

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

**TUESDAY, 21 APRIL 2009
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DAVID AMBURN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

David Amburn, Chair
John Cluver
Rudy D'Alessandro
Shawn Evans
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

Sabra Smith, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
David S. Traub, Save our Sites
Greg Heller
Richard Ortega
Roderick Wolfson, First Unitarian Church
Lonnie Hovey, Vitetta
Richard Mai, Kieran Timberlake
Stephen Kieran, Kieran Timberlake
Jeff Miller, Converse Winkler
Paul Levy, Center City District
Nancy Goldenberg, Center City District
Warren Williams, SEPTA
Marilia Rodrigues, KT
Greg Burfell,
Susan K. Weiler, Olin Studio
Doris Fanelli, Independence National Historical Park
Amanda Jones, National Park Service
Charles Tonetti, Independence National Historical Park
Jonathan Broh, JKRP
Lauren Eikenberg, JKRP
David Waxman
Brendan B. Kelley
Jason Nusbaum
Robert Scully
Richard Sauder

Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch
Cecil Baker
Chris Blakelock, Cecil Baker Architects
Murat Aslanson
Am Aslanson

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Amburn called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. Mses. Gutterman and Pentz and Messrs. Cluver, D'Alessandro, Evans, and McCoubey joined him.

1907 GREEN STREET

Owner: Mykola Kulish
Applicant: Mykola Kulish
History: c. 1859; contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000
Project: Legalize vinyl window installation

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of fourteen vinyl one-over-one windows in the front façade of the building. The historic windows would be a wood, two-over-two, double-hung sash. The windows were installed without a building permit or Commission approval.

The applicant has submitted financial documentation that demonstrates his income level meets the Section 8 Eligible Guidelines established by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) of not more than 80% of the median income for Philadelphia.

An estimate from Architectural Window of Philadelphia Inc. was obtained for full replacement with wood, two-over-two, double-hung windows at a cost of \$21,292.89. No information has been provided regarding the total cost of the vinyl window installation.

The staff suggests a compromise; the illegal vinyl windows could be replaced with the historically appropriate at a rate of two windows per year. The violation could remain in place but not enforced until all windows are replaced.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the legalization, provided two windows are replaced annually until all 14 are replaced.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Mykola Kulish represented the application.

Mr. Kulish emphasized to the Committee that he wants to work with the Commission to bring his building into compliance. He stated that he supports the staff recommendation.

Mr. Evans requested clarification regarding the term "legalization" in the staff recommendation. Ms. Sell stated that the illegal work would not be legalized, but rather the violation would remain in place though not enforced provided the applicant fulfills the agreement to replace two windows per year. The applicant added that, where possible, he would be willing to replace more than two windows per year.

Mr. Cluver recommended that the applicant note the window material on the drawing. Ms. Gutterman clarified that there is already a note on the drawings that states the windows will be wood.

Mr. Farnham suggested that the Architectural Committee could craft its own motion to accept the conditions of the agreement recommended by the staff without legalizing the vinyl windows and clearing the violation immediately. He added the City would defer violation enforcement until the work is complete.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the City not enforce the violation provided the applicant replaces the illegal vinyl windows with historically appropriate windows as shown in the submitted drawings at a rate of two or more windows per year, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

2116-32 CHESTNUT STREET, 2115-27 SANSOM STREET

Owner: Sidney Hillman Medical Center of the Male Apparel Industry

Applicant: William Schwartz, Esq.

History: 2116-32 Chestnut Street, Magaziner & Polss, architects, 1950

Contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

2115-27 Sansom Street, Herman Polss, architect, 1959

Non-contributing in Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Demolish buildings, construct mixed-use tower with parking

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the complete demolitions of the buildings at 2116-32 Chestnut Street and 2115-27 Sansom Street and the construction of a 32-story, mixed-use building on the site. Both properties are listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places and are within the boundaries of the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, which the Commission designated on 8 February 1995. The property at 2116-32 Chestnut Street is classified as Contributing in the district. The property at 2115-27 Sansom Street is classified as Non-contributing in the district. Section 14-2007(7)(j) of the Philadelphia Code states that:

No permit shall be issued for the demolition of an historic building, structure, site or object, or of a building, structure, site or object located within an historic district which contributes, in the Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Commission finds that issuance of the permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Commission finds that the building, structure, site or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

Before the Commission may approve a demolition permit for the Contributing building at 2116-32 Chestnut Street, it must find that the permit is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. The applicant has submitted a hardship application claiming that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. That application has been forwarded to the Architectural Committee and the Committee on Financial Hardship.

The architectural firm of Magaziner & Polss designed the Sidney Hillman Medical Center building at 2116-32 Chestnut Street in 1950. It was used as a medical clinic for the needle workers labor union that still owns the property.

The non-contributing building at 2115-27 Sansom Street was designed by Herman Polss as the Hillman Recreational Center in 1959. Louis Magaziner, Polss former partner, had died in 1956. The building is Non-contributing in the district.

The application proposes the complete demolition of the two buildings on the sites. In their places, it proposes the construction of a 32-story, 336'-4"-tall, mixed-use tower. The base of the building would be four stories in height. It would house a parking garage, retail and office spaces, and the residential lobby. The offices, retail space, and residences would be entered from Chestnut Street. The offices and an atrium would wrap and hide the parking garage from Chestnut. The garage entrance and loading docks would be located on Van Pelt Street. The south section of the base, facing Sansom Street, would be four-stories tall with a fifth story set back and would house offices for the current owner, a labor union. The base would be clad in brick with a limestone base, stone copings, and glass and aluminum window and door systems. A large terrace would sit atop the north and west sections of the base. The tower would rise from the eastern section of the four-story base. It would be clad in a glass and aluminum window wall system. Small, recessed balconies would be located at the four corners of the tower. The tower would have a north-south orientation, with its broader facades facing east and west.

The review of this application can be divided into two primary tasks. First, the review must address the merits of the hardship claim. Some potential questions related to the first task are:

- Are the cost estimates provided for the rehabilitation of the Hillman Center reasonable?
- Has the applicant explored all feasible potential reuses for the Hillman Center?
- Can the new program be achieved without demolishing the Hillman Center?

Second, the review must address the merits of the proposed construction.

- Is the construction differentiated from yet compatible with the buildings in the historic district?
- Are the materials, size, scale, proportion, and massing of the proposed building compatible with the historic district?
- Could the design of the proposed building be revised to save some or all of the historic building? Could a profitable mixed-use tower be constructed on the site of the Non-contributing building and open rear area?

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE: The staff recommends that the applicant prepare architectural studies demonstrating whether an addition or new building in lieu of the proposed building can be feasibly constructed at the rear of the property that would allow all or most of the historic building to be preserved and provide a reasonable rate of return on the owner's investment in the property. The staff recommends that the proposed building complies with the compatibility segment of Standard 9: The building is "differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of ... its environment."

