with existing conditions. Others again objected to altering historic conditions merely to create consistency.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants to describe the proposed signage. Mr. Paruta stated that the banners would be illuminated, either from the back of the banner or via a discrete lighting strip at the top and bottom. He noted that the lighting would be a wash and not intended to be a strong spot light. He asserted that they want to be as sensitive to the building as possible yet be able to give the hotel a street presence. He specified that the green and white color scheme is comes from hotel chain brand and is used throughout the country. He explained that two banners would be installed, one on 5th Street and one on Ranstead Street. Mr. Paruta spoke about the internally illuminated sign at the pediment and described it as a low-profile sign with soft glow illumination. He noted that the pediment is not decorated. Ms. Hawkins inquired about the height of the letters and the height of the sign off the ground. Mr. Paruta answered that the letters in the sign would be about 18 inches tall or slightly bigger. The sign would be located about 135 feet off the ground. Mr. Wolfe clarified that the sign would be set back about two feet from the edge of the cornice, owing to the set back of the pediment. Ms. Gutterman noted that the size of the sign was limited to the raking of the pediment, which prevented them from proposing a larger sign, which would expand beyond the triangle of the pediment. Mr. Paruta agreed and stated that the proposed sign was dictated by the proportions of the pediment. Ms. Hawkins described the proposed sign as a "light beacon" and stated that she did not understand the purpose of the sign. Mr. Paruta asserted that the sign would act as a beacon to give the Hotel Monaco presence on the streetscape from a distance. He noted that the sign may not be necessarily readable from afar but that it would give the hotel a much needed presence. Ms. Hawkins stated that she could not support the sign because she did not think that the letters would be readable from a great distance. She stated that the roof-top bar would be sufficient illumination at the top of the building. She described it as a green point of light at the pediment without a real purpose.

Mr. Paruta described the metal sign with the Kimpton hotel chain logo proposed for the corner of Ranstead. Mr. Evans asked if the sign would be installed angled. Mr. Paruta answered that the slight tilt in the sign was part of the chain's logo. Mr. Paruta stated that all other proposed work on the Ranstead elevation would be restoration work.

Mr. Paruta explained that the proposed flags on Chestnut Street would be coupled on the same base. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the attachment details of the flag poles. Mr. Paruta

answered that the flag poles would be through-bolted to the steel structure in the building and not attached to the stone cladding.

Mr. Evans expressed his dislike of the banners as proposed. He stated that smaller banners would be better, but was not sure how small they should be. He also expressed hesitation about the illumination of the banners. Mr. Cluver advocated for smaller banners that would be two stories tall rather than three stories tall. Mr. Cluver also acknowledged the need for the hotel to have a street presence. Mr. Evans stated that these signs would be next to Independence Hall. Mr. Cluver recognized that the signs would be next to Independence Hall but stated that he wanted the hotel to be successful. He said that the building had been a derelict empty shell for too long and that this great historic resource should be put back into use. Mr. Evans thought that the banners would be unnecessary, since pedestrians would not be motivated to stay at the hotel as they walked down the street and saw at the banners. Mr. Paruta stated that the hotel must be identified with signage that has street presence.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she was opposed to the proposed awnings. She described them as awkward. She stated that it is strange to have awnings on just some bays and not throughout the entire elevation. She also disliked the fact that they were not intended to block sun or rain. She stated that the awnings are merely signs. Mr. Paruta reiterated that the awnings would serve to differentiate the restaurant from the hotel. He acknowledged that the awnings would also provide the restaurant tenant with an opportunity to advertise along the skirt of the awning. He described the awnings as a positive addition to the rehabilitation of the building. Ms. Pentz expressed her approval of the awnings. Reminding her fellow Committee members of their purview, she asserted that they would not have an adverse effect on the historic resource. Mr. Evans changed his opinion and said that, indeed, the applicants were very sensitive to the historic significance of the building. He expressed his support of the banners and the awnings. Mr. Cluver agreed with Mr. Evan's change of heart. Mr. Cluver stated that, if awnings and sign were to be allowed on this building at all, the way the applicant had proposed them would be the ideal way.

Mr. Cluver brought the discussion back to the non-historic storefronts at the corner of 5th and Chestnut Streets. He noted that he was still bothered by the detailing of the new storefronts. He reiterated his desire to see a horizontal band that would unify the elevation. Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant if a base in a different material would be possible. She asserted that the different materials would visually differentiate these bays from the rest and also provide the unity that Mr. Cluver sought. Mr. Paruta expressed his confusion; he asked why he should add a non-historic element merely for the sake of some abstract unity. Mr. Cluver conceded and dropped his request for bases at the corner bays.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance described the application as a very thoughtful proposal. However, he noted objected to the awnings and signs. He stated that the awnings disrupt the architectural rhythm of the elevations and obscure architectural details. He asserted that the awnings serve no purpose. He noted that the Commission had denied awnings on similar buildings. He gave the Benjamin Franklin Hotel and the Ritz Carlton Hotel as two examples. He described the banner signs as "tacky." He reminded the Committee that this building is across the street from Independence Hall. Mr. Paruta explained that the restaurant needs to be differentiated and that it must have a street presence to be successful. Mr. Gallery stated that they should look at other ways of achieving that presence.

Mr. D'Alessandro changed his earlier opinion and expressed his agreement with Mr. Gallery. Mr. Paruta noted that the awnings would not cover architectural features and that they had open sides that allowed for a view of the windows behind them. From the sidewalk and street, the historic windows will be fully visible; they will not be obstructed. He also stated that they did not propose awnings for most of the storefronts in the building and that the awnings would only be reserved for the restaurant space for the purpose of visually demarcating it from the rest of the hotel. He asserted the importance of street signage for a successful business at this location.

