MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

TUESDAY, 23 FEBRUARY 2010
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DAVID AMBURN, CHAIR

PRESENT
Shawn Evans, Acting Chair
John Cluver
Rudy D'Alessandro
Dan McCoubrey
Nan Gutterman

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

ALSO PRESENT
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Joe Schiavo, Old City Civic Association
Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association
Christopher Miller, John Milner Architects
Roy Pieroni, Aeratis
Jenny Ly
Eugene Bukh, Walnut Street Equity Partners
Jared Felderman, Walnut Street Equity Partners
Judi Forte, Hopkinson House
Anthony Kelly, Hopkinson House
Myra Ester, Society Hill Civic Association
Theresa Shephard, Klein & Hoffman, Inc.
Midori Kurihana, A Pickled Phoenix
Vera Tse, A Pickled Phoenix
Charles Peruto
Richard Sanford, Sanford Architects

CALL TO ORDER
Mr. Evans called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman and Pentz and Messrs. Cluver, D'Alessandro, and McCoubrey joined him.

2420 GRAYS FERRY AVENUE
Owner: Toll Naval Associates
Applicant: Chuck Breder
History: 1827-1833, William Strickland, architect
Project: Install composite deck on porches.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a composite decking material at the verandahs at the front and rear of Biddle Hall, the main historic building at the Naval Home. The existing mahogany deck is not original. It was installed in 2005, when Biddle Hall was rehabilitated as condominiums. The existing deck has failed and it presents a considerable maintenance cost to the condominium association. The applicant proposes to replace the existing wood decking with a synthetic composite decking material that would nearly replicate the dimensions and appearance of the original.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Roy Pieroni, a representative of the decking manufacturer, and Chuck Breder of Toll Brothers represented the application.

Mr. Cluver stated that the central question for him was whether the problem with the decking was caused by a material failure or an installation error. He stated that, if the problem resulted from a material failure, then he would be willing to support the replacement decking. However, he contended that the most likely cause of the problem was an installation error. Also, he suggested that the lack of information in the application was problematic. Mr. Danta provided samples of the proposed decking to the Committee. Mr. D'Alessandro noted the buckling of the wood decking in the photographs and asserted it resulted from an installation error. He posited that the wood tongue-and-groove decking was installed too tightly. Mr. Cluver noted that the wood is rotting and suggested that resulted from inadequate ventilation. Mr. D'Alessandro reported that the wood flooring available today is not old growth and therefore is prone to failing. He stated that he prefers real wood, but understands that composites will become more prevalent as quality wood becomes less and less available.

Mr. Breder described the composite material as similar in appearance to the extant mahogany decking. He reported that this material has been used in other historic applications. He noted the failure of the decking and explained that he is attempting to reduce the annual maintenance costs of $20,000 that the condominium association now endures.

Mr. Cluver observed that the composite decking has two grooves in the base that historic flooring does not. He stated that they would be visible where the flooring overhangs the edges of the verandahs by several inches. He asked if the ends of the strip flooring would be capped with a trim piece. He also asked the applicants to state whether the extant flooring was installed correctly. He asked if it is pitched correctly to allow drainage and if it is ventilated correctly. He asserted that the composite flooring would also fail if it is not installed correctly. He again stated that the Commission should not approve the composite material if the wood flooring is failing because it was installed incorrectly. Mr. Breder responded that the wood flooring is pitched and ventilated correctly. Mr. Cluver read from the specifications of the composite decking, which indicate that the composite must be installed carefully to avoid early failures. Mr. Pieroni stated that a ¼-inch pitch is recommended. He also discussed the ventilation requirements. He recommended cross ventilation. He added that the composite decking will not absorb water like

wood. He stated that the material has been tested under extreme conditions and has not buckled. He also noted that the decking is toe nailed. Ms. Pentz asked why the mahogany decking had failed so quickly. Mr. Breder said that moisture caused the failures. He explained that the masonry building is susceptible to moisture problems. He reported that the failures are not as prevalent on the front of the building, where the ventilation may be better. Mr. Breder said that the decking on the rear verandahs must be replaced immediately.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the dimensions of the wood decking. Mr. Breder stated that it is 5/8-inches thick. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the decking may not have been specified correctly; it is not as thick as typical wood decking. Mr. Breder said that it was specially ordered.

The Committee members asked if the composite decking can be painted. Mr. Breder replied that it can be painted, but they do not plan to paint it. Mr. Pieroni explained that the composite decking would remain consistent in color, fading only very minimally.

Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro both asserted that the wood decking failures resulted incorrect installation, not faulty materials. Mr. Breder stated that the wood is rotting, indicating a material failure.

Mr. Cluver asked again about the trim detail proposed for the ends of the decking strips. He noted that he is concerned about the visibility of the undersides of the decking, which are slotted or ridged. Mr. Pieroni stated that they would cap the ends with trim. Mr. Breder added that they would comply with the Committee's advice in this matter. Mr. Pieroni described the trim as a bull nose capping.