DISCUSSION: Mr. Cluver disqualified himself from the review owing to his firm's involvement in the application.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Daniela Voith and James Plunkard and attorneys Hercules Grigos and William Schwartz represented the application.

Mr. Plunkard introduced the project. He stated that the design of the new building is predicated on green and traditional urban building practices. He provided a history of the site. He explained that the Rittenhouse Hotel was constructed on the site in the 1890s, but it was destroyed in a fire in 1943. The needle workers trade union erected the Sidney Hillman Medical Center building on the site in 1950. He further explained that the late Victorian hotel building and the mid-twentieth century medical center interacted with Chestnut Street in very different ways. The lost hotel building stood at the edge of the sidewalk and addressed the street; the medical center looks inward without windows on the street. He argued that the proposed design would reestablish the streetwalk along Chestnut Street. The spaces along Chestnut Street would be reactivated with retail and residential spaces. He stated that the proposed set-back at the corner of Van Pelt and Chestnut Streets would emphasize the bell tower of the Lutheran church. Ms. Voith stated that the floor plan was ambitious and complex, fitting a large program onto a small site.

Mr. Evans asked if the Wilson Eyre-designed house at the northwest of the site, at the southeast corner of 22nd and Chestnut Streets, was part of the project site. Ms. Voith replied that it is not.

Mr. Plunkard continued with his overview. He stated that the building steps down at the west along Chestnut Street to better relate to the Wilson Eyre house. He noted that the loading docks and parking entrance were located along Van Pelt Street. He observed that the union offices will be located on Sansom Street; the design of the façade on Sansom takes the smaller scale into account. He claimed that the proposed treatment along Chestnut Street addresses the surrounding buildings and undoes the negative effect that the 1950 Hillman Medical Center façade has on the street experience. He noted that the tower is set backed from Chestnut Street to minimize its impact. Mr. Plunkard again noted that the four-story base building steps down at the northwest corner to address the Wilson Eyre-designed building at the corner. The façade along Chestnut Street has the same vertical rhythm as the neighboring rowhouses. The cornice line, materials, and proportions of the base of the building relate to the environment along Chestnut and 22nd Streets. He noted that the residential entrance would be located at the northeast corner of the site, at Van Pelt and Chestnut Streets. An atrium would rise above the entrance. Ms. Voith added that the façade would be active and populated. The current façade is not.

Mr. Plunkard reported that Van Pelt Street would be widened. He stated that the existing building did not lend itself to adaptive reuse owing to its angled siting. He noted this siting made it difficult to re-engineer or to incorporate the Hillman façade into new construction. He stated that the existing building has not windows on the street and does not invite one in. Ms. Voith explained that they had looked into maintaining the street façade of the Hillman Medical Center and building behind it. She claimed that this would not be possible because the main section of the building is situated at a 45 degree angle from the street. She contended that they could not build an efficient building behind the canted façade. She reported that they considered constructing a building on the parcel currently occupied by the Non-contributing building on Sansom Street, but it is not large enough. It is only 80' x 112'. They would need to build 51-story building on this site to house the same program. The lower 11 stories would be an unscreened parking podium. They would only be able to provide six to eight units per floor. It would be a

very inefficient building. The tower would not be a compatible with the district and would not be based on accepted urban design practices.

Mr. Plunkard explained that the proposed plan would allow the union headquarters to be built separately from the tower. He noted that the tower was oriented to maximize sun and light to the properties to the north. He again stated that Van Pelt Street would be widened and would include amenities like benches and bike racks.

Mr. Evans asked the architects if they had considered other possible redevelopment schemes that did not require the complete demolition of the historic building. Ms. Voith answered that their engineer had researched the structural capabilities of the existing building and determined that it could support one additional story.

Mr. Evans asked for a definition of the Architectural Committee's purview during hardship reviews. Mr. Farnham stated that the the Architectural Committee has two tasks. First, it must determine assess the merit of the hardship application. For example, are the proposed construction costs to rehabilitate the existing building reasonable. Second, it must assess the merit of the proposed construction. It must determine whether the tower complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines.

David Brownlee, an architectural historian and a former member of the Commission, addressed the Committee. Mr. Brownlee asserted that the Hillman Medical Center has great architectural and historical significance. He stated that it was one of the few great Modernist buildings constructed in Philadelphia in the period bounded by the construction of Howe & Lescaze's PSFS Building and Kahn's Richards Medical Laboratories at the University of Pennsylvania. He contended that the design of the building has an artistic vigor to it; it weds traditional materials to a bold Modernist geometry. He stated that this corner of the historic district is extremely significant owing to the three important churches and the Wilson Eyre house. He asserted the applicants are only viewing the building as a stumbling block. He contended that the applicants should seek innovative solutions. He stated that the sculptural building invites innovation.

David Traub of Save Our Sites addressed the Committee. He suggested that the developer consider one of the vacant sites in the area. He stated that Save Our Sites had not yet considered the matter but might oppose the demolition.

Ms. Voith stated that the building does not satisfy the union's needs. She remarked that the union needs a building that will serve its core constituency. She stated that Sidney Hillman, the Chicago union organizer, was an extraordinary person, but this building is only named after him, not directly connected to him. She noted that there are several centers Sidney Hillman across the country. She noted that this building was constructed after Hillman's death. Mr. Plunkard informed the Committee that Lynne Fox of the union had testified before the Committee on Financial Hardship that the building is more than 50% vacant and has been since Moss Rehabilitation moved in 2007.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance addressed the Committee. Mr. Gallery stated that demolition should not be the first solution. He noted that the Committee on Financial Hardship had recommended tabling the hardship application until further information was submitted. He also noted that the the application does not include any architectural or engineering analyses of the existing building. Therefore, he claimed, there is no basis for judging the cost estimates to rehabilitate. He criticized the application because it only considered reuse as office space. He claimed that other reuses for the building must be explored. He rhetorically questioned why the

applicants had proposed a 32-story tower and then answered that the price set for the site predetermined that the proposal would be overscaled. He stated that the foundations for the Hillman Medical Center were designed to accommodate a 50% expansion; he suggested that the applicants consider an addition. He asserted that the height would not be compatible with and would have an adverse effect on the historic district. He disagreed with the comparison of the proposed tower to buildings outside the historic district such as the Murano on Market Street. He noted that such comparisons were irrelevant and that the buildings surrounding the site were not as tall. He further noted that the zoning code mandates a 45° degree set back above 50 feet for any building on Chestnut Street. He stated that the proposed tower significantly exceeds the allowable FAR. He stated that these zoning issues are beyond the Historical Commission's jurisdiction, but they directly affect the proposed architecture and massing. He stated that the Non-contributing parcel on Sansom Street was the same size as the parcel located at 17th and Rittenhouse Streets, where a similar tower with underground parking is currently under construction. He claimed that the proposed glass curtain wall and the amount of glazing on Chestnut Street would be incompatible with the district. He opined that the Sansom Street elevation was more compatible because the masonry to glass ratio is higher. He asserted that the Hillman Medical Center building is more compatible with the Wilson Eyre building at the northwest corner than the proposed building would be. He concluded that the proposed project is not compatible in design, scale, height and massing with the historic district.