Mr. Cluver advised that the staff should look at the height of the proposed banners and make a final determination in regards to the height of the banners. Ms. Pentz reiterated her approval of the awnings. She noted that the applicants had proposed very respectful and minimal awnings, which would not adversely impact the building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the illuminated pediment sign and the awnings, but approval of all other aspects of the application, with the staff to review the details.

ADDRESS: 209-25 N 18TH ST

Project: Construct entrance pavilion and garden

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Cathedral Basilica of Sts. Peter and Paul

Applicant: Robert Koochagian, O'Donnell & Naccarato Inc.

History: 1846, John Notman and Napoleon LeBrun, architects, Cathedral of Sts. Peter and Paul

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

District Designation: None

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of an entrance pavilion at the southern transept of the Basilica of Sts. Peter and Paul and the creation of a garden on the southwestern corner of the cathedral's property. The area currently has a lawn with minimal landscaping.

There is already an entranceway with ADA ramp and 1950s airlock at this location at the transept; the proposed pavilion would formalize this as a main entrance. The entrance pavilion would be clad in brownstone and would connect to the Basilica and the Parish house with glass walls. The design of the pavilion is complementary to both the Basilica and the Rectory. The rear of the rectory currently has a bathroom addition and service spaces. These bathrooms and their related hallways and spaces would be refurbished and connected to the pavilion.

The existing garden at the southwestern corner of the Basilica's property would be redesigned with new landscaping and pathways. A fountain would be installed in the middle of the garden. The garden would be enclosed by an iron fence.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Gutterman recused herself from this review owing to her firm's involvement with the property. Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Monsignor Arthur Rodgers, architect Antonio Fiol-Silva, and construction manager Robert Koochagian represented the application.

Mr. Fiol-Silva described the project to the Committee. He described the setting as an architectural trinity composed of the Cathedral, the Rectory, and the Chapel of the Immaculate Conception. He noted that the area where the garden is currently located was historically occupied by a building, which obscured the southern elevation of the Cathedral. He asserted that since that elevation was not meant to be seen it was treated in a much more simplified manner than the Palladian front along 18th Street. He explained that one of the main reasons for the project was to enhance the ADA access to the Cathedral as well as to formalize the entrance at the transept. Mr. Fiol-Silva described the sequence of changes that have taken place in this area through the years. He explained that the airlock was added in the 1950s and the infill behind the parish house was constructed in the 1970s to create bathrooms for parishioners. The bathroom addition has tiled hallways. Mr. Fiol-Silva stated that they propose to remove all of the tile finishes and expose the stone cladding of the Cathedral's southern elevation as an interior finish.

Mr. Fiol-Silva described the proposed pavilion. He described it as an entrance pavilion to the transept, which will also serve as a vestibule to a gift shop. He noted that the transept entrance is very close to the altar and that parishioners could wait in this vestibule during services in order to enter the sanctuary without disrupting the services within. He explained that the pavilion was designed in a manner that would not detract from the Palladian entrance on 18th Street. He stated that they wished to make the pavilion discrete, yet respectful to and harmonious with the Cathedral. The pavilion would be connected to the Cathedral's southern elevation with glass walls. Mr. Fiol-Silva specified that the pavilion would be free standing and the masonry of the pavilion would not touch the masonry of the Cathedral. He stated that the proposed materials for the pavilion are ashlar brownstone and a granite base. He specified that the Cathedral has a granite base; the base at the pavilion would match the base of the Cathedral.

Mr. Fiol-Silva described the pavilion's architectural articulation as discrete. He noted that the pilasters and brownstone give the pavilion a dignified appearance that would signal its importance as a formal entry point into the Cathedral. However, the pavilion would be subservient to the Cathedral and Rectory. He explained that the design aimed to mediate between the grand Palladian front of the Cathedral and the Italian Renaissance Palazzo style of the Rectory. He stated that the pavilion did not have the style of those two dominating elements, but instead responded to the more Romanesque and simplified articulation of the Cathedral's southern elevation, specifically its blind arches. He acknowledged that the pilasters in the pavilion recall the Palladian entrance, yet do not compete with the Cathedral's primary elevation in any way. Mr. Fiol-Silva noted that the pavilion would allow an original arch above the transept entrance to be revealed. The arch is currently enclosed within the 1950s airlock. He further explained how the garden and the pathways create an axis to guide parishioners to the apse entrance.

Mr. Evans asked if the existing base at the Cathedral is concrete. Mr. Fiol-Silva answered that the base is granite. Ms. Pentz requested a clarification of the existing conditions at the rear of the Rectory. Mr. Fiol-Silva explained that the area is currently infilled by bathroom additions. The addition was constructed in the 1970s. He noted that the bay window at the rear of the Rectory was encapsulated within the bathroom addition and it did not open onto the exterior. He stated that they propose to light the existing stained glass windows that are extant in the bay window to give the appearance that they remain on the exterior. He asserted that that would restore the original lighting in the interior of the Rectory parlor.

Mr. Cluver asked for an explanation of the conditions at the corner of the ramp and the apse entrance. He stated that the ramp looked arbitrary to him. Mr. Fiol-Silva stated that they had done 30 or 40 schematic studies for the ramp because they wanted the ramp to be very deferential to the Cathedral and not encroach more than was strictly necessary. He explained that the profile and pathway of the ramp were meant to keep the ramp as a low-profile alteration. He clarified that the corner of the ramp against the Cathedral would be filled with soil so as not to create an empty pit that could be used by homeless people. He explained that the soil would slope away from the ramp to meet the leveled grade of the garden. He also said that, in order to provide a greater sense of safety, the proposed glass connecting the pavilion to the Cathedral's wall would allow parishioners to see out as they are about to exit into the garden. The proposed plants for the garden also enhance the sense of safety by not obscuring views. Ms. Hawkins asked on the drainage for this area. Mr. Fiol-Silva explained that there would be catch basins in any area where the water would shed towards the base. Ms. Hawkins asked if the fill would extend above the granite base at any point along that wall. Mr. Fiol-Silva stated that it would not. He asserted that they are very mindful of the drainage, but also of the possibility of creating an area where homeless could congregate. That is why they are proposing the raised slope to eliminate an empty pit at that location.