Mr. Evans contended that Biddle Hall is a building of international significance and should be treated as such. He advocated for the replacement of the historic material.

Ms. Pentz stated that she would like to review the 2005 deck plans to determine whether the installation was flawed. She suggested that the applicants send a piece of the extant wood flooring for testing to determine whether it is the material specified in the 2005 plans. Mr. D'Alessandro recommended that the applicants retain an independent consultant to investigate the reasons for the premature failure. The Committee members agreed that they could not offer a recommendation on the replacement material without additional information. They decided that the application was incomplete without the information.

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

1701 DELANCEY PLACE
Owner: Tenth Presbyterian Church
Applicant: Christopher Miller, AIA
History: 1854, John McArthur, architect
Project: Enclose rear porch and install ADA ramp

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to enclose an open-air porch at ground-floor. The porch is located on the west side of the property at the rear of a side yard. The yard is closed-off from the Spruce Street by a wrought iron gate. The applicant proposes to enclose the porch and

create an ADA accessible entrance. The existing iron columns and exposed lintel would remain in place and exposed. The proposed masonry enclosure would be completely reversible.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Christopher Miller represented the application.

Mr. Danta introduced additional photographs of the project site.

Ms. Gutterman asked how the new brick wall would engage with the existing iron columns and lintel. Mr. Miller replied that the details are not yet fully developed, but the brick would abut the existing metal structure and a sealant would be applied to create a weather-tight joint. He added that the new wood detailing would be based on and sympathetic to the wood detailing around the windows on the church building. Ms. Gutterman asked about the extant rainwater conductor. Mr. Miller explained that new rainwater conductors would be incorporated into the new walls and tied into the drainage system. Mr. Evans asked why the wall would abut the columns rather than being set back behind them. Mr. Miller responded that the location of the wall relative to the existing structure was determined by the need to tie into the existing lintel as well as desire to create as much square footage as possible.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the choice of the brick for the walls. He stated that he would prefer glass or some other material that would clearly indicate that this had been an open porch. Mr. Cluver added that brick over CMU with insulation would result in a very thick wall. Mr. Miller stated that his firm had developed 10 schemes during their careful study of this project. He explained that, as an exterior wall, it must have one-hour fire rating. He stated that, owing to the mechanical systems, a transparent wall would be inappropriate. He concluded that this scheme was preferred by the architects and their client.

Mr. Evans claimed that the project would not satisfy ADA requirements. Mr. Miller disagreed, stating that the entrance is currently accessible and would be maintained in its current configuration. Mr. Cluver asked if the goal of the project was create new space to replace the space being used for the new internal elevator. Mr. Miller stated that that was correct.

Mr. Cluver asserted that, if brick is used instead of glass, then it should be pulled back from the columns as Mr. Evans had suggested. Mr. Miller stated that the infilling of the porch would be a relatively minor alteration at a point a great distance from the street, at the rear of a gated side alley. Mr. Danta showed photographs indicating that the work site would be a great distance from the public right-of-way. Mr. Evans asked about the date of the addition of the second-floor room that created the covered porch. Mr. Miller stated that he did not know the date of the addition. Several Committee members opined that the second-floor addition that created this covered area at the first floor is an oddity that is not original to the structure.

Mr. Evans asked about the foundation for the new enclosing walls. Mr. Miller explained that a new foundation would be engineered that would preserve the foundation under the existing column. Mr. Miller stated that space is limited at this active church and an additional 250 square feet is very important to the client.

Mr. Evans suggested eliminating the historic columns altogether. Mr. Miller stated that they have developed a scheme to maintain a water-tight joint between the new brick wall and existing

columns. Mr. Miller contended that retaining the columns is the best preservation solution, even if it makes the design more complicated.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the exterior windows that will be enclosed in the new space. Mr. Miller stated that they had studied the problem carefully. One of the two windows will be cut down for a door. He stated that they will fur the wall out and maintain as much of the window elements in place as possible.

The Architectural Committee members agreed that infilling this area was acceptable. They also agreed that the review of the joint and flashing details could be relegated to the staff. The Committee members agreed that the brick was acceptable, even if other materials might be more appropriate.

Mr. Evans asked if the new brick walls would be load bearing. Mr. Miller stated that they would not be load bearing. Mr. Evans asked about the maintenance problems that might arise with the brick wall and column on the property line. Mr. Miller stated that the column and wall would not be on the property line. It would be slightly within the property line. He contended that the flashing details would adequate to protect the columns from water infiltration and rust. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that this building is very well maintained; he asserted that the Committee should leave the maintenance details to the property owner.

