

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

**TUESDAY, 28 AUGUST 2012
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, Chair
John Cluver
Rudy D'Alessandro
Nan Gutterman
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

Benjamin Leech, Preservation Alliance
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
George Skarmeeas, Preservation Design Partnership
J. Thomas Becker, Philadelphia University
Geoffrey Cromarty, Philadelphia University
Robert Powers, Powers & Co.
Mark Merlini, Brickstone
John Connors, Brickstone
Arman Chowdhury, Stantec
Pete Crippen, Overbrook School for the Blind
Vera Kiselev, WRT
Gabe Canuso, D3
Chris Scarlett, Harman Deutsch Architects
Brett Harman, Harman Deutsch Architects
Andrew Lengel, Blackney Hayes Architects
John Hayes, Blackney Hayes Architects
Claire Pouncey
Pablo Meninato, Ivano D'Angella Architects
Ivano D'Angella, Ivano D'Angella Architects
C. Finch
C.J. Tsikos
Sarah Leuzzi
Bernice Hamel, Society Hill Civic Association
Lorna Katz-Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Thomas Manning
Murat Aslansan
Mark Shaw
Hal Kessler, Philadelphia Drafting & Design
Vincent Mancini, Landmark Architectural Design
Tricia Desmarais-Clark, Esq., Bochetto & Lentz

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 3230 W SCHOOL HOUSE LA

Project: Remove non-historic rear additions, construct rear addition, rehabilitate building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia University

Applicant: George Skarmas, Preservation Design Partnership

History: 1802; Roxboro House

Individual Designation: 11/24/1964

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate and adaptively reuse a historic house on School House Lane as the Senator Arlen Specter Center for Public Policy at Philadelphia University.

The historic section of the house will be rehabilitated. The roof will be replaced with a new standing-seam metal roof. A chimney will be reconstructed with salvaged brick. Dormers will be reconstructed using salvaged trim. The historic cornice, which is in storage, will be reinstalled. The wood siding will be repaired or replaced in kind. The windows will be replaced with windows matching the historic designs and materials. Missing shutters will be replicated. The front porch will be repaired and missing pieces will be replicated to match the originals.

At the rear, non-historic additions will be removed and the historic rear porch will be revealed and reconstructed using salvaged pieces.

An elevator, stair, and restroom addition will be constructed at the northeast corner of the building, away from the primary public views of the building. It will be clad in stucco and glass and have an open metal stair. It will attach to sections of the building that have been disturbed by later additions. It is designed to be differentiated from but compatible with the historic building, to connect below the historic cornices, to reveal the corners of the historic building, and to be completely reversible.

Limited site work will be undertaken. A few new parking spaces will be added to the existing drive. Some minor signage will be added. A storm water management system will be added.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Hawkins recused and left the room, owing to her firm's involvement in the project. Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect George Skarmas and J. Thomas Becker and Geoffrey Cromarty of Philadelphia University represented the application.

Mr. Skarmas stated that the building was in very poor condition when the University acquired it. The University stabilized the building several years ago and is now prospered to rehabilitate it as the Senator Arlen Specter Center for Public Policy.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the documentation provided by the applicant was very clear and thorough. He commended the application. He asked Mr. Skarmeeas to confirm that the rear additions proposed for removal are not historically significant. Mr. Skarmeeas stated that the additions proposed for demolition were not historically significant. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the clapboards would be replaced with stock or custom clapboards. Mr. Skarmeeas responded that they would replace any irreparable clapboards in kind precisely, with custom if necessary.

Mr. Cluver observed that the addition will provide an elevator, ADA restroom, and an egress stair. He asked if these facilities were required by the building code, or were simply desired by the property owner. Mr. Skarmeeas stated that the facilities are required by code. The second floor does not have two means of egress. Mr. Cluver stated that buildings under 3,000 square feet are exempt from the ADA elevator requirement. Mr. Skarmeeas stated that this building is larger than 3,000 square feet. Mr. Cluver asked if the first floor could be made accessible without the elevator. Mr. Skarmeeas stated that it could not without significantly modifying the grand front entrance. He explained that the site slopes down at the back. The first floor is three feet above grade at the front, but a full floor above grade at the rear. He stated that the elevator will be entered at grade or the basement level at the rear and take riders up to the first and second floors. He added that the ADA parking space is adjacent to the elevator. Mr. Cluver conceded that he was unaware that the ground sloped away at the rear.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the proposed standing-seam roof. Mr. Skarmeeas stated that it is documented in a historic photograph of the house. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the chimneys. Mr. Skarmeeas replied that they are in poor condition and will be dismantled to the roof and rebuilt to match a historic photograph. He noted that the flues will be used for the distribution of utilities in the building.

Mr. Cluver questioned the height of the elevator shaft, suggesting that it might be taller when constructed. Mr. Skarmeeas suggested that Mr. Cluver look at the plans carefully. He contended that he had accounted for the elevator height. Mr. Cluver claimed that the shaft roof would be two to three feet higher than depicted. Mr. Skarmeeas disagreed; he projected that it would not grow in height by more than six inches, if at all.