Attorney Anthony Forte addressed the Committee on behalf of his client, the Lutheran Church to the east of the site. Mr. Forte distributed handouts to the Committee members that included photomontages showing the impact of the proposed development would have on the air and light of the church. He explained that the his client is very concerned about the impact the proposed development would have on the stained-glass windows facing Van Pelt Street. He suggested further studies and a redesign to minimize the impact. He noted that the 1871 bell tower is a landmark and that the proposed development would block views of it. He asserted that the current zoning requirement of a set back should protect the steeple. He stated that he agreed with Mr. Gallery and Mr. Brownlee's comments. He concluded that the tower is pushed too close to the church and should be moved away from the church to the back of the site. Mr. Evans asked about the accuracy of the photomontages showing the impact of the proposed development would have on the air and light of the church. Mr. Forte answered that they were prepared by a parishioner. He stated that they were "generally accurate" but not "scientifically accurate." The Committee members expressed confusion about the photomontages, stating that it was unclear what the various colored areas indicated. Mr. Forte reiterated his concern regarding the flow of air and quality of light into the nave of the church. He noted that the church does not have an air conditioning system and relies on breezes to ventilate the space. He claimed that the tower would block those breezes. He stated that the proposed changes to Van Pelt Street will require the passage of an ordinance, which, to his knowledge, has not yet occurred. He suggested that the Committee refrain from formulating a recommendation because the application is not yet ripe for a decision.

Mr. Amburn and Ms. Pentz suggested that the Architectural Committee not enter into a discussion of the architectural merit of the proposed tower until the question of the demolition is decided.

Attorney Michael Mattioni and engineer Rick Ortega, who represented the Unitarian Church across Chestnut Street from the site, addressed the Committee. Mr. Mattioni agreed with Mr. Forte's comments and stated that the proposed development would have a direct adverse effect on the rose window of the Unitarian Church. Mr. Ortega stated that he had been monitoring the structural stability of the Frank Furness designed church building for 20 years. He noted that the

design of the church was ambitious for its time and that the church was stable but delicate. He stated that the proposed project could have adverse effects on the church. He opined that the vibrations from the excavation for the tower might hurt the church. He also posited that the added ice and snow loads as well as wind loads caused by the tower may damage the delicate church structure.

Avis Allman, who owns 113 S. 22nd Street, to the west of the site, addressed the Committee. Ms. Allman criticized the application for lacking an elevation drawing of the west façade. She claimed that the site plan was inaccurate; it does not show an easement running behind the properties along 22nd Street. She argued that the proposed location for the mechanical equipment would have a negative impact on the quality of life of the residents of 22nd Street. Mr. Amburn stated that the easement matter was a private matter.

Ms. Pentz stated that the Hillman Medical Center building is a very significant work of architecture. Mr. Evans opined that the costs of rehabilitation were not realistic. He noted that the cost analysis assumes a complete rehabilitation of the building; it ignores many of the grandfathered conditions a historic building enjoys. Mr. Grigos stated that all financial issues had been discussed at the meeting of the Committee on Financial Hardship. Mr. Evans stated that the building code does not require some of the work proposed. Mr. Schwartz stated that the Hillman Medical Center building must be completely rehabilitated. Ms. Gutterman contended that the information necessary to understand that claim had not been presented. Mr. Evans stated that the studies must be predicated on a reasonable rate of return, not a maximum rate of return. He opined that the building had only been marketed as a tabula rasa development site.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application.

DILWORTH PLAZA AT CITY HALL

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Paul Levy, Center City District

History: 1966-74, Vincent Kling, architect; City Hall individually designated, 5/28/1957

Project: Alter plaza including grading, paving, and landscaping; construct transit entrances and food service building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to Dilworth Plaza, the open space on the west side of City Hall. It proposes alterations at and below grade and will link with a separate project to rehabilitate the below-grade transit stations.

The Historical Commission designated City Hall as historic on 28 May 1957. At that time, the City Hall parcel was smaller than it is today. An arm of Broad Street ran along the west side of City Hall, where Dilworth Plaza is now located. To compensate for the loss of the public space known as Reyburn Plaza, which was located on the north side of John F. Kennedy Boulevard, with the construction of the Municipal Services Building, the City vacated the block of Broad Street running along the west side of City Hall and created a public space extending west from City Hall to 15th Street. Famed architect Vincent Kling designed the plaza, a complicated, bi-level space connecting City Hall to Penn Center, the Suburban Station and South Broad Street transit concourses, and the Municipal Services Building. The plaza, which was named for Richardson Dilworth, the Mayor of Philadelphia from 1956 to 1962, was begun in 1966 and completed in 1974. A sculpture titled *Phoenix Rising* by artist Emlen Etting at the north end of the plaza was dedicated to Dilworth in 1982.

The historic preservation ordinance defines a historic building as “A structure, its site and appurtenances created to shelter any form of human activity.” The Commission has always considered its jurisdiction to expand as a historic site expands. Therefore, the Commission should assert plenary jurisdiction over the plaza even though it was not part of the site when designated. The question of whether the plaza has achieved its own historic significance is open, but most would agree that it has not. Note that the Commission has no record of reviewing the design for Dilworth Plaza, even though City Hall was designated at the time.

The Center City District is proposing to alter Dilworth Plaza to overcome a series of chronic problems with the space related to maintenance, circulation, assembly, amenities, drainage, transit access, and disabled access. The application proposes the removal of all at- and above-grade structures on the plaza including a fountain, railings, stairways, ramps, benches, walls, paving, trees and other plantings, and other features. The fountain in the sunken plaza would also be removed, but the remainder of the sunken plaza features would be retained and rehabilitated. The new plaza would include a lawn at the southern end of the space, a water feature with bridge at the central and northern end, glass-covered stairways and elevators to the concourse level along the western edge, and a small food service building at the northern edge. The sunken plaza would be retained and rehabilitated as a covered concourse. It would include interpretive displays related to the site's history. The connections from the concourse to the mass transit stations would be upgraded during a separate SEPTA project. The plaza would be re-graded to eliminate the many steps and ramps that make it difficult for pedestrians to navigate. The plaza would be repaved in granite. The structures would be constructed of metal, glass, and granite. New trees and other plantings would be introduced. The water feature, which would be very shallow, would be configurable and easily drained to be used for assemblies. It could also be used as a skating rink during the winter months. The *Phoenix Rising* sculpture would be retained and repositioned.