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

115-117 N. 3RD STREET
Owner: Olde North Third LP
Applicant: James M. Francis
History: c. 1840; individually designated on 12/31/1984; contributing to the Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003
Project: Reconstruct rear wall

OVERVIEW: This application proposes two options to reconstruct the rear or east walls of these adjacent buildings. Option A proposes a four-bay series of tripartite wood casements and single casements with Juliette balconies. Option B proposes six bays of wood casements and Juliette balconies on the outer bays. Both options propose brick elevations and window openings to match the height of neighboring window openings.

On 26 January 2010, the Architectural Committee reviewed a proposal to reconstruct the rear in a modern design using a series of aluminum awning windows, Hardieboard panels, and balconies. The Committee recommended denial of the application pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and stated that the design is not compatible in materials, proportions, and patterns of the historic rear facades. The applicant withdrew the proposal before the February 2010 Commission meeting.

These properties are part of a row of eight Greek Revival buildings that contribute to the historic significance of Old City. Not only are these buildings important because of their age and architectural style, but they are exceptionally well-preserved and have retained their original design, configuration, and materials. The consistency in the row is demonstrated best in the

front facades, but is also evident at the rears, where the original brick, window openings, lintels, and sills survive.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Vera Tse and Midori Kurihana represented the application.

Ms. Kurihana stated that her design team prefers Option A because it allows for more light and air to enter the buildings. She presented photographs of the existing conditions and described the rears as covered with stucco and fenestrated with one-over-one replacement windows. She stated that the rears historically had double-hung windows. She would like to maintain the same rhythm as the adjacent buildings through window appearance and sill and head heights. She added that she maintained the line of the cornice with the neighboring buildings. Ms. Tse echoed that they tried to replicated the six-over-six pane pattern to stay within the historic vocabulary.

Ms. Pentz commended the architects for the great improvement of these designs over the previous submission and stated she is in favor of Option A. She inquired about the material of the sills. Ms. Kurihana stated the sills would be limestone.

Mr. Evans asked why the staff preferred Option A over Option B. Ms. Sell replied that Option B has more bays of windows, thereby forcing the window openings to be more narrow and crowded. She added that Option B is really a historicist interpretation of a contemporary elevation. She concluded that, because the walls will be reconstructed, Option A meets the contemporary requirements without giving a false historicist impression. Mr. Evans opined that Option B gives a false impression because it looks like a historic elevatoin typically found in the 1880s industrial factory. Ms. Kurihana interjected that she understood that the buildings were historically used for commercial and storage enterprises. Mr. Evans stated that he was not concerned with the historic use, but rather the buildings' expression. Ms. Tse explained that, in Option A, the new window pattern speaks in a new language that is now appropriate because the two buildings are being joined as one property. Ms. Kurihana added that, currently, the rears have mismatched alterations from the 1970s and their mission, as architects, is to bring back the historic vocabulary. Mr. Evans disagreed that these designs achieve their mission. Ms. Tse asserted that they are introducing a fenestration scheme that is appropriate to the new use. She explained that the new use is residential; the occupants will want more light and air into their living space.

Mr. Evans asked how the cornice will be articulated. Ms. Kurihana stated that the cornice will match those of the adjacent buildings.

Mr. Cluver noted that, in either scenario, the Committee should consider that the facades will be reconstructed; they will not be historic facades.

Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association contended that a change in use has never been a sufficient reason for altering historic fabric. Nearly every building in Old City has been adaptively reused, but their historic appearances have been maintained. He asserted that the applicants' proposal would give the buildings a false industrial appearance. He claimed that multi-bay windows of this type are unrelated to the building. He stated that he strongly disagrees with the staff recommendation. Mr. Evans stated that, although he agrees with some of Mr.

Thom's assertions, this will be a new façade, rather than a historic façade; therefore, Mr. Thom's logic breaks down. Mr. Thom reiterated that Option A would give a false impression of an 1890s building. Ms. Kurihana contended that this façade would not give a false impression to anyone because it is not visible from any public right-of-way. Ms. Sell supported Ms. Kurihana's claim and added that the staff met with the applicants and walked down every possible street to verify this façade is not publicly visible. The Commission is generally more liberal when reviewing applications for facades out of the public view.

Ms. Pentz stated that Option B, which replaces four bays of windows with six bays, will create a crowded appearance.