Mr. Cluver asked if the stucco on the addition would be real or synthetic. Mr. Skarmeeas responded that it would be real. Ms. Gutterman asked why the stair was exterior to the addition, rather than enclosed. Mr. Skarmeeas replied that enclosing the stair would make the addition much larger and would add cost. Ms. Gutterman asked about the railing. Mr. Skarmeeas answered that it would be a metal mesh. He stated that the roof over the stair would be flat metal panels. Answering Ms. Gutterman, Mr. Skarmeeas stated that the stair would be for emergencies only, not for convenience. He reported that the window system in the addition would be metal and the facing would be smooth stucco with scoring.

Ms. Pentz asked if they would parge the foundation wall. Mr. Skarmeeas answered that they will excavate around the foundation to install an exterior perimeter drainage system and will then parge the foundation wall.

Mr. Cluver asserted that the proposed basement restrooms do not meet the ADA code. Mr. Skarmeeas stated that they do, in fact, meet the ADA code. Mr. Cluver stated that, if they meet code, then the restroom in the addition is unnecessary. Mr. Skarmeeas disagreed, stating that the code allows restrooms to be at most one floor away from an occupied floor. The additional restroom is needed to meet code. He added that the restroom was located outside the footprint

of the historic building to protect the integrity of the historic building. Mr. Cluver stated that the restroom projects oddly. Mr. Skarmas disagreed, stating that the restroom provides some of the cover over the stair at the landing. He suggested that Mr. Cluver look at the plans carefully. Mr. Cluver suggested consolidating the restroom into the main mass of the addition. Mr. Skarmas responded that that would increase the overall size of the addition, which is designed to be as small as possible. Mr. Cluver suggested rotating the elevator lobby. Mr. Skarmas responded that that would make the addition much larger because the stair would need to project out much farther. He again stated that the addition was designed to be as compact as possible. He noted that they studied numerous possible designs over a long period and determined that this was the best, most compact design, given the many factors and limitations.

Mr. D'Alessandro again complimented the design documentation. He then asked about the windows. Mr. Skarmas stated that the current windows are not original; they are replacements. He stated that they have found two original windows in the basement and will replicate them in wood with true-divided lights. They will have double glazing.

Ms. Gutterman claimed that they would need to dismantle the cornice to construct the addition. Mr. Skarmas explained that the cornice was removed, numbered, catalogued, and stored on site several years ago with the Commission's approval. He stated that it will be reinstalled as part of the rehabilitation project.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that it is great to see this building restored and original elements returned. He stated that "overall, it is a very positive project." However, he objected to the wrapping of the stair around the elevator. He also contended that the addition was too large. He stated that the addition would be intrusive. He suggested exploring alternatives. Mr. D'Alessandro disagreed and stated that the addition was as compact as possible. He commented that it is always better to enclose new facilities like restrooms and elevators in additions to historic buildings than to force them into historic interiors in the buildings themselves. Mr. Gallery noted that there is a stair in a non-historic addition that will be removed. He asked if it could be reconfigured. Mr. Skarmas suggested that Mr. Gallery look at the floor plans very carefully. He asserted that there is only one possible location for an addition that will not be conspicuous from the public right-of-way. They have proposed the stair for that location. He also noted that the code requires the two egress stairs to be at opposite ends of the building. If the grand historic stair in the southern half of the building serves as one means of egress, then the other, the new stair, must be in the northern section of the building to satisfy the code. He also explained that reconstructing the important, historic, rear porch was an major goal. Shifting the addition as suggested would impact the porch. Mr. Skarmas concluded that the new addition was intended to be freestanding and distinct from the historic building, away from the historic core of the building. He stated that the location of the addition was very carefully chosen based on preservation principles. He stated that the footprint of the addition has been minimized as much as possible. He asserted that the suggested changes would enlarge the addition, making it more intrusive. He again suggested that everyone look more carefully at the proposal. It is a minimal elevator shaft with a stair wrapping around it. It cannot be made smaller or less intrusive. He asserted that they used a minimalist approach. The addition is as small as possible and has the least possible impact on the building. He again noted that they considered numerous alternative designs including those suggested by Mr. Gallery and concluded that the proposed design has the least possible impact, given the constraints. He again stated that reconfiguring the stair would either cause the addition to intrude on historic fabric or would make it much larger. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the proposed design has the advantage of being easily reversible; it could be removed in the future without impacting historic fabric. Mr. Cluver stated that he agreed that constructing an addition

to house the code-required facilities was appropriate; however, he again suggested that the addition could be reconfigured for a better design. He suggested that the elevator shaft would need to be taller. He also again questioned the ADA-compliance of the restrooms proposed for the basement of the historic building. He stated that he believes that the sinks overhang too close to the toilets. It was noted that the details of restroom design is outside the Commission's purview. He stated that the addition is a "mean, bargain-basement addition." He stated that it should project farther out to the east. Mr. Skarmeas responded that it would interfere with the historic porch if it projected farther out. Mr. Skarmeas stated that the addition was designed very precisely to comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. It is as small as possible, separated from the historic building, at the least conspicuous corner of the house, and reversible.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the chiller, which is to the east of the addition, could be moved. Mr. Skarmeas suggested that she look very carefully at the plans. He noted that the chiller could be moved, but he again objected to enlarging the addition beyond the outer plane of the porch. Ms. Gutterman concluded that, "overall, it is a good design that does respect the historic fabric." Mr. Cluver stated that he is opposed to some design details of the addition, but noted that the applicant has had a much greater opportunity to study the problem and analyze alternatives. He stated that he believes that the elevator shaft will need to grow in height, but then conceded that he is probably incorrect in that assertion. The other three Committee members voiced their support for the project.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details including the relationship of the addition to the historic bay, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

ADDRESS: 701-39 MARKET ST

Project: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Independence Center Realty, LP

Applicant: Mark Merlini, Independence Center Realty LP

History: 1859; Lit Brothers Store; various buildings, 1859-1906

Individual Designation: 5/26/1970, 6/30/1970

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of signage and lighting on the Lit Brothers Building on the 700-block of Market Street.