Owing to the sweeping shape and transparency of the stair enclosures, the location of the food service building, and the transparency of the new trees, the views of the historic City Hall building would not be obstructed. The project would have no adverse effect on historic resources on the City Hall site.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, 9, and 10. The features and spaces of Dilworth Plaza that would be altered and/or removed do not characterize the historic property. Dilworth Plaza has not acquired historic significance in its own right. The alteration of the plaza will not destroy historic materials. The new plaza will be differentiated from but compatible with City Hall. If the plaza alterations and additions are removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of City Hall and its environment will be unimpaired.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Gutterman disqualified herself from the review owing to her firm's involvement with City Hall projects.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Paul Levy and Nancy Goldenberg of the Center City District, architect Steve Kiernan, and landscape architect Susan Weiler represented the application.

Mr. Levy described the proposal for the Committee. He noted that the Center City District was created 18 years ago to enhance the quality of life of in Center City Philadelphia for businesses and residents alike. He stated that the Center City District began developing a plan for Dilworth

Plaza in 2007. The plan has been revised several times since its inception. He explained that the core objectives of the project were to remove grade changes and other obstacles associated with the current plaza, to create a substantial space to accommodate large public gatherings, and to enhance the entrances to the transit stations. The project is separate from but directly connected to the project to rehabilitate the transit stations beneath City Hall.

Mr. Kiernan stated that the existing trees would be removed and replaced with lighter foliage that would allow greater visibility of City Hall. He explained that the two pavilions providing new access to the underground transit stations would also be transparent, allowing full views of City Hall. He noted that the pavilions would be 20 feet tall at the north and south ends and 250 feet long. He explained that the pavilions would be protected by a moat-like feature, which would prevent people from climbing on them but would not be obtrusive. He stated that the basic elements of the plan had not changed since the earliest proposals; the plan included and still includes a fountain, lawn, and improvements to the entrances to the concourse. He added that the current proposal incorporates a small café where the elevator to the concourse would be located. He stated that the café building would measure only 11 to 14 feet tall. He also explained that the sunken plaza and the *Rising Phoenix* sculpture commemorating the life of Richardson Dilworth would be retained and incorporated into the new plaza.

Ms. Weiler noted that the site has played an important role in the history of water management in Philadelphia. She explained that the design team will celebrate the site's important history as well as its association with water through interpretative panels in the arches of the sunken plaza and other features. She also noted that water management would play an important role in the new plaza through the retention and storage of run-off water in a cistern beneath the lawn. The water would be used for irrigation purposes.

Mr. Evans asked the applicants whether they were seeking a final or in-concept approval. Mr. Farnham informed the Committee members that the application requested a final approval.

Elise Vider of the Preservation Alliance stated that she had had only one day to review the proposal and would not be able to comment on behalf of the Alliance until the Commission meeting. Greg Heller of the Design Advocacy Group echoed Ms. Vider's comment. He stated that he had not seen the revised plans and also noted he had made repeated requests to the applicants to meet and discuss the project. He noted he was not prepared to speak on the design. Mr. Farnham stated that the application was submitted prior to the submission deadline and was available to the public for review for nine days prior to the Architectural Committee meeting, as required by the Commission's Rules & Regulations. He stated that, if the representatives of the Preservation Alliance and Design Advocacy Group had not reviewed the application materials, they had elected not to access the materials available at the Commission's office. The materials were made available to the public by the Commission in compliance with all laws and regulations.

Emanuel Kelly, a member of the Art Commission, reported that he had objected to earlier versions of the design, which proposed two wall-like concourse entrance buildings along the west end of the plaza, separating the plaza from 15th Street and the city to the west. The latest version of the design, however, overcomes his concerns. He praised the revised design as elegant and sensitive and supported its approval.

Mr. D'Alessandro voiced his concern regarding the water retention system and the impact it may have on the foundations of City Hall. Ms. Weiler responded that all retained water would be stored in a cistern away from the foundations and would have no adverse effect on City Hall.

Mr. Amburn voiced his appreciation of the plan's preservation of the views of City Hall.

Mr. Evans agreed, but opined that the previous plan with the blockier headhouses may have been more compatible. He opined that the scale of the current design was not appropriate to the enormous City Hall building. He noted that he was likely alone in such an opinion. Mr. Evans asserted that information and details were lacking for a final approval, such as paving patterns and the transitions between types of pavement. He suggested that the application be presented again to the Architectural Committee when it is more developed.

Mr. Cluver stated that the proposal would have a minimal impact on the historic structure. He inquired about the proposed maintenance of the glass pavilions. Mr. Kiernan answered that the Center City District is committed to the maintenance and cleaning of the plaza. He noted that he is proposing the use of a glass that has three important components: anti-graffiti, anti-scratch, and self-cleaning qualities.

Ms. Pentz opined that the proposed design is respectful of City Hall, but contended that the question of whether Dilworth Plaza had achieved historical significance should be debated. The other Committee members contended that Dilworth Plaza was not historically significant in its own right.

Mr. Evans stated that the design should include the other three sides of City Hall to create a unified apron around the building. The applicants stated that nothing in their plan would preclude extending the design around the entirety of City Hall, but noted that they are only charged with redeveloping Dilworth Plaza at this time.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the inconsistencies between the drawing and renderings for the design of the benches. Ms. Weiler answered that benches were not yet finalized, but that a generous wooden seat with integral lighting would be proposed.

Mr. Cluver inquired about the species of trees proposed. Ms. Weiler answered that the plants had not yet been finalized, but the trees would be transparent to protect view corridors.

Mr. Evans reiterated his opinion that the project should not be granted final approval, but should be resubmitted when the details are finalized, allowing the Committee to review them. Mr. Farnham stated that the Historical Commission's purview is the protection of historic resources. He noted that all agree that this proposal protects the historic resource on the site, City Hall. He suggested that the Historical Commission allow the Art Commission to consider the aesthetic issues that have no bearing on the historic resource, such as the paving patterns. Mr. Farnham noted that the Art Commission defers to the Historical Commission on historic preservation matters; the Historical Commission should likewise defer to the Art Commission on aesthetic issues. Mr. Kelly of the Art Commission agreed and noted that the Art Commission would review the details with the utmost care. Mr. Evans observed that he has faith in the designer team, but is afraid that the details will be neglected for budgetary reasons. Ms. Goldenberg stated that the Center City District has a \$10 million commitment from the Commonwealth and a \$20 million commitment from the federal government.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, 9, and 10.