Mr. Evans recalled that the property owner, James Francis, stated at the previous Architectural Committee meeting that he intends to propose additions to the building that would render this application moot. Ms. Tse stated that those proposals are not within their current scope and they will return with a new proposal if the owner expands his plans.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that he finds the proposals problematic because the historic façade is currently intact. He expressed his concern about giving a residential building an industrial appearance. He proposed an Option C, which would maintain the original four-bay alignments but enlarge one bay on each building to provide for paired double-hung windows. He opined that this option addressed the need for more light and air and stays within the historic rhythm and proportion. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he prefers Option B because the change from the historic configuration is apparent. Mr. Cluver stated that allowing a deviation from the historic would set a negative precedent. Mr. Evans reminded him that the wall would be new and not visible from the public right-of-way. Ms. Gutterman stated that, although it is not visible, it would still set a precident. Ms. Gutterman stated that any new openings maintain the historic vocabulary rather than introduce a new vocabulary. She stated that she was in favor of Option B or C and that the tripartite window in Option A is not appropriate. Ms. Kurihana introduced photographs of other historic buildings in Old City that have tripartite windows. Mr. Evans noted that those buildings were constructed at different time periods.

Joe Schiavo of the Old City Civic Association stated that exceptions for large, factory-style openings were made prior to the designation of the Old City Historic District.

Mr. Evans stated that although he would prefer to see a reconstruction, he would be in favor of Option B with limestone lintels and a brick cornice. Mr. Cluver agreed and added that the windows should be real double-hung sash and not casements. Ms. Gutterman added that she is in favor of Option B because the the front façade has six bays. Ms. Pentz stated that she is in favor of Option A or B. Mr. McCoubrey stated he is in favor of the so-called Option C that he proposed because it takes into account the rhythm that exists on the rear. He asserted that the rear should not look like the front because it did not historically.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Option B, provided the lintels and sills are limestone, the cornice is brick, and the windows are real double-hung sash, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

1618 NORTH STREET
Owner: Walnut Street Equity Partners, LLC
Applicant: Eugene Bukh
History: 1886; contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000
Project: Construct headhouse, roof deck, and stair

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a headhouse, roof deck, and stair on the roof of this property. The proposed headhouse would be a stucco box that is 7' tall, 14' wide, and 8' deep and set back 10' from the façade. The edge of the proposed deck would be set back 7' from the façade. Structural details are not provided.

The staff contends that the bulk of the headhouse could be reduced and the northern or front portion of the deck eliminated to reduce visibility. The staff also recommends a mock-up installation to prove that the headhouse and deck would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. Structural details should be provided to show how high the deck will stand above the roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developers Eugene Bukh and Jared Felderman represented the application.

Mr. Bukh introduced a second option to the Committee, Option B, which eliminates the pilot house. In Option B, the applicants propose to cut a new opening in the rear façade and install a spiral staircase that leads to the roof. Ms. Gutterman asked if the deck would be set back farter from the front façade than the 7' proposed in the original submission. Mr. Bukh replied that the deck will be set back 10'-4" from the front façade with a lower rail.

Returning to the design initially proposed, Mr. Evans asked the staff if the pilot house would be visible. Ms. Sell replied that there is a possibility and the staff would review a mock-up installation to determine its visibility. Mr. Bukh noted that he prefers Option B over the initial proposal, Option A. Mr. Felderman explained that he met with neighborhood association, which indicated that pilot houses are eyesores. Mr. Evans stated that, from his interpretation of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, a pilot house would have less impact on the building than Option B. Mr. Bukh stated that he formulated Option B after the staff informed him that he would have greater flexibility with the rear façade because it is not visible to the public. Ms. Sell stated that Option B could be approved at the staff level, owing to its lack of visibility from any public right-of-way. She reported that the rear of the house is recessed and landlocked. However, the staff would ask that the deck be set back from the side façade, where an alley runs between the houses.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the applicants use an existing opening in the rear rather than creating a new one.

Ms. Sell noted that the drawings show different windows and doors than those that currently exist. The applicant stated that his intention is to submit an application for new windows and doors.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised design, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

2224 FAIRMOUNT AVENUE
Owner: Don Nguyen and Jenny Ly
Applicant: Jenny Ly
History: c. 1855, contributing to Spring Garden Historic District
Project: Legalize vinyl windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize vinyl windows that the current owners claim were installed prior to their purchase of the property in 2007. The Commission's staff worked with the former owner who renovated the building, approving permit applications in 2005 and 2006. Those applications explicitly stated that the front windows would not to be replaced. Instead, vinyl windows were installed on the front façade with an unusual two-wide, three-down pane configuration.

Although the current owners, Don Nguyen and Jenny Ly, have claimed no connection to the former owner, Jonie Nguyen, who they assert installed the illegal windows, the staff has discovered since the Architectural Committee meeting that the deed for the property recorded on 8 August 2007 indicates that the current owners are the brother and sister-in-law of the former owner.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Jenny Ly represented the application.

The Committee asked the staff how these illegal windows came to the attention of the Commission. Mr. Baron answered that the illegal windows were discovered during a site visit to a neighboring property. The Commission requested a violation, which was issued.

Ms. Ly explained to the Committee that she purchased the property in August 2007 without any knowledge of its historic designation. She also stated that, prior to the purchase, a building inspection was undertaken; the inspection did not mention that the property was designated as historic. Ms. Ly claimed that she is a victim. She claimed that the cost of replacing the windows is beyond her capacity.