Mr. D'Alessandro expressed his support for the pavilion addition. Mr. Evan stated his support and described the pavilion as handsome. He noted that he found himself surprised at how much he liked it since he usually prefers strictly differentiated additions. He stated that the pilasters seemed oddly proportioned, but deferred to Mr. Cluver's expertise in that area.

Mr. Evans asked how the glass wall would join with the Cathedral's wall. Mr. Fiol-Silva explained that the glass wall would be butt joined and that the Cathedral's masonry would not be cut to create a groove for the glass wall. Mr. Evans criticized the proposed cornice at the pavilion. He stated that it should be more ornamented. Mr. Fiol-Silva noted that the current archbishop used to be in charge of additions and facilities at the Vatican and that he advised the design team on such matters. He stated that they completed about 30 studies for the cornice and concluded that the pavilion's cornice needed to be simple. He stated that a more ornate cornice gave the pavilion too much significance and it drifted away from the Romanesque simplicity they sought. He noted that the only highly decorated areas are the capitals of the pilasters. Mr. Cluver agreed with Mr. Evan's comment and stated that cornice seemed very harsh, owing to all of the right angles. Mr. Fiol-Silva reiterated his earlier explanation, but stated that they would look into revising it.

Mr. Evans asked if there were any muntins in the pavilion windows. Mr. Fiol-Silva answered no and reiterated that they were trying to create a simple pavilion.

Mr. Cluver stated that an S-curve shape at the cornice would probably be better than the proposed profile. He also stated that the columns at the pavilion should have entasis. Mr. Fiol-Silva clarified that they were not columns but pilasters and as such should not have entasis.

Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz expressed their support for the proposed design.

Ms. Hawkins objected strenuously to the proposal. She stated that the proposed vocabulary was inappropriate at this location. She acknowledged that her opinion was just one out of many on the Committee. She stated that it was unfortunate that they were proposing a blank face to the Parkway. She described the proposed pavilion as a "mausoleum." Mr. Evans asked why the side towards the Parkway was blank. Mr. Fiol-Silva explained that the design was based on the

blind arches of the Cathedral. He also explained that the program for the pavilion included a gift shop and they wanted to create a sense of enclosure for the retail space. He clarified that the pavilion will serve dual purposes. Mr. Fiol-Silva noted that he was on the board of the Center City District and was well aware of the enhancement on the Parkway and the significance of the Parkway. He described the project not just as entrance pavilion but also as an entrance garden. He explained that the procession around the garden was as important as the pavilion itself. All Committee members but Ms. Hawkins agreed with the applicants that the design was appropriate for the historic buildings and setting.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 2105 SPRUCE ST

Project: Construct rear addition and decks

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Nadine & James Biles

Applicant: Arthur Willson, Foster-Willson Co. Inc.

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a rooftop addition over the rear ell of the property. This residential property has a three and a half story main block with a three story rear ell. The rear ell currently has an addition that extends from the rear of the mansard roof. The proposal would extend the existing addition the entire length of the rear ell. The ell of this property faces a service alley with very limited visibility from the public-right-of-way. The most prominent view of the ell would be blocked by the much larger corner property directly adjacent to the east. The proposed addition would be clad in stucco.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the slope of the historic rear ell roof line is retained via a barge board or similar visual break on the exterior of the property, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Additions Guidelines.

Explanation: The proposed addition would be located in the most appropriate location. The addition would not alter the main façade of the building on Spruce Street. The addition would be located over a rear ell facing a service alley. The alley, however, is open to the public and it is a public right-of-way. The sloped half gabled roof of the rear ell is a character defining feature of mid nineteenth-century Philadelphia rowhouse typology. The retention of a barge board or distinctive break between the brick rear ell and the stucco addition would emphasize the historic shape of the roof and retain this character defining feature.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application.

Architect Martin J. Rosenblum, construction manager Arthur Willson, and property owner Nadine Biles represented the application.

Mr. Danta explained the staff's recommendation to indicate the half-gable slope of the rear ell with a bargeboard. Mr. Rosenblum stated that they would be open to the recommendation. However, he stated that the top courses of brick on the rear ell would have to be taken down

and rebuilt as part of the construction. He expressed his desire not to maintain it for clarity of construction and in order to have a clean break between the historic rear ell and the addition. Mr. Danta displayed an earlier drawing submitted by the applicant that showed the inclusion of the barge board. Mr. Cluver asked if the addition would be brick or stucco. Mr. Rosenblum answered that it would be finished in stucco. Mr. Rosenblum clarified that they were proposing a stucco belt course where the barge board is currently located. He stated that a wood barge board in the middle of the wall would deteriorate easily and quickly. He requested that the Committee recommend approval of the stucco bargeboard instead of the wood bargeboard. Ms. Pentz noted that the addition would barely be visible from the public-right-of-way and did not see much of a need to retain a wood barge board. Ms. Gutterman concurred.

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

ADDRESS: 2131 ST JAMES ST

Project: Install stucco

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Doug Ross & Joyce Frye

Applicant: Tim Kerner, Terra Studio, LLC

History: 1923, Spencer Roberts, architect, English Village

Individual Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to re-stucco over the existing stucco on the front façade of this rowhouse in the English Village, as well as stuccoing over the brick chimney. Adding another layer of stucco would bring the façade out further and alter the appearance, spatial relationships, and proportions of the front façade. This application also proposes to install a metal storm door at the front entrance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Architect Tim Kerner represented the application.