314 W. TULPEHOCKEN STREET

Owner: SEPTA

Applicant: Warren Williams

History: c. 1885; individually designated, 1981

Project: Reconstruct failing roof structures, mothball building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the failed roofing structures on the main roof, canopy, and roof over the tunnel stairs, as well as the sleeping porch structure and reconstruct the roofing structures and porch to match the historic roofs and porch in size, shape and configuration with replicated details. Please note that some of the details are not drawn accurately in this submission. In addition, this application proposes to mothball the building by installing plywood in the openings and a new steel door. The drawings are unclear as to whether the plywood is to replace the windows as infill or to cover the existing windows. The staff suggests that SEPTA consult the National Park Service Preservation Brief for mothballing historic buildings for guidance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, provided that architectural materials and elements are salvaged and reused wherever possible, and that accurate scaled detailed drawings are submitted for reconstruction and reuse, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Warren Williams of SEPTA and architect Jeff Miller represented the application.

Mr. Williams described the station as similar to others along the Chestnut Hill West Line. He declared that this building is in the worst condition of all the stations. He explained that water infiltration has damaged the roof and termites have heavily damaged the structure. He stated that the building has been vacant for approximately ten years. He stated that the damage is so extensive that the assumption is that all roofs and wood details will require replacement. He added that they would salvage when possible in both the interior and exterior and they would replace in kind exactly on the exterior components. The one exception is where the original design pushed the wood to the elastic limits. They may sandwich wood components with a hidden steel centerpiece, but allow the steel to cantilever loads for the lower canopy. The upper roof would be made of prefabricated timbers and the decorative end pieces would be replicated and attached onto the building. He noted they believe that the rafter tails are not structural but decorative. The roof material will be asphalt shingle. He stated that the windows will retain their sash intact, but the glazing will be removed. They intend to cover the openings with plywood to protect them from the elements. Mr. Williams also stated that there is a hesitance to do extensive interior renovations without a confirmed tenant. Mothballing the building is the only feasible option at this point.

Ms. Pentz asked what type of ventilation would be introduced once the plywood is installed. Mr. Miller replied that they intend to install exhaust fans at the gable louvers and vents in the basement. Mr. Williams continued to explain that a small electrical service is proposed to accommodate lighting and the proposed ventilation. Ms. Pentz asked about the proposed termite treatment. Mr. Williams responded that a complete termite treatment is scheduled during construction. Mr. Evans asked about the windows and plywood. Mr. Miller replied that they were responding to the staff's recommendation to keep the existing windows in place and install the plywood on the exterior.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the extent of removal and replacement in the interior of the station building. Mr. Williams stated that they did not know the full damage at the second level, but there will be complete removal and replacement on the first. Mr. Cluver observed that this application proposes a shell stabilization.

Mr. Evans asked why the staff did not approve this proposal at the staff level. Ms. Cote responded that, given the extent of the demolition, the staff determined that the proposal should be reviewed by the Committee and the Commission. Also, the staff would like to see more materials salvaged and better drawings provided. Mr. Baron voiced his concerns about the lack of detail information, for example about the rafter tails. He noted that the drawing does not show a replication. He asked the Committee to recommend that the applicant provide more accurate details. Mr. Evans agreed that the Committee should request additional details.

Mr. Williams explained SEPTA's policy of specifying wholesale replacement when requesting bids. However, he plans on submitting accurate, detailed shop drawings to the staff for the retention and replacement for its review.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that architectural materials and elements are salvaged and reused wherever possible, and that accurate scaled detailed drawings are submitted for the reconstruction and reuse, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

500-36 CHESTNUT STREET, INDEPENDENCE HALL

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Doris Fanelli, National Park Service

History: 1752, tower added 1828 by William Strickland; UNESCO World Heritage Site, individually designated, 1955

Project: Restore Tower

OVERVIEW: The Architectural Committee and Commission reviewed this application to restore the clock tower at Independence Hall at their 9 April and 24 March 2009 meetings. The Commission tabled the application for a period not to exceed six months and remanded the application back to the Architecture Committee. The Commission also agreed to conduct a site visit to see the deterioration first hand. The Commission and Committee members visited the tower on 2 and 4 April 2009.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Charles Tonetti, Doris Fanelli, and Amanda Jones of the National Park Service represented the application.

Mr. Baron observed that there are a number of issues that need to be discussed. To date, the Committee has concentrated on the repair and/or replacement of the wood siding. He suggested reviewing the application point by point, beginning with the simplest parts of the proposal. He noted that many of the items would typically be approved at staff level, provided sufficient shop drawings and specifications were submitted. Mr. Baron provided overviews of the following aspects of the application.

The balustrade is now proposed in wood to match the existing. The balustrade has been replaced in the past and is not original. Mr. Baron explained that the staff should review shop

drawings. He asked the Committee members if they were agreeable to the review of the balustrade by the staff. The Committee members unanimously agreed to this suggestion.

The applicants have proposed to replace the iron weathervane with stainless steel and to reattach the metal flags. The ball, which has split, would be soldered and repaired. The original iron rod would be kept in the study collection. Mr. Tonetti explained that the vane itself would not change, only the internal rod would be replaced. Mr. Baron asked if any Committee members had concerns with the replacement. Mr. Evans asked about paint sticking to the rod, but was told that the rod is entirely encased in an outer sleeve. Mr. Cluver asked if galvanic action posed a concern. Mr. Tonetti said that, if galvanic action is possible, a protective layer would be applied on the metal to prevent it. The Committee members agreed that this proposal was appropriate, provided the staff reviewed the details.

The applicants propose to replace the clock face in glass. This non-original face is currently made up of several pieces of fiberglass, which are cracked. They propose to replace the face with a single piece of glass to minimize the structural elements, which otherwise might show on the exterior as shadows. The exterior elements that sit proud of the glass would be reinstalled. Mr. Tonetti said that the clock will retain its current appearance. Mr. Tonetti acknowledged it has been difficult to find a vendor who can fabricate a single piece of glass of this size. Mr. Tonetti stated that the new glass would have the same milk color. Mr. Baron asked the Committee members if they agreed with the proposal to replace the fiberglass face with real glass. The members recommended approval of the replacement of the clock faces, with some flexibility of the materials and size of the piece or pieces of glass, with the staff to review details.

Mr. Baron then explained that recent pointing, although based on a study of the original materials, was an inappropriate, bright white color that looks jarring. Mr. Baron suggested that the mortar should follow the original mix, but be darkened with sand or dye to blend more closely with the extant mortar. The newly-added bright mortar at the second floor west wing should be dyed to blend with the rest of the surrounding mortar. Ms. Gutterman recalled pointing done at the Philadelphia Museum of Art and stated that the mortar was dyed afterward to make the many different types of pointing cohesive. Mr. Cluver asked the applicants if cleaning the pointing had been discussed. Mr. Tonetti stated that their concern was that cleaning would actually highlight the portions recently done and show the changes. The members agreed that pointing with the original mortar mix stained to blend with the surrounding wall, with the staff to review the details, was appropriate.