The Architectural Committee members agreed that they could not recommend the legalization of inappropriate windows. They suggested that, if Ms. Ly is claiming that replacing the windows would impose a financial hardship, then she should file a financial hardship application.

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

604-36 S. WASHINGTON SQUARE
Owner: Hopkinson House Owners Association
Applicant: Theresa Shephard, Klein & Hoffman, Inc.
History: 1961, Oscar Stonorov, architect; Contributing to Society Hill Historic District
Project: Replace ground floor windows.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the windows on the ground floor of this mixed-use, but largely residential high-rise building. The ground floor currently houses several

commercial spaces. The occupants of those ground-floor spaces are seeking greater energy efficiency. The ground-floor windows have several different configurations with glass panes of several sizes. The largest panes of glass are 16'-6" tall. Only one manufacturer on the east coast, Rochester Glass Company, can manufacture such large panes of glass and they are very expensive. Replacing the large panes in kind, rather than dividing them up into smaller panes, would increase the total project cost from $1.2 million to $1.5 million. For this reason, the applicant seeks an approval to install windows with revised configurations. Transoms and/or bases and transoms would be introduced to reduce the sizes of the primary pieces of glass.

The window patterns differ significantly throughout the ground floor of the building. Moreover, the windows installed when the building was constructed in 1961 deviate from architect Oscar Stonorov's original window plans. The south-facade windows are visible from a private courtyard only. The east- and west-facade windows are only visible obliquely from the street. The windows at the north façade currently feature a mix of full height and divided windows. Also, darkening film has been applied at the upper halves of many of them, at the mezzanine level, altering their appearances.

The applicant proposes two alternative ways of breaking up the window sizes with horizontal mullions. One proposes introducing transoms; the other transoms and bases.

The new window system would have structural corners that increase in width from 4½ for the existing to 6½ inches for the proposed. The intermediate mullions match closely the glass to glass dimension of the existing, although the shape differs somewhat. The applicant proposes adding a low base to the windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Engineer Theresa Shephard represented the application.

Ms. Shephard stated that the building was not constructed as designed by Stonorov. She explained that she is seeking to bring some uniformity to the windows on the ground-floor. The building currently has a wide array of window configurations at the ground floor that appear random. She explained that some of the horizontal mullions and areas covered with black-out film hide mezzanines that were installed for the retail users. In addition, she is seeking to reconfigure the windows to reduce the height of the glass panes to save money. Only one manufacturer is able to provide the full-size glass, which is very expensive. She stated that the cost per square foot is $100 for insulated panes of glass that are larger than 50 square feet. Smaller panes cost $8 per square foot. She has proposed two alternates, both of which incorporate horizontal mullions to achieve these goals. The mezzanines will remain in place and the windows must accommodate them.

Mr. Evans posited that the lack of uniformity resulted from individual tenants making changes. Ms. Shephard disagreed; she stated that the building was not constructed as designed. She claimed that many of the divided windows are original, but do not reflect the original design. Ms. Shephard stated that the added mezzanines must be accommodated with either spandrel glass or mullions to hide the drop ceilings and floor structures. Ms. Shephard stated that the large double-pane pieces of glass exposed to direct sunlight suffer from structural problems as well, especially the "kissing effect," during which the panes of the double glazing touch one another, contributing to increased wear. The windows were originally not insulated. The tenants have

complained about water and air infiltration. Ms. Shephard noted that heavy winds rattle the windows. She stated that the tenants are also seeking greater energy efficiency. Mr. McCoubrey asked if she could show that the current windows do not meet wind load standards. She said that it is possible to do that testing, but it would be cost prohibitive.

Mr. Cluver acknowledged the need for the replacement windows and asked Ms. Shephard to present the options. Sheet R201 shows the existing conditions; Sheets R200 and R200 Alternate show the proposals for the new window patterns. The Committee discussed the south elevation first. Sheet R201 shows that the southern ground-floor windows primarily have full-height glass; six have horizontal mullions at about the halfway point up on the windows. The Committee members noted that there is no discernable pattern to the existing window configurations. Ms. Shephard said that she was trying to break up the window sizes and provide an alternating pattern of horizontal mullions, as shown on Sheet R200. Ms. Shephard stated that Mr. Baron suggested providing one single mullion across each of the windows to replicate the existing east elevation, as shown in R200 Alternate. She stated that she could accept either proposal from a design standpoint. However, she prefers the R200 option because the panes are smaller and easier to handle and install.

Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Shephard to comment on the architect's original intent. No one was able to discern intent from the original drawings.

Mr. Baron advised the Committee that the ground floor at the south is not visible to the public. The east and west are only minimally visible at a sharp angle from South Washington Square.