Mr. Kerner explained that the jalousie windows were replaced with historically appropriate windows. He stated that this work damaged the stucco around the windows. He added that the current layer of stucco is not the original stucco that was on the building and that it has a troweled texture. Ms. Pentz asked if the stucco was painted. Mr. Kerner replied that it was not. He explained that the option to patch and paint the stucco would create maintenance issues and would not have a uniform appearance. He stated that removing the stucco down to brick would damage the brick underneath because the metal lathe is fastened to the brick. He stated that stucco was removed successfully on another property in the English Village, but there was no metal lathe in that instance. He stated that the brick is a relatively soft brick. He stated that is why the owner wants to stucco over the existing stucco. Mr. Kerner pointed out that this house's façade is not in the same plane as its neighbors; therefore, adding a layer of stucco would not create an obvious change in plane.

Ms. Gutterman asked what the dimension of the proposed new layer of stucco would be. Mr. Kerner stated that there would be a base layer of ¼ inch to make an even surface, and a ¼ inch

surface layer over that. The new stucco would add at least ½ inch and at most ¾ inch to the building. Ms. Gutterman asked what would happen at the eaves and the window returns. Mr. Kerner suggested that the stucco would not look bad at the window returns and it would be in the shadow at the eaves.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that diagrams of each location would be helpful. He stated that it is very difficult to understand the application based on the verbal description.

Ms. Hawkins stated that, based on the photographs, the brick header looks flush with the existing stucco; therefore, there would to be a return of ½ inch and a need for flashing. She observed that the sills would need to be extended to project out beyond the new layers of stucco. Mr. Kerner stated that he did not think there would be a need for a sill extension. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the diagrams would be helpful in this instance.

Mr. Baron stated that he reviewed the stucco removal at the other property in the English Village. He reported that it was removed successfully. He stated that he felt that the same could be done in this instance. He stated that adding another layer would make the features of the building look sunken in.

Ms. Pentz stated that she was not convinced they could not get an acceptable patch. Mr. Kerner stated that they do not want to remove the stucco. If they cannot stucco over, then they will most likely patch and paint. Mr. Evans asked about the extent of the patching required. Mr. Kerner replied that it was at each of the window openings, the full return, the head, and the jamb.

Ms. Hawkins asked why the chimney needed to be stuccoed. Mr. Kerner responded that that is how the owner wants to repair the chimney. She asked about the storm door. Mr. Kerner stated that the storm door is to look like the storm door that was approved for a neighboring property. He stated that is a steel door painted black and custom fit to the arched opening.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that more information was needed about the condition of the stucco around the windows. She recommended patching rather than adding a layer of stucco. Mr. Evans suggested that the staff should review a mock-up patch should the owner choose to patch around the windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the added stucco layer and stuccoing the chimney, but approval of the storm door, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 19 S 21ST ST

Project: Construct addition

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Marc Ginsburg

Applicant: Jose Hernandez, JKR Partners LLC

History: 1885

Individual Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the second-floor rear bay and construct a two-story addition over a one-story rear portion of this much altered Victorian Gothic rowhouse in the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District. The addition would have a stucco finish with vinyl windows. Alterations are proposed for an existing historic window opening on the second-floor side elevation of the building. Please note that there are discrepancies in the window information provided between the plans, section, and elevations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the windows are one-over-one double-hung windows set in the plane of the wall and are a compatible material and provided the stucco is not scored or has expansion joints, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Owner Marc Ginsburg and architect Jose Hernandez represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked for a clarification on the windows. Mr. Hernandez replied that that the new windows would be double-hung to match the existing windows in the building. Ms. Gutterman asked what would happen to the mechanical components currently on the roof. Mr. Ginsburg responded that the mechanical units could be located on a bracket on the rear wall or on the roof.

Ms. Pentz asked about the proposed stucco for the addition. Mr. Hernandez stated that the score lines shown on the elevation drawings could be eliminated. Ms. Hawkins asked if it was real stucco or exterior insulation and finish system (EIFS). Mr. Hernandez replied that the addition would be parged in stucco.

Mr. Cluver asked about the bay at the second-floor rear. He noted that the bay does not appear on the property atlas. Ms. Cote stated that the bay does not appear on the atlas because it is within the footprint of the historic rear ell. She added that the bay has been altered. Mr. Cluver wondered if the Committee would require the preservation of the bay if it had not been altered.

Mr. Farnham stated that the staff conducted research and determined that there was a bay on the rear of the building historically, but it was narrower. A zoning permit from 1954, when the rear ell was expanded, shows that the bay was considerably narrower. The permit showed the bay centered over the historic rear ell and almost as wide as the ell. He stated that it was likely that the bay was significantly altered at the time the ell was widened. He also noted that the current window openings in the bay have non-historic proportions.

Ms. Hawkins asked if they were proposing vinyl windows for the addition. Mr. Ginsburg stated that they were proposing vinyl windows for the addition and one opening in the historic building. Ms. Hawkins asked if the Committee deemed vinyl windows appropriate. The Committee

members concurred that the vinyl windows would not be appropriate for the addition or historic building.

Mr. Evans stated that he did not think it was appropriate to demolish the rear bay. He suggested that staff investigate the bay to determine if it could be restored.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the windows are wood, and provided the stucco is traditional without scoring or expansion joints, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 35 S 02ND ST, UNIT C1

Project: Alter signage and awning

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Water Bridge

Applicant: John Christinzio, Quest Design Services

History: 1885

Individual Designation: 10/7/1976

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the existing letters on the flat wall signs and install new backlit letters. This application also proposes to remove the existing awning cover and install a new cloth cover. The Historical Commission reviewed and approved a similar proposal for this building in August 1999.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Tim Lu and John Christinzio represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked what was behind the flat signs. Mr. Christinzio replied that there are transom windows behind the signage. He stated that the letters are reverse channel letters with the light behind the letters. He stated that they propose to use the existing sign panel, but remove the letters and install new letters spelling "Red Zone." He stated that the awning exists. He stated that they already replaced the fabric on the existing frame. Mr. Christinzio stated that they now propose to paint the flat panels white instead of black. He stated that the letters are aluminum. Mr. Farnham noted that the Commission would not approve panels over transoms today. However, the panels are extant and legal.