The Lit Brothers Department Store was one of Philadelphia's most important department stores and, with Gimbel's, Snellenberg's, Wanamaker's, and Strawbridge & Clothier, anchored one of the most significant retail districts in the country. The Lit Brothers Building is not one building, but is a conglomeration of mid nineteenth-century to early twentieth-century buildings consolidated into one structure. The architectural firm of Collins & Authenreith constructed the building at the northeast corner of 8th and Market Streets for Lit's in 1893. The complex grew eastward, annexing earlier buildings dating to the mid and late nineteenth century. By 1907, when architect Charles Authenreith constructed the corner building at 7th and Market, the department store occupied the entire north side of the 700-block of Market Street. The last additions were completed during World War I by architects Simon & Bassett along N. 7th Street. The sprawling building faced with brick, stone, terra cotta, and cast iron is one of the most

significant examples of commercial architecture in the country. The Lit Brothers building was saved from demolition in the 1980s and rehabilitated using federal historic preservation tax credits.

The application proposes adding facade lighting on Market, 7th, and 8th Streets. The fixtures would be installed on sills at the second and top floors to provide washes of light on the building. The fixtures would not be visible from the street. The staff should review all details of the installations of light fixtures and conduits.

The application also proposes the reconstruction of an enormous historic sign along the roof line on Market, 7th, and 8th Streets. The historic sign underwent many alterations over the years, but stood on the building in one form or another from the 1890s to the 1980s. Originally, the sign was painted wood. By 1910, it had been replaced with a metal screen with painted metal letters attached. This metal-screen sign remained in place until the building was rehabilitated in the mid 1980s.

The reconstructed sign would replicate the material, size, location, and appearance of the historic sign in most, but not all, regards. Unlike the earlier sign, the letters themselves would be lighted, employing an array of LEDs on the metal screen that would recreate the Lit's sign. Moreover, the sign would have the capacity to produce programmable, high-resolution, moving images at the two corners of the building. The sign is designed to take advantage of a recent City ordinance allowing large format signage on this section of East Market Street. The ordinance was designed to encourage investment in and activity on this stretch of Market, which has suffered in recent decades. To qualify for such a sign, a building owner must make at least \$10 million in investments in capital improvements. The City Planning Commission is charged with certifying the investment.

The ordinance prohibits such signs on buildings designated as historic under the City's preservation ordinance unless the Historical Commission "determines that the placement of the sign is consistent with historic precedent with respect to such building and the sign does not materially obscure the view of the building's key architectural, historic or character-defining features." The sign appears to comply with the requirements of the ordinance. The placement of the sign would be consistent with the historic precedent. The proposed sign would stand where the historic sign stood. The sign would not materially obscure the view of the building's key architectural, historic or character-defining features. It would wrap around the balustrades at the tops of the corner towers, but would do so in the same way that the original sign did.

Valid preservation arguments can be formulated for and against the new sign. Arguing in its favor, one would note that the sign would recreate one of the retail landmarks of Philadelphia. Moreover, it would represent and interpret a significant moment in American cultural and economic history for passers-by. Our current notions of consumerism, commercialism, advertising, and retailing were invented by the owners of department stores like John Wanamaker along this stretch of Market Street, Alexander Turney Stewart in New York, Rowland H. Macy in Boston, and Marshall Field in Chicago. The large scale signs would remind viewers of the primary significance of the Lit Brothers Building as a commercial palace and would invoke the historic appearance of the Market Street shopping district, which was awash a riot of garish, attention-grabbing signs. One could claim that, in its current condition, the clean, white Lit's building is sanitized and thereby divorced from its historic appearance and context. Also, in the late nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, department stores were at the forefront of advanced advertising methods and technologies. Wanamaker, for example, was the first to install electric lights, telephones, and the wireless telegraph in his store. The proposed

sign would invoke East Market Street's prominent position in American retailing history. With regard to the Secretary of the Interior's Rehabilitation Standards, one could contend that the programmable, high-resolution sections of the sign satisfy the Standards. In size, scale, materials, and proportion, the proposed are essentially equivalent to the historic sign. No historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property would be destroyed. The integrity of the property and its environment are protected. In fact, federal historic preservation reviewers agreed with this Standards-based assessment when the 1980s rehabilitation project was certified for tax credits. At that time, the reviewers approved the removal of "the deteriorated roof sign" and stipulated that a "new sign similar in scale but contemporary in design may be installed." Finally, in favor of an approval of this sign, one could point to the \$10 million capital investment as a significant positive feature of the project.