Ms. Shephard stated that the north, east and west elevations currently have some original full-height windows. Some north-elevation windows have horizontal mullions at the two-thirds point with black-out film above the mullions. All windows on the east elevation have the horizontal mullion. None on the west elevation have the horizontal mullion. In her proposal, as is shown on Sheet R200, she would take that mullion height and make it consistent around the west and north facades and retain it on the east facade. In some cases, the upper portion will be blacked out with tinted film on the inside of the glass because of the mezzanines. Alternatively, she could install insulated metal panels in the upper parts of those sections, which would reduce the amount of glass. Mr. Cluver opined that metal has a different feel than glass and recommended against that option. Ms. Shephard proposed short metal panels at the bases of some windows. She explained that, currently, some window systems rest on the ground and are corroding, especially because of snow-melting salt. She is proposing pre-cast concrete curbs between the columns, upon which the window frames would rest; the curbs would raise the window frames above ground, where water collects. Mr. Baron noted that the concrete bases already exist in some locations, where baseboard heating elements are located.

Ms. Pentz asked if the proposed horizontal mullions align with the canopy at the front. Ms. Shephard replied that they do align with it. The new mullions would also align. Some Committee members posited that any extant horizontal mullions might have been installed to support for doorways.

Ms. Shephard explained that a bank occupies one of the retail spaces. She will be coordinating with the bank to ensure that its site remains secure. Mr. Cluver asked about a hatched pattern on the drawings. Ms. Shephard said that it indicates a solid metal panel for security for the bank. The solid metal doors, which exist, would be replaced with matching doors. Mr. Evans asked about Stonorov's original design intent for the area now occupied by the bank. Ms. Shephard

and Mr. Baron stated that they did not know whether this section originally included metal panels or glazing.

Mr. Evans acknowledged that this building has undergone many changes. He stated that he is concerned about setting a precedent for other Modernist buildings if the Committee recommends approval of anything but a restoration. He asked if the Commission has faced similar problems with Modernist buildings. Mr. Baron noted that the Mercantile Library on Chestnut Street will need large panes of glass when it is restored. Society Hill Towers also has tall windows at the ground floor. Mr. Evans said that he would not support altering the window configurations at Society Hill Towers.

Mr. Baron asked if the Committee would consider recommending approval of deviations from the existing window configurations at the facades with little or no public visibility, the south, east and west facades. No Committee members responded directly.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he would be uncomfortable basing an approval decision on cost alone. He said that, if cost is the only reason for deviating from the original design, then the application should be considered a hardship application. He asserted that, absent a finding of hardship, the Committee should base its determination on the Standards. Mr. Evans asked if the cost estimates are documented for the Commission.

Ms. Shephard asserted that existing conditions require horizontal mullions. She stated that there are structural reasons for approving the new mullions. She said that the mezzanines are an existing, grandfathered condition that must be accommodated. She said that the windows must have mullions at the mezzanine floor levels. Mr. Evans asked if the windows are subject to direct sunlight. Ms. Shephard stated that many are, especially at the south. Ms. Shephard said cost is a factor. She said that not only is the large glass much more expensive, $100 per square foot vs. $8, but the large panes require a crane for installation that costs $3,100 a day. The installation will take many months.

Mr. Cluver suggested a spacer bar at the mezzanine level to prevent the kissing effect. Messrs. Cluver and Evans asked about using other types of glass and mullions, such as structural glazing without mullions. Ms. Shephard said that that would be much more expensive than the large panes of glass. Ms. Shephard explained that she has a very limited space in which to install this glazing; the glazing may be able to expand outward from its current position ½", but cannot expand inward at all owing to structural and plumbing elements. Other glazing systems would require additional space that simply does not exist. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested considering thinner mullions. Ms. Shephard explained that they have worked with the window system manufacturer to reduce the mullions to the thinnest possible size. The Committee members discussed the slightly larger mullion that would be used at the corners. They decided that the deviations were insignificant. Mr. Evans suggested that they may be other window systems available that would solve these problems. Ms. Shephard stated that they had considered such systems and determined that they were unworkable because the windows would project at least two inches into the interior. She stated that there is no flexibility in this dimension. The new windows cannot extend inward at all with displacing the heating system. Mr. Evans asked if the entire window system could be shifted outward. Ms. Shephard stated that that would not be possible.

Mr. Baron asked if, as a compromise that would not require a hardship application, the Committee would be willing to recommend approval of the R200 scheme on east, west, and

south facades, which are less visible, provided the full-height windows are installed on the north facade. Ms. Shephard stated that she has calculated the cost differential for this design. It would cost approximately $120,000 more for the full-height glass than the glass with a single horizontal mullion on the north façade. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Evans asserted that this differential was not significant. Ms. Gutterman stated that the full-height glass is essential to the appearance of the north façade. Ms. Pentz stated that she is opposed to aligning any horizontal mullion with the front canopy. Ms. Shephard stated that she could adjust its location, but noted that that is the existing condition, which may be the historic condition. Ms. Pentz stated that the mullion should be located at the door height, where there are doors.