The extant roofing at Levels 6 and 7 is wood shakes; the roofs have a fairly shallow pitch. The application proposes removing the wood shakes and installing a flat seam metal roof with an increased pitch to allow better water run off. Mr. Baron asked Mr. Tonetti if increasing the pitch will involve removing original roof rafters or simply adding shims. Mr. Tonetti said the rafters would not be destroyed; rather, shims would be added. The roofs at Levels 6 and 7 are not visible from the ground. Committee members expressed concern about the high failure rate of flat seam metal roofing as well as the difficulty of repair. They agreed to accept either wood or metal as well as the increase in roof slope by 4 or 5 inches.

The question of an appropriate repair/replace plan for the wood sheathing for Levels 4, 5, and 6 is the most complex question because so little is known about the construction and the ability to repair the sheathing. Mr. Baron and Mr. Tonetti again summarized the construction of the 1828 Strickland sheathing, which is comprised of thick wood boards set and staggered iron rods. The water damage involving the rusting of the rods and the resulting damage to the surrounding wood. The Committee members agreed that, if possible, the ideal solution would be to

disassemble the sheathing, replace rotted boards with similar wood boards, and replace the iron rods with stainless steel rods. Committee members feared, however, that this might prove impossible and result in the total loss of the historic sheathing. The Committee agreed to support the idea of a model to help determine the feasibility of disassembly and to create a standard for the contractors for the reconstruction. Concerned that the model would not actually replicate the conditions that have resulted from 180 years of wear, Mr. Baron asked about the possibility of disassembling one wall of the tower to see whether it is feasible to save any fabric before possibly destroy all of the sheathed walls. He said that, if this disassembly resulted in total demolition, then the Committee might want to consider covering the rest of the walls in place or disassembling them in large pieces for reconstruction in a museum environment. The members were not in favor of cladding or covering and ruled this option out. On the issue of disassembling one wall as a test, the Committee recommended waiting for the results of the mock up before deciding. Mr. Baron asked the applicant if the model and results from the mock up would be available in time to present to the Architectural Committee in May in order to meet the Historical Commission's June deadline. Ms. Fanelli replied that this timeline would not be feasible. She said that they were not seeking a final decision on this matter at the present, but would contact the staff once they had derived additional information from the mockup.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of replacement of the balustrade, weathervane rod, clockface, pointing, and roofing at Levels 6 and 7, with the staff to review details. On the cladding, the Committee voted to recommend approval of the construction of a mockup of the cladding, with all further action postponed at the request of the applicant, until the results of the mock up are available.

3 RECTOR STREET

Owner: Rector Street Associates, LP

Applicant: Jonathan Broh A.I.A.

History: c. 1880; Main Street Manayunk Special Controls District, 12/14/1983

Project: Replace windows and doors.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the replacement of windows and doors throughout this commercial property in Manayunk. The applicant proposes a combination of restoration and alterations. Most of the historic openings would be restored with the installation of replicas of the historic windows. The building was expanded in the early twentieth century and a combination of casements and double-hung windows are historically accurate. On the canal side, the applicant proposes the installation of two balconies with cable railings. The design for the doors at the balconies is different in both cases. One door would have a transom; the other one would have a blind panel above. Also the color rendering dated 6 April 2009 and the architectural drawings contradict one another on the design of the balconies and their railings. On the north elevation, the applicant proposes to remove what appears to be an original four-panel wood door and replace it with a metal and glass door. This alteration would not meet the Rehabilitation Standards. However, the Rehabilitation Standards would support the installation of glass in the upper two panels. The applicant should consider this alternative instead. On the west elevation, the applicant proposes to reopen an oculus window above the main entrance and install a fixed glass panel. The staff did not find evidence of the original window design for this opening, but opines that the proposed single-pane configuration would not replicate any of the possible historic configurations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the southwest balcony doors are arched-top to match the segmental arch; the southeast balcony transom is eliminated; the railings have simple

vertical pickets; and a more appropriate oculus window is installed on the west elevation, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jonathan Broh represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the proposed windows were replicas of the originals in all cases. Mr. Danta answered that the building had been added onto in the early twentieth century; hence, the various types of windows including casements and double-hungs. Mr. Broh stated that his client agrees with the recommendation of the staff.

Mr. Danta asked if the applicant would be agreeable to retaining the four panel wood door and replacing the upper two panels with glass rather than replacing the entire door. Mr. Broh did not have an objection to this suggestion.

Mr. Amburn asked for clarification on the proposed replacement of the oculus window. Mr. Danta answered that the applicant proposed a single sheet of glass, which would not have been the original window configuration. Mr. Danta further stated that the staff had not located any evidence that showed the original window, but that several divided-light window types would be more stylistically appropriate. Mr. Baron noted that it had been suggested that the light pattern of the transom above the front door be used for the oculus window. He noted this was a good solution. Mr. Broh agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the southwest balcony doors are arched-top to match the segmental arch; the southeast balcony transom is eliminated; the railings have simple vertical pickets; the four-panel wood door is retained with glass inserted in the upper two panels; and a more appropriate oculus window is installed on the west elevation, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 and 9.

316 S. 21ST STREET

Owner: William Hozack & Vesna Hess

Applicant: Tuval Shlomo

History: c. 1860, main block refaced in 1949

Contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Alter side elevation

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to a side façade. The applicant has submitted several applications for alterations to his façade. The Historical Commission approved a very different proposal for this property in July 2007. That proposal proved unsuitable to the owner's program. The owner now proposes a scaled back version of the design previously approved.

The application proposes three alternatives. All three alternatives propose the same rear addition and alterations to the garage; the design for the rear addition and garage is similar to that portion of the design approved in July 2007. The primary changes from the approved design involve the treatment of the rear ell wall. The three schemes propose the addition of simple bays at two locations instead of the previously approved Ionic portico and balconies with French doors. The staff contends that the three alternatives meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. All three clearly respond to the comments the applicant has received from both the Architectural Committee and the Historical Commission, which stressed the preservation of the rear ell wall and the spatial relationship between the main block and the

rear ell. The applicant has successfully integrated those comments into the three proposed alternatives.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the three alternatives, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect Tuvo Shlomo and property owner Vesna Hess represented the application.

Mr. Shlomo stated that the three proposed designs were driven by the suggestions made by the Committee and the Commission during the previous reviews, as well as the staff suggestions. Mr. Danta noted that the current proposal was a noticeable improvement over the previous applications and that it met the Standards. Ms. Hess noted her preference for Option One.

Mr. Amburn recited the approvals already granted by the Commission, which included the removal of the bay, installation of the French doors, and construction of the two-story addition and new porch. Mr. Danta added that the Commission also granted approval of the alterations to the existing garage and the relocations of the windows so that they align.

Mr. Evans asked if the rear ell would be stuccoed. Mr. Shlomo clarified that it would be painted as it is currently. Ms. Gutterman opined that the proposed alterations to the rear ell do not comply with the Standards. She objected to the projections on Cypress Street. Mr. Amburn countered that the impact would be minimal.