Arguing against the sign, one could contend that the programmable, high-resolution, television-like billboards at the corners of the building did not exist historically, would not satisfy the Standards, and should not be added. One could claim that the brightly-colored, changing, moving images would distract viewers from the architectural qualities of the refined, detailed historic building and would adversely impact spatial relationships at the building. One might assert that such crass marketing of soda and fast food was inappropriate for a building certified as historic. One might also argue that the proposed sign should be rejected because promoting good taste and reducing visual clutter is an essential part of contemporary historic preservation, even if it is not explicitly recognized in the Standards. It could be noted that the original sign was poorly designed from an architectural perspective and that the new sign, like the old, would wrap around the decorative caps on the corner towers, blocking views of historic features and changing perceptions of the building. Beyond the corner signs, one might object to the LEDS that form the recreation of the historic parts of the sign because they would present a different appearance than the historic illuminated painted metal sign did.

The arguments are compelling on both sides. Whether the proposed sign does or does not meet the Standards is open to discussion. Different, equally valid, interpretations of the Standards and other review criteria produce opposite results when applied to this unique case. There is no clear right and wrong answer in this case.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the lighting, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. No recommendation on the proposed signage; arguments based on the Commission's review criteria can be made for and against the signage.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owners John Connors and Mark Merlini, preservation consultant Bob Powers, and architect Arman Chowdhury represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked if the staff had a preference between the three different lighting options proposed. Mr. Farnham responded that the staff did not have a preference, but considers all three to comply with the Standards, provided the details of the fixture and conduit attachments to the historic building are carefully reviewed.

Mr. D'Alessandro contended that the sign would hinder the inspection and maintenance of the facades because it would prevent the use of platform drops and other equipment lowered from the roof. The applicants explained that this building is only five stories in height and all sections of the facades are easily accessible from high lifts on the ground. The asserted that Mr. D'Alessandro's concerns were unfounded.

Mr. Chowdhury provided an overview of the project. He stated that the guiding principle of the design of the signage and lighting is that none of the additions will detract from the architectural-significant, historic building. He explained that this building has been a commercial building from its inception and advertising and signage are inherent to commercial buildings. He stated that their design is predicated on the historic signage that stood on the building. He showed numerous photographs of the historic signage that stood on the building. He reported that the historic signage consisted of a chain-link mesh above the cornice line with large lettering on it. The historic design allowed the lettering to stand out against the sky. He displayed numerous photomontages of the proposed signage. He stated that the LEDs would recreate the historic lighting as well as providing larger signs with animated images at the corners.

Ms. Hawkins asked how the signage would be installed to the roof. Mr. Chowdhury responded that the signage would attach in the same manner as the historic signage; the mesh would be attached to metal posts that would mount to the roof. Ms. Pentz asked about the existing structural systems of the roofs. Mr. Chowdhury responded that it varies because the building is comprised of numerous structures, but the roofs are predominately wood framed. Mr. Connors confirmed that the roofs are mainly wood framed. Mr. Chowdhury displayed a sample of the metal mesh with LEDs that would be used for the signage. He also displayed a large aerial photograph of the roof with the high-resolution and replication section of the sign indicated. He also noted that they have prepared a video simulation of the sign. He explained that the corner sections of the sign will have the high-resolution LEDs; the remainder of the sign will have low resolution LEDs only where needed to replicate the historic sign.

Mr. Cluver asked where the sign would fall on “the spectrum from fun to tacky.” He contended that the mere fact that the sign existed historically does not mean that it was good. He stated that he objects to the change from a stable, static sign to a dynamic one. He stated that he could accept the restoration of the historic sign, but is not sure that he could accept the animated sign. Mr. Chowdhury explained that they are currently thinking that the static historic sign will be projected for a certain length of time between the projections of the animated advertising images. He compared it to the projection in the Comcast lobby, which is usually static. Ms. Hawkins contended that the Committee should consider the sign as a physical object to be added to the building and judged using architectural terms and not attempt to consider the potential imagery that could be projected on the animated part of the sign. Mr. Merlini affirmed that the sign ordinance limits the total area of signage allowable. Therefore, they could not convert the remainder of the sign into an animated sign in the future. Mr. Powers reminded the Committee that a sign of the configuration now proposed stood for nearly a century on the building. The sign on the roof is the historic configuration, not a shift away from it. Ms. Gutterman claimed that the historic sign was more transparent than the proposed sign. Mr. Chowdhury disagreed and stated that the transparency of the new sign is adjustable. Ms. Pentz asked Mr. Powers why the historic sign was removed in the 1980s. He responded that it was in very poor condition and posed a safety hazard. Mr. Merlini added that Mellon Bank, the major tenant of the renovated building, wanted to brand the building with its corporate identity and not that of a defunct department store.