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

ADDRESS: 121 BECK ST

Project: Construct rear addition

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rachel Matkoski

Applicant: James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Company Architects

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 1/26/1965

District Designation: None

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story rear addition over an existing one-story addition. The new addition would be clad in stucco with six-over-nine double hung windows with brick row lock course headers and sills. French doors are proposed for the rear of the existing one-story addition. The existing gable roof on the main block would remain. The new roof would meet the building at the cornice line.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Owner Rachel Matkoski and architect James Campbell represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked if the new addition would be constructed over the existing non-historic, one-story addition. Mr. Campbell stated that that decision would be made in the field, but that it was likely that the one-story shed addition would need to be demolished because the walls are too thin to support the new addition. Mr. Cluver clarified that this application actually proposes to demolish the shed addition and construct a three-story addition. Mr. Campbell confirmed that that is likely the case. He stated that the shed addition is not historic and the new addition would be within the same foot print. Ms. Gutterman observed that the neighbors on either side of this property have one-story additions. Ms. Hawkins asked about the visibility of the new addition from the public right-of-way. Mr. Campbell stated that you may be able to see a portion of the addition from S. Howard Street, but it would be inconspicuous. Mr. Campbell stated that they endeavored to make this addition consistent with the neighborhood. Ms. Matkoski stated that she is working with her adjacent neighbors to ensure that the construction would not adversely impact them.

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

ADDRESS: 1126-36 ARCH ST

Project: Enlarge mezzanine, construct restrooms, relocate kitchen, alter aisle, add partitions

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Reading Terminal Market Corporation

Applicant: Tony Bracali, Friday Architects-Planners, Inc.

History: 1893, Wilson Brothers, architects, Reading Terminal Market

Individual Designation: 2/5/1981

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes several changes to the interior of Reading Terminal Market.

This application proposes straightening what is called Avenue D, the north-south aisle running along the eastern edge of the market. Currently, Avenue D twist and turns as it runs around the freight elevator area and other obstruction. The application proposes to straighten the aisle by shifting some vendor and storage space and then realigning the walkway.

This application proposes creating a flexible rental room along Avenue D at the east end of the Center Court. The room would be separated from the public space by a sliding butt-glazed wall. A large sign reading "Rick Nichols Room" would be installed over the entrance to the room.

This application also proposes demolishing the inadequate restrooms, which do not meet code, and replacing them with new, larger restrooms. Also, the demonstration kitchen would be relocated.

The application also proposes enlarging a mezzanine area, which currently houses the administrative offices for the market. The current space is not adequate for the market's needs. A conference room would be added at the west end of the mezzanine, extending out over a non-historic vendor space. The extension would be clad in corrugated metal and windows.

On 11 February 2011, the Historical Commission reviewed and approved this application in-concept. Since the Historical Commission meeting, the applicant submitted new drawings with final floor plans, details of finishes, and signage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Paul Stenke, the Reading Terminal Market General Manager, and architect Tony Bracali represented the application.

Mr. Steinke introduced the project and stated that the concept of the proposal has not changed since it was last presented to the Committee. However, choices have been made regarding materials and finishes. He added that the board elected to name the multi-purpose room after Rick Nichols, retired food writer for the Philadelphia Inquirer. He explained that the revisions to the market floor are meant to be in character with the aesthetic of the historic public market and to best serve the needs of the market's customers and merchants. He noted that the number of visitors to the market has increased significantly.

Mr. Bracali compared the differences in this application to their earlier in-concept proposal. The ceiling of the Rick Nichols room, he explained, had been a solid ceiling with an apron. He stated that the ceiling has been lightened and the apron removed from this application. He stated the signage will be affixed to a steel beam on the glass wall. Mr. Bracali explained that the window sizes on the mezzanine have been reduced, and the walls of the mezzanine will be clad in corrugated metal like the existing cladding. He explained that the glazing of the mezzanine will be in similar size to existing openings and will have vertical steel plate divisions in the glass. He stated that the fasteners will be exposed and will appear more "tectonic."

Ms. Pentz asked how the mezzanine will be supported. Mr. Bracali responded that it was more cost effective and practical to hang the mezzanine from the ceiling than support it from the floor, as originally proposed.

Ms. Hawkins asked how the ceiling of the Rick Nichols room is rendered. Mr. Bracali responded that it has a perimeter of dry wall and that one will be able to see above the ceiling to the utilities and rafters.

Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant for details of the signage. Mr. Bracali stated that the signage will be a non-illuminated, flat metal letter face with an applied aluminum finish.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant about the safety of the translucency of the glazing in the demonstration kitchen. Mr. Bracali stated that he would like to render the glass with a transition or sill so as not to create a tripping hazard.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he met with the applicants one day before the review. He explained that some his suggestions that were discussed at the meeting have not been raised at this meeting. He stated the glass wall of the demonstration kitchen should have a higher sill. He opined that the butt-glazing system of the mezzanine is not compatible with the historic aesthetic of the market and that the windows be treated as smaller openings within a wall, similar to the existing mezzanine windows. Mr. Steinke confirmed that they met yesterday and that he agreed with Mr. Gallery's suggestions, but they did not have sufficient time to incorporate the changes into their plans. He stated that he would like to explore options for framing and other devices to introduce division in the mezzanine windows and also options to ensure safety at the demonstration kitchen wall. He noted that they would work out the details before the Commission meeting.