Several Committee members stated that, despite their criticisms of the proposal, they could support the compromise. Mr. Baron restated the compromise as he understood it. The glass may be divided with a single horizontal mullion on the east, west, and south facades, provided the glass is full height in all window openings on the north façade that do not have doors. At those openings with doors, the mullion should be located at the door height, not the canopy height. Mr. Evans suggested that the full-height glass should be wrapped around onto the northernmost bays at the east and west facades. Others agreed. Ms. Shephard again noted that is not the existing condition and may not be the historical condition. Mr. Baron also noted that the Committee objected to any metal panels over the fire doors. The Committee advised that the tint should be a removable film adhered to the interior. Ms. Shephard objected to the Committee's suggestion that the metal fire doors should be converted to glass doors.

Ms. Shephard objected to the full-height glass requirement. Ms. Gutterman stated that the structural arguments presented by Ms. Shephard were unconvincing. She asserted that her only convincing arguments were cost arguments, which should be presented to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

Ms. Shephard asked if she could replicate the horizontal mullions where they currently exist on the front façade. The Committee members stated that she could replicate the horizontal mullions only at those bays that currently include doors. Ms. Shephard objected, stating that the horizontal mullions are original to the building. She stated that she studied the horizontal mullions at the north facade and they are exactly the same type and age as the other mullions and frames. She again noted that the building was not constructed according to the Stonorov drawing she provided. It was noted that historic preservation standards favor as-built over as-designed. Ms. Shephard asked again about the horizontal mullions at bays without doors at the north façade. Mr. Evans conceded that the horizontal mullions do exist and the Committee should respect them unless additional historic documentation proves that they are not original. Mr. Evans suggested additional research. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the horizontal mullions on the north façade are later additions. Ms. Shephard disagreed, stating that they match all of the other mullions and frames exactly. She said that there is no evidence that they are not original, yet the Committee is suggesting that she restore to another configuration, for which there is no evidence. Ms. Shephard noted that the Committee appears to be recommending full-height glass in the northernmost bay of the east façade, yet that façade had the dividing mullion in all bays originally. She asked the Committee to account for that inconsistency. Mr. Evans responded that they are "making a compromise to serve the primary façade best." Mr. Cluver reported that the glass in Bays 1, 2, 4, and 5 of the north façade has mullions, but no doors. Ms. Pentz stated that, other than the precedent problems this might raise, she would accept this proposal. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. Ms. Pentz stated that the ground-floor window configurations are not a major feature of the design. Mr. Cluver stated that, if the Committee accepted dividing the full-height glass, then it should require the same division

on all four facades of the building. Mr. Cluver said that, perhaps, the design was altered during construction to accommodate a tenant. Several Committee members suggested that the staff undertake additional research. The Committee concluded that the four windows in the north façade that are now divided should be restored to their full-height glass unless contradicting documentation is found.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the R200 design for all four facades, provided that the full-height glass is restored in the window openings without doors on the north façade, unless documentation shows that the glass was divided originally, with removable opaque film applied on the inside surfaces of the glass as needed, and metal doors and panels where they currently exist, but not elsewhere, with the staff to review details.

2000-2002 DELANCEY PLACE
Owner/Applicant: A. Charles Peruto
History: 1865
Individually designated, 1971; Contributing to Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, 1996
Project: Construct penthouse and deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a penthouse and deck on top of this corner townhouse. In November 2008, the Historical Commission approved a stairhouse and roof deck as part of the larger rehabilitation of this building. The approved stairhouse and deck were significantly smaller than those now proposed. The new application proposes a deck expanded to the full width of the building and setback 11' from the front façade, as opposed to the 13-foot setback originally approved. In addition, the new penthouse includes a larger stairway and bathroom and measures approximately 15' by 18'-11.5", rather than the approved 3'-6" by 11'-2".

When it approved the original proposal, the Commission inadvertently approved the demolition of a rear chimney because the plans were incomplete and did not explicitly call out the demolition of the chimney to make way for the penthouse. The applicant now proposes to save that chimney. Although the staff commends the retention of the chimney, it contends that the enlarged deck and penthouse will be much more visible on this corner building than the smaller stairhouse and deck originally approved.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Charles Peruto and architect Rich Sanford represented the application.