Mr. Cluver stated that he is opposed to any sign that can produce an animated image. He added, however, that he considered the animated versus still question to be one that must be decided by the Historical Commission, not the Committee. He also asserted that LEDs have a very different character than incandescent lights. He offered the lighting at Boathouse Row as an example.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he deemed the proposed signage to be appropriate for the historic building and in compliance with the Standards. However, he asserted that the attachment details for the sign must be carefully reviewed to ensure that historic fabric was not damaged.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she was concerned about the lack of transparency of the proposed wire mesh. She stated that she did not believe that it would be as transparent as the historic chain-link sign. She suggested a mock-up so that the applicants could demonstrate the transparency of the proposed material. She stated that she is concerned that it would look like a solid wall from the ground. Mr. Chowdhury stated that the Miami Heat has installed this material in its arena and it is nearly invisible when the LEDs are off. Ms. Hawkins stated that she is also concerned with the proposed moving images. She stated that she would support the reconstruction of the historic sign, even with some changes, but she would not support an animated billboard on the building.

Mr. Powers stated that advertising is the essence of this historic building. The building has always served as the backdrop for signage. He displayed a photograph from 1905 that shows that the building hosted numerous signs, not just the one now proposed for reconstruction. He asserted that there is precedent for large-scale signage on this building. He observed that the historic signage was the state-of-the-art for its day. The proposed signage will be the state-of-the-art for today. He claimed that the proposed sign would extend the historic trajectory for signage on this building. It would be in keeping with the building and its historic significance. It would be a contemporary interpretation of historic signage. Within this context, it is appropriate and satisfies the Standards.

Responding to an earlier statement by Ms. Hawkins, Mr. Chowdhury contended that the proposed material would not be denser than the historic sign. He also explained that the sign material can be customized; elements can be removed to create a more transparent sign. He offered to construct a mock up to demonstrate the transparency.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that it was telling that the applicants had not displayed any images of the sign in its animated mode for the Committee. Mr. Gallery reported that he saved this building from demolition in the 1980s. He stated that he convinced Mayor Green to oppose the demolition. He stated that he and others who marched around this building in protest in the 1980s never anticipated that the preservation of the building would lead to the erection of animated signs on the roof. He stated that restoring the historic sign, even in a slightly different form, would be appropriate, but the proposed sign is not. He stated that he did not imagine that this sort of sign would be feasible under the large-scale sign ordinance when the legislation was under discussion. He now realizes that it is feasible. He conceded that the sign is in compliance with the large-scale sign ordinance. He stated that he is adamantly opposed to such a sign on this building. However, he stated that some associated with the Preservation Alliance are not opposed to this sign. He stated that his organization is mixed in its opinions on this application, much in the same way that the staff is. He suggested that the sign could be made more transparent. He also suggested some management of the programming of the advertising. He stated that the sign might be acceptable if the historic appearance of the sign was the "dominant" image. He suggested that there should be some control or management of the frequency and duration of the display of the historic sign and animated advertising. He concluded that, if the sign material was made more transparent and if the programming of the sign was managed appropriately, then the application might be deemed acceptable.

The Architectural Committee moved to the lighting portion of the application. Mr. Cluver questioned the brightness of the light proposed for some sections of the building. Mr. Chowdhury explained that the renderings may not be entirely accurate. He stated that the intent is to wash the entire façade from the second floor up with the same light. He added that the bays would be lighted with slightly more intensity to highlight them. Mr. Cluver stated that he prefers Option 1A for the lighting. Mr. Chowdhury showed a sample of the light fixture, which he plugged in and illuminated. He explained that the fixtures are wired one to the next and do not require any special electrical boxes or conduit. Ms. Gutterman asked how the fixtures would be attached to the building. Mr. Chowdhury responded that they would be bolted to the metal cornices. Ms. Hawkins asked whether the cornices project enough to illuminate all five stories. Mr. Chowdhury responded that he is certain that they do project sufficiently. He stated that they illuminated 901 Walnut, which is 11 stories tall, with the same fixtures.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the façade has been inspected according to the new City ordinance. Mr. Merlino stated that it was inspected using lifts.

Mr. Gallery asked if the color of the lighting is yellow as it appears in the images. Mr. Chowdhury stated that the light would be white and unchanging, like Buckingham Palace. Mr. Gallery objected to Option 3, because it alters the architectural appearance of the building. Mr. Chowdhury stated that the light fixtures would be installed at the second level only under Option 1A. Under that option, there would be no need for the fixtures at the top floor. Mr. Gallery asked if any fixtures would attach to terra cotta. He stated that terra cotta was not an appropriate material for attachment. Ms. Gutterman stated that the attachment details are very important and the staff will need to be very vigilant. She also suggested that the running of conduit would pose preservation risks. Mr. Merlino stated that there is conduit in place already for all of the light fixtures. He stated that the proposed fixtures would replace existing acorn fixtures. No new wiring would be needed. Mr. Chowdhury added that the light fixtures connect in series, making the wiring easier.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she would move to recommend approval of the lighting, but denial of the signage. Mr. Cluver suggested recommending approval of Option 1A of the lighting. He also suggested not recommending denial of the signage outright, but recommending denial owing to incompleteness. He stated that he may be convinced of the appropriateness of the signage with additional information. He stated that a mock-up might help him reach a conclusion. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he was not opposed to the signage. Ms. Pentz stated that the historic signage was an important element on the building. She stated that she misses the historic sign and would like to see it restored. She stated that she has concerns about the weight and wind load of the new sign, but an appropriate design can address those concerns.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 3 to 2 to recommend approval of Option 1A of the lighting, with the staff to review attachment and wiring details; and denial of the signage.