Ms. Hawkins stated she agrees that the full transparency of the butt-glazing could cause a tripping hazard and that a differentiating device could be used to mitigate that problem. She agreed with Mr. Gallery's observation about the mezzanine windows and opined that corrugated metal next to butt-glazing is not a compatible juxtaposition.

Mr. Bracali stated that he is willing to make the revisions requested by the Committee and his client. He added that the foreground of the mezzanine is comprised of mostly mechanical equipment. He explained that several lengths of ductwork will be relocated around the extension and it was his intention to lighten the mezzanine. He added that he viewed this design as a compromise.

Mr. Steinke stated that there are correct design solutions for different situations. He explained that he has observed Modernist approaches in some European public markets, but that Philadelphia is more conservative. He added that the conservative approach is the charge in Reading Terminal Market. He stated that he would work with Mr. Bracali and the Commission's staff to find a more conservative solution.

Ms. Pentz stated that she approves of the application as submitted.

Mr. Bracali and Mr. Steinke stated that they could redesign the mezzanine windows to have more articulation. Mr. Gallery suggested that the changes could be made prior to the Commission meeting.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the mezzanine windows are articulated and the glazing in the demonstration kitchen is treated for safety, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 150 S INDEPENDENCE W ML

Project: Install banners

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: PLB Partners LP

Applicant: Amy Needle, Historic Philadelphia, Inc.

History: 1926, Horace Trumbauer, architect, Public Ledger Building

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install two banners on the northeast corner of the Public Ledger Building, covering two pilasters. The banners would be hung from existing banner attachments, where banners previously hung at this location. The attachments are a series of pulleys bolted to the granite and marble entablature. The Commission has no evidence of an approval of the existing banner attachments, but it does have evidence that they existed in 2005. The staff visited the site and observed that the banner attachments have eroded marble pilasters at several points. Therefore, the staff suggests that the pulley system, which is damaging the building, be removed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 7, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Project manager Michael Williams and Amy Needle and Lisa Deets of Historic Philadelphia represented the application.

Mr. Williams explained that the organization, Historic Philadelphia, took over the Lights of Liberty organization in 2008. He stated that the previous banners were installed under the Lights of Liberty program in the early 2000s. Ms. Hawkins asked if approval was obtained for the banner installation. Mr. Williams stated that he contacted the previous organization and was told that approvals were obtained, but did not know from which organizations. He explained that the existing banners were an existing condition inherited by Historic Philadelphia. He acknowledged that there was damage to the marble and the previous banners are falling apart. Therefore, their proposal is to update the banner system and repair the marble damage. He described the proposed application of a silicone coating to avoid further abrasion from the clips. Ms. Hawkins asked if there were any details that he could provide. Mr. Williams responded that he could obtain them. Ms. Gutterman asserted that the attachment details would be necessary to review in order to evaluate their potential effect on the structure. Mr. Evans argued that a plastic coating would eventually erode.

Ms. Hawkins asked Committee members if the proposed banners' sizes and locations are appropriate for this building. Mr. Evans responded that they were not. Mr. Cluver asked the applicant if there is any other signage for Historic Philadelphia on the building. Mr. Williams replied that there is nothing but a small sign that reads "Historic Philadelphia." He stated the organization had presented a previous application to replace the entrance awning, but that it never came to fruition. Mr. Evans observed that there is currently a large digital screen inside that commands visibility from the outside. Ms. Needle asserted that signage is necessary to explain what is happening inside the building. The building, she continued, looks like an office building. They would like it to read as a tourist attraction and resource. She explained that the banner will explain the function of Historic Philadelphia and that tickets and tours to significant

landmarks are available inside. Ms. Hawkins stated that banners are not appropriate at this location and at the proposed height off the ground. She suggested using the window glazing for signage. Ms. Needle asked if the precedent was set by the previous banner installation. Ms. Gutterman clarified that it is unclear if the previous banners were legal. She also stated that alterations performed in the past may not be appropriate today. Mr. Williams explained that their proposal was based on the assumption that the banners were approved. Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant considered using the window glazing. Ms. Needle responded that they wanted to keep the windows clear. Ms. Hawkins asserted that they could keep the windows clear and also achieve street visibility. Mr. Williams asked the Committee if their objection to their proposal concerned the banner location or size. Ms. Hawkins stated that banners are not appropriate below the storefront cornice level. Ms. Pentz stated that this corner of the building is a sensitive location and she would like to see alternative signage proposals. Mr. Williams asked the Committee if utilization on an existing three-prong flagpole above the entrance on Chestnut Street would be an option. Ms. Hawkins responded that flags on the existing prongs would be preferable to banners. Mr. Cluver stated that the applicants need signage that can be easily recognized by visitors who are unfamiliar with this building and the area. He suggested that the applicants explore other signage options.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he agreed with the Committee members that banners are inappropriate at this location. He asserted that the building has a prominent awning and internal digital display that call attention to the tourist services. He suggested using window signage.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 7, 9, and 10.

ADDRESS: 541 PINE ST

Project: Construct garage, ADA ramp, and deck

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Louis Castelli

Applicant: Louis Castelli

History: 1970

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a garage with roof deck and a curb cut on the 6th Street side of this property. The additions are proposed for rear parking and ADA access to the building. The garage would be built with brick to match the main house with blue stone coping. The garage doors would be paneled to match the front door of the house in design and color. The existing sidewalk brick would be reinstalled.

There is an existing brick garden wall at the rear of the building on 6th Street. Behind the wall is a temporary ramp that provides the owner with access to the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Louis Castelli and Francisco Careno represented the application.

Referring to his cover letter and submission materials, Mr. Castelli explained that there is a precedent for garages in the Society Hill Historic District. He opined that providing his own parking would be advantageous to the city as he would not take a spot on his street. He explained that it sometimes takes him more than one hour to find a parking spot. He explained that he is handicapped and cannot walk more than one block, owing to arthritic back pain. Therefore, he uses a scooter for mobility and a ramp that occupies his courtyard space to access the house. He explained that the proposal would create a covered space for the scooter. He stated that he has applied for an on-street handicapped space, but that those spaces are never guaranteed and may be occupied by someone else at any time.

Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant if he discussed the proposal to raise the brick wall with the neighbors. Mr. Castelli responded that he has discussed the proposal with the neighbors and they are in favor of the application. He explained that a glass wall is proposed on the north and east side of the garage so as not to obstruct light.

Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant if the project requires a curb cut. Mr. Castelli asserted that it will require a curb cut.

Lorna Katz Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that the Association opposes the project on zoning and safety issues. She explained that it is not opposed to the application on historic preservation grounds.

Ms. Pentz stated that the project would not have an adverse effect on the district. Mr. Evans disagreed and stated that off-street parking is not in character with the district.

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

ADDRESS: 9554 BUSTLETON AVE

Project: Construct rear addition

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lifeway Baptist Church

Applicant: Vasily Kolesnik, Lifeway Baptist Church

History: 1885, Hazlehurst & Huckel, architects, Pennypack Church, Old Lower Dublin Baptist Church

Individual Designation: 11/29/1960, 5/28/1968

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a second-story addition to a non-historic, rear, one-story building. The addition would be clad in stucco and roofed with Slate-line asphalt shingles. The existing structure is set back from the historic church and the connection will not be visible from the public right-of-way. The connection between new and old is at the rear, facing a parking lot, and the building at the rear, on which the addition would be constructed, has no historical significance. A Gothic arched window would be removed from the rear of the church, but the opening would be maintained as an interior feature.

The Historical Commission reviewed a similar application in September 2009. The Commission denied the application owing to incompleteness. Minutes from the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission noted a lack of information such as connection details, materials, and other design aspects. The current application contains information and details that were previously missing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Edward Hinderliter and Vasily Kolesnik of Lifeway Baptist Church represented the application.

Mr. Cluver stated that the current façade of the addition has a pediment over the entry. He argued that the ramp proposal does not recognize the extant pediment and columns. He asked the applicant if he considered a ramp that would link to the connector. Mr. Hinderliter responded that the connector is very small and would not work with the length of ramp required.

Mr. Cluver stated that the plan of the portico does not match the elevation because the columns are not shown and railings are missing. He argued that the emergency egress at the rear of the addition would not meet code and its revision would change the nature of the Committee's review.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the elevator serves the office level. Mr. Kolesnik responded that it does not. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the applicant verify the overrun of the elevator to be sure it would not penetrate the roofline. Ms. Hawkins also suggested that the applicant verify that the addition of more office space does not require ADA accessibility.

Ms. Pentz asked what the existing roofing material is on the main church. Ms. Sell confirmed that the staff recently approved an application to replace the roof with a slate-line asphalt shingle in the historic rectangular and fishscale pattern.

Mr. Evans stated that there are several code-compliance issues regarding the ramp and front doors. Ms. Hawkins asked if the pediment at the non-historic building would be retained or removed. Mr. Kolesnik stated that it will be lengthened and widened. Ms. Hawkins concluded that the porch will be fully reconstructed.

Mr. Gutterman stated that the project is feasible in-concept, but that the Committee cannot approve the application as submitted because of several inconsistencies in the drawings. She asked the applicant if the elevator will access the second-floor offices and if the top of the elevator shaft will penetrate the roofline. Mr. Kolesnik stated that the elevator will only provide access to the main building and the overrun will remain under the roofline of the gable, as drawn.

Ms. Hawkins stated there are inconsistencies with the drawing in plan and elevation. She questioned the design of the railing. She disputed several aspects of the ramp design, for example, the clearance for the ramp, size of steps relative to the front door, swing of the door relative to the ramp, radius and clearance at the landing, and width of the door. She stated there may be code compliance issues with the exposed emergency stair at the rear of the addition.

Mr. Farnham asked the Committee to focus on the preservation of historic fabric. He stated that the staff does not consider the rear building to be historic. He asked the Committee members if they believe that the rear building has historic significance. Ms. Hawkins stated that the rear

building may not have historic significance, but there is a lack of resolution between plans and elevations and the relationship of the addition to the church. Ms. Hawkins asked the other Committee members if they believe the addition has historic merit. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Farnham if the rear addition was included in the nomination. Mr. Farnham responded that the building was apparently individually designated in 1960 and again in 1968. The designation predates the use of nominations. He explained that it appears that the church was designated to commemorate the congregation of the Pennypack Baptist Church, which constructed this building in the 1880s, after it outgrew its eighteenth-century building. Mr. Farnham noted that the original church, which is still owned and again used by the Baptist congregation, is located nearby. Although the church was built by prominent late-nineteenth century architects Hazlehurst & Huckel, the only information provided in the designation was the name of the building and address. He stated the rear building was likely constructed in the 1920s and was likely not deemed historic by the Commission in the 1960s.

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

ADDRESS: 417 S 08TH ST

Project: Add gate for parking

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Marc Neff

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Architects

History: 1835

Individual Designation: 6/28/1976

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes removing a section of a rear garden wall on Addison Street and installing a wooden gate to provide access to a new parking space in the yard. The curb would be lowered at the entrance to the parking.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Site Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Architect Rustin Ohler represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the proposed gate is appropriate to the context, which includes many parking areas and houses with garages in the front facades. The Committee members agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Site Guideline.

Mr. Cluver excused himself from the meeting.