Mr. Evans found the realignment of windows problematic without knowing the locations of the load bearing walls. Mr. Shlomo clarified that there were no interior load bearing walls in the ell. Mr. Evans suggested that the owner might not be aware of the cost or complexity of the project. Both Mr. Shlomo and Ms. Hess stated that they were aware of extent of the project.

Mr. Danta stated this is the sixth application for this project. He noted that the staff agreed unanimously that the applicant had successfully incorporated the comments it had received throughout the process into this application, which emphasized the retention of the spatial relationship between the main block and the rear ell and the maintenance of two distinct volumes.

Mr. Cluver stated that the staff should review the details.

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

2115 PINE STREET

Owners: Valerie Hobson, Jan Williams

Applicant: Brendan Kelley, former owner

History: c. 1855; contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: legalize repairs to brownstone, sills, lintels, water table, and installation of vinyl basement windows and rebuild planter

OVERVIEW: The applicant, who owned the property until recently, made repairs to the building. Although he sought and received a permit for a new door, he did other work without a permit or Commission approval. The brownstone lintels, sills and water table were shaved of loose stone and detail, parged with cement and painted brown. The details now have a soft pillow-like

appearance without their original detail. Cement, rather than a compatible material, was used for the repairs. The Commission received a complaint and had a violation issued. A staff member met with the applicant to discuss ways to repair the façade and noticed that the applicant had also installed white vinyl sliders in the basement openings. A planter in front of the watertable had been built or rebuilt using modern brick with a bluestone cap.

The staff recognizes that the building had already lost some of its brownstone detail before the work occurred. A compromise might take that factor into account. At the least the lintels with their projecting molding should be rebuilt using Jahn or a like material.

Although the windows could be made much less visible with black paint, the Commission does not typically approve these windows and should not reward work performed in violation.

Visually, the planter is the most prominent piece of the inappropriate work.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Brendan Kelly represented the application.

Mr. Baron remarked that the high-priced repair estimate provided by the applicant was based on the complete repair of all brownstone elements. He stated that the designation photograph shows that the building had already lost a substantial amount of brownstone detail by 1995. He recalled a similar application at 1524 Pine Street; at that instance, the Commission asked for the removal of the cement but found an area of compromise on a pediment over the doorway that had lost a substantial amount of its detail. He suggested that, if the Committee wished to seek a compromise, it might ask for the restoration of the first-floor lintels in Jahn or a like material with the legalization of the cement repair on the watertable and sills. He noted that the neighboring property had the correct lintels.

Mr. Kelly stated that the planter had been in place for a long time, before he owned the property. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that it is not good to have dirt up against the wall of the building because it leads to water infiltration and damage to the wall. Mr. Baron stated that the designation photograph seemed to show a hairpin fence with plantings, but no wall. The new wall is raised.

Ms. Gutterman was concerned about the condition of the brownstone. Mr. Baron explained that loose brownstone is shaved away before a product like Jahn is applied.

Mr. Kelly stated the work was not done to circumvent the process.

Mr. Evans suggested that the planter could remain if it was extant at the time of designation; if not, it should be removed. The rest of the Committee concurred.

Mr. Baron stated that vinyl basement windows were installed. He noted that the original window would have been a six-pane wood window and that neighboring houses feature wood six-pane basement windows. They provide a model to match. Mr. Kelly stated that he thought that the new window is wood and could be painted black to minimize its visibility. Committee members concurred that, if it is wood, it could remain, provided it is painted black.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend the legalization of the masonry work provided that the two first-floor lintels are restored with Jahn or like material; denial of the legalization of the planter unless it was extant at the time of designation; and denial of the legalization of vinyl basement windows, but approval of the legalization of wood basement windows, provided they are painted black.

1940 PINE STREET

Owner: Gary Waxman

Applicant: Jason Nusbaum

History: date unknown; contributing to Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Legalize roofdeck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of a roof deck on a corner building. The deck is set back behind a parapet but is still slightly visibility from the public right of way. Although visible it is inconspicuous.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Jason Nusbaum and Richard Sauder represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that this building is much altered and the deck is set back beyond a high parapet, making it inconspicuous.

Mr. Cluver stated that the roof deck would be visible. He suggested they at least lower the railings to minimum code requirement of 36 inches. Mr. Baron stated that this building has lost its original roof line; it has been compromised.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the deck is accessed through a roof hatch. Mr. Sauder replied that the existing stair on the back of the property is illegal from a zoning perspective; therefore, he is proposing a hatch. Mr. Evans observed that this application is for the legalization of the deck and the installation of the roof hatch. Mr. Nusbaum confirmed this observation.

Mr. Evans stated that the Committee is agreeing to recommend approval of this proposal because of the building was significantly compromised with inappropriate alterations before designation.

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

118 S. 20TH STREET

Owner: Meyer Fitler II LP

Applicant: Jason Nusbaum

History: c.1850 storefront alterations c. 1910; contributing to Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Modify storefront, cut side door

OVERVIEW: The Commission has previously reviewed the restoration of the building and the addition of a mansard. The new plans call for modifications to the later storefront and the cutting

of a side door. The storefront which was cut into the original residential front features a mix of white marble, green marble and slate as well as stucco where the stone has fallen off. The proposal calls for restoring the copper and prism glass transom and rebuilding the frame of the storefront with wood panels to cover the existing mix of materials.

The application also proposes cutting a door in the side façade to access a new outdoor seating area. This location formerly featured a window which had been cut down into a door and accessed by steps. The recent restoration restored that window opening. The current proposal would recut the door but at a lower level without a stoop.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the storefront and door, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Robert Scully, the operator of the store, and Jason Nusbaum represented the application.

Mr. Baron introduced a photograph showing the building before restoration with a side door and stoop. He explained that the restored basement window and a small amount of brick would be removed to create an access door to serve outside dining. .

Mr. Baron discussed the mix of pieces making up the storefront. He stated that the application calls for restoring the transom and encasing the old storefront in a new wood paneled storefront. Mr. Evans observed that the drawings do not call for retention or restoration of the prism glass. Mr. Nusbaum stated that call the glass is extant and would be retained. It has been cleaned from the interior.

The applicants showed a rendering of the awnings they would like to install. They are not part of this application. They will be submitting an application for the awnings and asked for guidance. The Committee members agreed that the awnings were appropriate.

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

640 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: Frank and Molly Napolitano

Applicant: Chris Blakelock

History: c. 1979 by Baker, Rothschild & Hornblake, architects; contributing to Society Hill Historic District

Project: Construct rear addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear addition to the second and third stories. The proposed addition would be stepped to resemble the original profile of the west elevation and held back from the original façade allowing the original exterior wall to be perceived. Metal panel partitions would cover the west side of the addition while glazing and cement-fiber panels would clad the south elevation. Glass and aluminum railings are proposed for the rear balconies.