ADDRESS: 6333 MALVERN AVE

Project: Remove pool wing

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Overbrook School for the Blind

Applicant: Scott Hecht, Alliance Environmental Systems, Inc.

History: 1900; PA Institute for the Instruction of the Blind; Cope & Stewardson, architects

Individual Designation: 5/26/1970

District Designation: None

OVERVIEW: The Overbrook School for the Blind proposes the removal of a wing of a building that housed a pool. In May 2007, the Commission approved an application for the construction of a new aquatic center elsewhere on the school's campus. The need to remove the pool wing was noted at the time of the review of the new aquatic center, but the removal was not part of the application or approval for the new aquatic center.

The Overbrook School for the Blind was designed by the renowned architectural firm of Cope & Stewardson between 1897 and 1900. The pool wing was not part of the original construction of the campus. Cope & Stewardson designed the pool wing, which was built at some point between 1912 and 1918. The pool wing is located at the rear of the campus, away from Malvern Street along a rear service alley. It was designed in the same style as the main campus building, albeit in a simplified manner. The wing extends off the rear of a rear building that is part of the main complex of the school.

The school submitted a letter from its structural engineer stating that the pool wing is in poor condition owing to degradation of the walls and roof structure by humidity. The letter also states that the removal of the pool basin would be impossible without the removal of the wing itself. The letter does not include a full engineer's report with photographs of the damage. Also, the application does not provide information detailing the post-demolition treatments of the wall of the building where the wing would be removed or the site itself.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application. Demolition contractor Larry Bronwell and facilities manager Pete Crippen represented the application.

Mr. Bronwell submitted photographs of the pool wing and described its existing conditions. He explained that his contract includes the demolition of the pool wing, backfill of the site, and seeding only. He noted that there is a single door that connects the pool wing to the kitchen building, which would be closed off. He stated that the school would parge the rear façade of the kitchen building to match the surrounding stucco once the pool wing is demolished. He noted that the affected area is roughly fifteen feet wide.

Ms. Hawkins asked why the school seeks to demolish the pool wing. Mr. Crippen explained that the wing is deteriorated and obsolete. He stated that restoring the wing would be cost-prohibitive. He noted that it would also be very difficult to make it ADA compliant owing to changes in the floor levels inside. He further stated that the school considered transforming the wing into a green house for its farm-to-table program, but that it was also cost-prohibitive. Ms. Hawkins asked if the architect or engineer involved in these costs analysis had submitted any documentation to the school to that effect. Mr. Crippen distributed an engineer's report to the Committee members. Ms. Hawkins stated that the report could not be reviewed on the spot and should have been submitted previously. Ms. Gutterman asked if the school had considered

retaining the walls of the wing and adapting them for a new use. Mr. Crippen explained that the walls are much deteriorated owing to one hundred years of exposure to humidity. He also stated that the roofing structure is compromised, and that they had installed temporary shoring to support it. The school's insurance provider has requested that the pool wing be restored or demolished. Ms. Pentz stated that if the roof had been shored up, then it was not in imminent danger of collapse. Mr. Crippen reiterated that it was a temporary fix. Ms. Pentz stated that the Commission is charged with protecting designated buildings, and that demolition is not the preferred option.

Ms. Pentz asked if the pool wing was individually designated. Mr. Danta answered that the entire campus was individually designated. He explained that the designation took place before the Commission generated a formal nomination report, which would have inventoried all of the resources included within the designation. He noted that, owing to the early date of construction of the pool wing, the fact that it was designed by Cope & Stewardson, and that it is in the same style as the original buildings, the Commission likely considered this wing a historic resource within the campus.

Ms. Pentz noted that the pool wing connects to the main complex. She explained that the Commission must decide whether the removal of the wing is an alteration or demolition in the legal sense. If it is deemed a demolition, then the removal of the wing cannot be approved without a finding of financial hardship or necessity in the public interest. The applicant has not presented the documentation for such a finding. Mr. Crippen stated that it is obviously in the public interest, since the children are at risk owing to the condition of this wing. Ms. Pentz asked if the unsafe condition could be remedied without demolition. Mr. Crippen answered that it could be remedied at an exorbitant expense. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the school officials had received several quotes for the adaptive reuse of the wing. Mr. Crippen said that they had only spoken to the architect. He stated that the conversation with the architect convinced them that studying the reuse of the pool wing was not practical.

Mr. Cluver stated that the information submitted was incomplete. He specifically addressed the lack of information related to the amount of demolition that would take place, and where the demolition would stop. Ms. Hawkins agreed and stated that the staff had correctly deemed this application incomplete. Ms. Danta stated that he had spoken to the applicant and informed him that the staff deemed the application incomplete. Mr. Crippen asked who had spoken with and noted that he was unaware of any such conversation. Mr. Danta answered that he had spoken to the representative from the demolition contractor, who had submitted the application.

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

ADDRESS: 140 N CHRIS COLUMBUS BLV

Project: Install rooftop mechanical equipment and railing

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia Fringe Festival

Applicant: Vera Kiselev, Wallace Roberts & Todd LLC

History: 1902; High Pressure Fire Service Station

Individual Designation: 4/6/1972

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install rooftop mechanical equipment. The Philadelphia Live Arts / Philly Fringe purchased the former High Pressure Pumping Station from the City of Philadelphia in order to convert the building into performance, office, and restaurant spaces. The Historical Commission reviewed and approved a phased proposal for the rehabilitation of the building in September 2011.