ADDRESS: 2307 ST ALBANS ST

Project: Construct roof deck and stair house

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: F. Scott Donahue

Applicant: F. Scott Donahue

History: 1869, Charles Leslie, developer

Individual Designation: 9/30/1969

District Designation: None

OVERVIEW: The application proposes to construct a deck and stair house on the main block of this rowhouse. The building does have a rear bay where a small deck could be located. Small decks have been installed on several of the rear bays on this block. The Commission has never approved a deck for a main block on this street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

Explanation: The Guideline requires that, for approval, the deck and stair house must be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and must not damage or obscure character-defining features.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Property owner Scott Donahue and architect David Traub represented the application.

Mr. Baron reported that the staff reviewed a mock-up at the house to assess visibility from the street. During the assessment of the mock-up, the staff determined that the proposed deck would be conspicuous from the public right-of-way. After the review of the mock-up, the applicant revised the roof deck to be accessed without the stairhouse. He provided a revised drawing to the Committee.

The Committee and staff reviewed the new drawing. Mr. Baron noted that the new deck proposal could fit onto the rear ell portion of the roof plan without sacrificing square footage or views. He explained that the Commission had a history of approving decks on rear ells. He asked whether the applicant would be willing to shift the deck to the rear ell. Mr. Donahue said that he could do that.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the original and revised designs, but to approve a deck on the rear ell without the stairhouse, but with a hatch on the main block of the building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 2310 DELANCEY PL

Project: Install deck, windows, and doors

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: AMCD Walnut Street Associates LP

Applicant: John Laning, JC's Home Improvements

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rebuild an existing deck on the rear ell of this house. There is no evidence that the existing deck was constructed with a building permit or the Commission's approval. The same applicant submitted a very similar application to the Commission earlier this year for the adjacent property at 2312 Delancey Place. In January 2011, the Commission:

denied the legalization of the deck, but approved a deck pulled back eight feet from the south façade of the rear ell, provided the door and window surrounds are painted and the rear brick cornice is repaired and repointed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

The applicant has already altered the rear window openings and installed a vinyl sliding door and vinyl double-hung window without a building permit or the Commission's approval. In general, when reviewing applications to convert a rear window opening into a door to access a deck, the Commission has required the retention of the original window opening, but allowed it to be cut down to install a door, provided the new door is fenestrated to replicate the original window size and pane configuration.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the deck, but denial of the alterations to the window openings and installation of the vinyl door and window, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

Explanation: The alterations of the window openings and the installation of the door and window do not satisfy Standards 6 or 9. The alterations of the window openings resulted in the destruction of historic materials, features, and spatial relationships. The new door and window do not match the old in design, color, texture, or materials.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Steven Balin represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained the Commission's approval for Mr. Balin's adjacent property to the Architectural Committee. The Committee members agreed that they could recommend approval of a deck pulled back the eight feet from the rear façade as the Commission done. They asked Mr. Balin when he had installed the door and windows in this building. He said that he undertook the work about three months ago. The Committee members stated that the Standards allowed them to recommend approval of a new single-leaf wood door configured like a six-pane window and two six-over-six windows within the width of the masonry openings that existed prior to the beginning of work.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the deck, provided it is set back eight feet from the rear facade, denial of the illegal vinyl windows and sliding door, and approval of a single-leaf wood door configured

like a six-pane window and two six-over-six windows within the width of the masonry openings, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 4700 STATES DR

Project: Install temporary tent on gravel base

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: David Goverman, Ohio House Café

History: 1876, Ohio State House, Heard & Sons, architects

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: None

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a temporary tent on the lawn adjacent to the Ohio State House, one of the few buildings to survive from the Centennial Exposition of 1876. The Ohio State House stands near the intersection of Belmont and Montgomery Avenues in West Fairmount Park. The building is owned by the City and leased to a restaurant operator. A large, original annex to the building once stood in the approximate location of the proposed tent. The tent would be temporary; it would be used seasonally and stored out of season. The tent would not connect to or attach to the historic building in any way. The tent would sit atop a gravel bed with the structure and floor supported by paving stones. Much of the tent would be located on what is now the parking area. The parking area would be reduced in size to accommodate the tent.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10 and the Setting Guideline.

Explanation: The proposed tent would be temporary and reversible. It would be located at the rear of the building, where the large, one-story annex once stood. It would not impact the primary views of the building from Belmont Avenue or States Drive.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Lucy Strackhouse of the Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust and business owner David Goverman represented the application.

Ms. Strackhouse stated that the tent would be rectangular and located at the rear of the building, away from States Drive. It would be located where the one-story frame addition was located. The tent would be 2,400 sf, 60 feet by 40 feet. She stated that there would be no connection to the historic building. On rainy days, a small marquee tent would be erected between the main tent and the building, but it would not connect to the building. It would provide access to the restrooms in the building. The marquee tent would be about six to eight feet wide and 15 feet long. The main tent would be about 15 feet from the building. The tent would not be as wide as the building.

Ms. Pentz asked about archaeology. Ms. Strackhouse stated that they would not disturb the surface. The tent would sit on gravel and occasional paving stones, which would support the poles and platform legs. The tent would not have a permanent foundation.

Ms. Strackhouse stated that the tent would be stored during the colder weather. Nothing would be permanent. It is all reversible.

The Committee members recommended that the applicants provide a real scale architectural plan for the tent at the Commission meeting.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10 and the Setting Guideline.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:57 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 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.

Additions Guidelines: Recommended: Designing a rooftop addition when required for the new use that is set back from the wall plane and is inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street.

Additions Guidelines: Not Recommended: Designing a new addition that obscures, damages, or destroys character-defining features of the historic building.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as ... decks and terraces ... when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

Setting Guideline: Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving building and landscape features which are important in defining the historic character of the setting. Such features can include roads and streets, furnishings such as lights or benches, vegetation, gardens, and yards, adjacent open space such as fields, parks, commons or woodlands, and important views or visual relationships.

Site Guideline: Recommended: Designing new onsite parking, loading docks, or ramps when required by the new use so that they are as unobtrusive as possible and assure the preservation of the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.