The applicant, Cecil Baker & Partners, designed the original structure in 1979.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the original horizontal metal railings are reused with or without glazing, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Cecil Baker and Chris Blakelock represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked the applicant about the treatment of the gap between the metal wall and the brick wall. Mr. Blakelock stated that the existing balconies would be continued through the walls with a door for access to those sections of the balconies.

Mr. Evan stated that he walks by the house twice a day and has always admired it. He added that he is pleased to see it being improved. He noted that he has viewed the existing railings as odd and preferred the glass railing as proposed. Mr. Amburn agreed and asked why the staff recommended that the railings remain. Ms. Sell responded that the staff viewed the railings as a historic design element. She explained that the strong horizontals of the railings are a unique feature of the building and the staff believed that this was the intent of the original design. Mr. Baker, who designed the railings, responded that code does not allow for horizontal railings over three feet and the rails must be four inches apart.

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

Paul Boni, who represents the Society Hill Civic Association, stated that the Association is opposed to the project because it has not come before the Association's committee for review, where the neighbors could comment on the proposal. It was noted that the Architectural Committee meeting is open to the public. Mr. Boni added that the owner built up the wall between the building and its eastern neighbor, incurring a violation from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. He explained that the owner appeared before the Association as well as the Zoning Board for a variance for the wall, but was denied. Mr. Baker responded that this proposal shows the wall cut back to its original height, thereby correcting the violation. Mr. Boni restated that the building is in violation and the situation has caused a disagreement between the neighbors. Mr. Amburn stated that the issues with the neighbors and Association are not within the purview of the Architectural Committee and that the current proposal shows the wall height as it existed originally. Mr. Boni stated that he believes that the Committee can take the public interest into consideration and use its discretion accordingly. He suggested that the Committee table this application for a month. Ms. Pentz stated that Mr. Boni's plea should not change the position of the Committee. However, she encouraged the applicant to meet with the neighbors soon. Mr. Evans added that unlike Zoning, there is no formal requirement for applicants to present proposals to neighborhood organizations.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application as submitted, pursuant to Standard 9.

108 PINE STREET

Owner: Murat Aslansan

Applicant: Rustin Ohler

History: c. 1766, restored c. 1968, individually designated 2/27/1967, Significant in Society Hill Historic District 3/10/1999

Project: Legalize rear addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a second-story rear addition. The addition was constructed without a building permit or Commission approval. The addition extends the second story to be flush with the rear wall of the existing first story. The addition and first story were stuccoed to match the existing stucco on the third story. A balcony rail and cornice are proposed for the new addition. The existing nine-over-twelve windows were removed from the rear of the main block and installed in the rear second-story addition. No information about alterations to the rear wall of the main block at the second floor, which is now encapsulated, has been provided.

Photographs from 1914 and 1957 show this building as part of a row. Circa 1930, a storefront was installed in the first-story facade. Between 1957 and 1967, during the Redevelopment Period, the adjoining structure at 106 Pine Street was demolished by the Redevelopment Authority, exposing the east wall of 108 Pine Street. In 1967, 108 Pine Street was restored and rehabilitated. This building has maintained the same design and configuration through the time of the Society Hill Historic District designation in 1999.

The current owner was aware of the Historical Commission's jurisdiction. He obtained the Commission's approval for a permit in June 2007 for interior work only. In August 2007, the staff observed a second-story addition under construction and notified the Department of Licenses & Inspections, which issued violations on 14 August 2007.

This application was first presented to the Architectural Committee in September 2007. At that meeting, Committee members concurred that because the building had been altered several times, a history and materials of the building should be documented. The Architectural Committee requested a study of the building and voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The applicant subsequently withdrew the application prior to the Historical Commission meeting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the applicant proves that the rear wall of the first and second stories were CMU and that the new cornice does not overlap onto the main block of the building, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Rustin Ohler represented the application.

Ms. Pentz asked about the material of the rear wall prior to construction of the addition. Mr. Ohler replied that the rear wall is made of eight-inch CMU block that went up the first and second stories to a steel beam. The owner removed the CMU up to the steel beam at the second story and built a new wood second-story addition. He stated that he believes the renovation and rear wall construction were executed in 1968.

Ms. Sell stated that she included photographs from the time of the reconstruction that show work to the rear wall in progress. Mr. Ohler stated that there is brick masonry at the third story resting on the steel beam, but CMU at the first and second stories.

Mr. Amburn concluded that the rear wall of the property was removed sometime prior to 1968. Mr. Ohler indicated that he included a map history that shows that property has been altered since 1890. He referred to a map from 1916, which shows that the building occupied one hundred percent of the lot, and a 1966 map, which shows only the four-story main block of the building.

Mr. Evans what had happened at the property between the first application to legalize the addition in September 2007 and today. Ms. Sell responded that nothing has changed with the property since the last Committee meeting. Mr. Evans asked if the applicant has submitted the requested documentation. Ms. Sell responded that we have the map research that the applicant has submitted. Ms. Gutterman stated that she does not know how to review the application without the written documentation regarding the rear wall that was requested by Committee in 2007. Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Sell if the staff is comfortable reviewing the application without it coming back to the Committee. Ms. Sell responded that the staff has reviewed the information submitted and the information already available and recommended approval of the legalization with some minor changes to the cornice. Ms. Sell added that the Preservation Alliance has a full easement on this property and that Randy Cotton of the Alliance has commented that the balcony should be removed from the application. He also agreed with the staff's recommendations regarding the cornice. Ms. Sell referenced a small photograph from 1967 and stated that, although it is difficult to read, she thought she could see CMU mortar joints on the reconstructed wall. Ms. Gutterman asked if Ms. Sell believes what has been submitted meets what the Committee requested. Ms. Sell responded that she believes that the Committee was looking for documentation regarding the condition of the rear wall, either a photograph or some other documentation. Ms. Pentz stated that the concern of the Committee was over the loss of historic fabric. She stated that she is convinced that there was no loss of historic fabric. Ms. Sell agreed and referenced the changing footprint in the atlas research. She added that the staff feels comfortable with the proposal and the evidence that has been submitted.

Mr. Cluver asked if the stucco on the new wood addition matches the historic stucco. Mr. Ohler responded that it does. Mr. Evans asked Ms. Sell what the staff means by recommending the cornice not overlap. Ms. Sell stated that the proposed cornice matches the historic cornice and overlaps onto the main block, making the addition look like a historic piece of the building. Mr. Amburn stated that a simplified cornice would be more appropriate. Ms. Pentz agreed and added that the cornice should not overlap over onto the main building.

Ms. Sell encouraged that the applicant to submit an application to the Preservation Alliance because it has an easement on the property.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the legalization provided the cornice is simplified and does not overlap onto the main block of the building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 4:45 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 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.