The approved proposal did not include mechanical details, since those were not fully developed at the time. The assumption was that the mechanical equipment would be located in the attic space of the building with some vents on the roof. As the design team developed plans, this approach proved inadequate. The acoustic requirements of the performance space would not allow for the location of the units in the attic space of the building. Therefore, the applicant proposes to locate the mechanical equipment on a flat section of the roof. The equipment would be surrounded by a safety railing as required by the code. This area of the roof originally had a large light monitor, which was removed in the 1950s.

The historic profile of the roof was not a traditional hip; instead it had a conspicuous light monitor. The location of mechanical equipment on the roof is not out of character with the original design; however, the equipment should be shielded from view by some sort of screen. Ideally, the applicant would consider the restoration of the monitor, or a screen that resembles it. This approach would provide a closer restoration to the historic appearance of the building, as well as the installation of the mechanical equipment as designed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the equipment is screened by a wall that resembles the historic light monitor, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application. Project manager Gabriel Canuso and architect Vera Kiselev represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked if the rooftop equipment had been presented as part of the original application that was approved. Mr. Danta answered that originally the mechanical equipment was proposed to be located in the attic space of the building. Ms. Pentz asked if the applicant had previously proposed to restore the light monitor. Mr. Canuso answered that such a restoration was never presented.

Ms. Kiselev explained the team's design process. She stated that the program for the building, mostly theatrical performances, limited the possibilities they could pursue. She explained that the space had acoustical restrictions that made the use of internal mechanical systems impossible. The performance space was also designed to expose roof trusses and structural members, which limited the use of internal equipment. She explained that the space inside the building could have accommodated only one unit, which would have been insufficient. Ms. Kiselev noted that the design team understands the architectural importance of the building and proposed the smallest units possible for the roof to mitigate the visual impact from the street.

The tallest unit would be 70 inches tall. Ms. Kiselev displayed photographs of the equipment that is present on the roof today as well as photographic studies of the impact of the proposed equipment. She noted that a railing must be installed around the perimeter of the units to meet OSHA regulations. She explained that the roof on the building is only a couple of years old and in very condition. The design team proposed a railing supported by a ballasted system that would not require anchoring into the roof, thus making the project more economical, and meeting the client's limited budget. Ms. Kiselev explained that they had considered attaching a screen to this system in order to shield the equipment, but concluded that it would be impossible owing to the added wind loads. Mr. Canuso stated that their client hopes the Commission will consider approving the application as proposed, without a screen.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the proposed location of the equipment would impede the future restoration of the light monitor, should they choose to restore it. Mr. Cluver stated that he did not believe that the monitor could be accurately restored, since the space occupied by the mechanical equipment is far larger than the space once occupied by the light monitor. Mr. Canuso stated that the space would allow for the erection of an enclosure that would shield the equipment. Ms. Hawkins explained that she would not want the approval of the equipment to preclude the future restoration of the light monitor. Ms. Kiselev stated that such a restoration should also be considered in terms of the acoustical limitations of the performance space below. She added that a reasonable effort could be made to recreate the light monitor along Columbus Boulevard and Race Street, but not on all four sides. She explained that a complete restoration on all four sides would probably be impossible.

Mr. Cluver opined that the equipment would be very visible from Columbus Boulevard and the piers. He suggested that the equipment be pushed back as much as possible. Ms. Kiselev stated that they could try to push it back, but that the design team was very restricted by the placement of the duct work inside and the acoustical limitations. She informed the Committee that they had been very conscious of the visual impact throughout the design process. Ms. Pentz stated that requesting a restoration of the light monitor was possible given the visual impact of the exposed equipment. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if all the equipment was related to the theater space. Ms. Kiselev answered that there were three zones and that the equipment would be routed according to zones. Mr. Cluver reiterated that the restoration of the monitor may not be attainable because the area taken up by the equipment is far larger than the historic monitor. Ms. Gutterman advised that even if the area is bigger a restoration could be achieved if the equipment is pushed further away from Columbus Boulevard and from Race Street.

Benjamin Leech of the Preservation Alliance agreed with the concerns expressed by the Committee and encouraged the applicant to mitigate the visual impact of the units.

Ms. Kiselev stated that the reconstruction of the light monitor would be very difficult, if not impossible. She stated that the construction of a screen system may be more reasonable and attainable. She reminded the Committee about the acoustical limitations, as well as the client's limited budget for the rehabilitation. She asked the Committee to consider those factors in its decision. Mr. Cluver acknowledged the restrictions. Ms. Pentz contended that the monitor should be restored.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, but approval, provided the rooftop equipment is located in such a way to allow for a future restoration of the light monitor.