Mr. Peruto explained that, when his architect drew up the initial plans, they had not yet been granted access to the building. In order to construct the staircase to the roof that the Commission approved, he would need to remove the chimney that runs up the party wall with 2004 Delancey Place. To avoid removing the chimney, which they hope to use to hide plumbing, he is now proposing a turned staircase, which would extend out farther from the party wall and require a larger rooftop stairhouse. The approved deck would also be expanded. Mr. Peruto claimed that the larger deck would be hidden by a parapet and chimney wall on the east side. Mr. Baron contended that this parapet wall would only hide the deck from the viewer standing directly across 20th Street to the east, but would not hide it from the viewer moving up

or down 20th street to the north or south. In addition, Mr. Baron stated that constructing the deck so close to active chimneys might trigger a building code requirement to extend the chimneys. Finally, Mr. Baron noted that the Commission had reviewed a similar application for a building at 17th and Spruce Streets and approved a small stairhouse, but not the proposed penthouse with bathroom and sitting area.

Ms. Pentz claimed that there were inconsistencies in the architectural plans; the parapet and chimney were not included on some on the plans. Mr. McCoubrey contended that the sight-line studies were inaccurate. Ms. Gutterman remarked that other applicants have been required to construct mock ups; she suggested that this applicant prepare a mock up. Ms. Gutterman stated that she would vote to recommend denial without a mock up to prove that the deck and penthouse would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. Mr. Evans and other Committee members asserted that the proposed penthouse would be too large. Ms. Pentz opposed the removal of the chimney.

Mr. Evans asked why the Commission should respect its approval that included the removal of the chimney if the removal had not been clearly indicated on the approved plans. Mr. Farnham stated that no one involved with the review on the staff, Architectural Committee, or Commission had realized that the approved proposal would require the removal of the chimney during the review. He stated that the construction drawings and application form had been stamped approved before the removal was discovered. He stated that the Commission could request that the Department of Licenses & Inspections revoke the permit, but he contended that such a revocation could leave the Commission open to litigation. He observed that the chimney was highly visible in the photographs submitted by the applicant during the first review and conceded that the staff should have recognized the omission on the plans. He also stated that the chimney is not a character-defining feature, but is a utilitarian stucco chimney at the rear along the party wall.

Mr. Evans observed that the current plans allow for the retention of the chimney; he suggested that the plan could be revised to both save the chimney and reduce the size of the penthouse. Some Committee members contended that the deck should be reduced in size to minimize its visibility from the street. They recommended that the applicant construct a mock up and then revise the plans to make the rooftop addition smaller and less conspicuous.

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

1523 PINE STREET
Owner: Kenneth Karlin
Applicant: Victor Brubacker
History: c.1850
Project: Construct elevator tower, replace front door

OVERVIEW: At its February 2010 meeting, the Commission reviewed an application to construct and elevator tower and roof deck with pilothouse at 1523 Pine Street. The Commission approved the roof deck with pilothouse, but denied the elevator tower owing to a lack of information. At the Commission meeting the applicant asked the Commission to approve a replacement door and railing as well, which the Commission also denied owing to incompleteness, because the information had not been submitted with the original application.

At the February 2010 meeting, the Commission voted "to approve the roof deck with stair house as submitted, but deny the remainder of the application including the elevator tower, front door, and railing, owing to incompleteness."

Based on the earlier application, this application proposes to construct an exterior elevator tower and replace the front door. The railing is not included in this application. The elevator tower would be located at the rear of the building and it would be clad in stucco. The existing single-leaf door would be replaced with a replica of the original double-leaf doors. The existing door dates from the turn of the twentieth century and it has a fine wrought iron grill with a decorative cartouche. This door is a fine example of an Arts & Crafts door and, although not original to the building, it provides glimpse into the evolution and layered history of the district, in which architects often updated and embellished earlier Italianate houses at the turn of the twentieth century. Furthermore, the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation directly address the alteration of non-original elements, when those elements have achieved historic significance of their own.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the elevator tower, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10; denial of the replacement of the front door, pursuant to Standards 4, 5, and 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Contractor Victor Brubaker and architect Dave Traub represented the application.

Mr. Danta explained that the Commission appeared accepting of an exterior elevator, especially in light of the fact that the owner stated that an interior elevator disrupt the historic interior. He stated that the Commission indicated that an exterior elevator would be appropriate, but remanded the application back to the Committee to ensure that the details were fully considered. Ms. Gutterman recalled that the Committee had been reluctant to recommend approval during the earlier review because key information including dimensions was missing. The Committee reviewed the elevator designs and deemed them acceptable.

Ms. Pentz asked about the front door. Mr. Brubaker answered that the door swings so far into the vestibule. It is difficult for more than one person to enter or exit simultaneously. The outer door and the inner vestibule doors both swing into the vestibule. He stated that if he cannot replace the exterior door, he will reluctantly remove the interior vestibule doors. He added that the owner really wants an approval for the elevator, but is less concerned about the door. The Committee members agreed that the removal of the door would not satisfy the Standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the elevator tower, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10; and denial of the replacement of the front door, pursuant to Standards 4, 5 and 6.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Standard 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.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights 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.