ADDRESS: 305 CHERRY ST

Project: Reconstruct 4th floor, green roof/deck

Review Requested: Final

Owner: 305 Cherry Associates

Applicant: Brett Harmann, Harmann Deutsch Architects

History: c.1760, 1860

Individual Designation: 7/21/1977

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

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the reconstruction of the fourth floor of this former commercial structure based on an historic photograph taken in 1911. The applicant will partially restore pieces of the front façade including arched windows and one bay of the historic storefront. He plans to construct a green roof and deck on top of the new floor, which will be set back 8 feet from the front façade. The new addition and green roof/deck railing will be somewhat visible from 4th Street, owing to the shorter buildings and a parking lot to the west of this building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details and ensure that the new construction is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Christopher Scarlett and the architects Brett Harmann and Eric Quick represented the application.

The architect explained that the façade rehabilitation and addition will be based on a historic photograph. Mr. Cluver inquired whether the fire escape would be retained or removed. Mr. Harmann explained that they are awaiting a code decision from the Department of Licenses & Inspections regarding the fire escape. He said that the fire escape served both this building and the neighboring building. They are asking for the option to remove if not required by the code.

Ms. Pentz asked why the structure has no pilot house for the deck. Mr. Scarlett explained that the stair will be open but drained. Mr. Scarlett said that his green roof tax credit will help to defray the cost of constructing the upper floor. He must keep a certain percentage of the roof covered with greenery. The cover will be a kind of grass that does not need to be cut because it does not grow beyond eight inches. Committee members thought that the green roof with railing should be treated as a deck during the review. They contended that the railing was too far forward for this type of building. They asserted that the railing should be moved back, even if the grass extended forward of that railing. They also suggested that the publicly-visible section of the side wall should be brick.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the option to remove the fire escape, provided the railing is set back to a point where it is inconspicuous and the publicly-visible section of the side wall is brick; with the staff to review details and to undertake a site visit to determine acceptable visibility; pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 1636 SPRUCE ST

Project: Legalize replacement of dormer windows and pediments

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Alexander Bochetto

Applicant: Carl Primavera, Klehr Harrison Branzburg L.L.P.

History: built c.1885

Individual Designation: 11/29/60

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

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize modifications to the dormers of this corner townhouse. The owner had the wood two-over-two windows removed and new one-over-one windows installed in their place with storm windows. In addition the wood beadboard pediments above the windows were removed and replaced with glass. A violation was issued by the Department of Licenses & Inspections for the illegal alterations. An application identical to this was reviewed by the Committee in January of 2012 and was forwarded to the Commission with a recommendation of denial. The applicants withdrew the application before it was heard by the Commission. Please note that the illegal work to the roof deck is not part of this application.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Tricia Desmarais-Clark represented the application.

Mr. Baron contended that the application was submitted in an attempt to have a court-imposed fine for the illegal work lifted. Ms. Desmarais-Clark corrected Mr. Baron regarding the fine, saying that it had already been lifted. She explained that the last application had been withdrawn to look into the possibility of adding muntins to the existing windows. She said that this was found not to be possible. She said that the cost of new windows, about \$10,000, was too high. She said that the Versailles building has one-over-one windows like the ones that the owner installed. The Committee members informed her that economic justifications would be better expressed under the auspices of a financial hardship application.

The Committee members asked about the installation of the beadboard in the dormer pediments. Ms. Clark said that the owner may be willing to reverse that alteration if the windows were legalized.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and 9 and owing to incompleteness.

ADDRESS: 247 S VAN PELT ST

Project: Construct third-floor additions

Review Requested: Final

Owner: David Fetkewicz and Michele Leff

Applicant: Andrew Lengel, Blackney Hayes Architects

History: 1860; façade modifications

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

Staff Contact: Randal Baron randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission approved in concept this application to construct an addition on this nineteenth century carriage house and modify the front façade. The proposed addition would be a mansard with a single centered window. The mansard would be finished with zinc shingles. The mid-19th century front façade had its arched windows and door squared off at the top and the façade painted grey to hide the new brick.

The proposed alterations to the front façade include the removal of the ornamental balcony at the second floor and its replacement with a single projecting balcony on the middle bay. That bay would be reopened to accommodate a French door; however, the architects do not propose to reconstruct the arch. The flanking windows in the second floor, which currently have steel windows from the 1941 alteration, would be replaced with clad casement units. The garage door would be replaced. The pedestrian door would receive a new rectangular transom but the architect does not propose to reestablish the arch.

The staff recommends that the two openings that will be modified return to their arch head configuration. The façade should be repainted brick red to match the underlying material.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the arches are reestablished above the two openings that are proposed for alteration and the façade is painted red, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Commission's in-concept approval.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects John Hayes and Andrew Lengel represented the application.

Mr. Baron suggested the restoration of the arches of the window openings. He explained that, when an applicant proposes modifying an opening, the Commission typically asked for the opening to be restored to its historic shape. Mr. Hayes said that they could restore the two openings to arches and paint the façade brick red, but that they would prefer to keep the façade consistent with the Modern changes of 1947. Mr. Cluver found the proposal acceptable as presented. He did not think that the brick red color would be appropriate. He opined that, if the Modern design was to be retained, then the windows should be steel, owing to their thin profiles. Ms. Hawkins said that the proposed changes to the transom were not appropriate; its arch should be restored or the proportions should be adjusted. Mr. Baron pointed out that Mr. Hayes mentioned the rebuilding of the brickwork above as well as to the sides of the central second-floor window. He thought that, if the Committee was not going to require the rebuilding of the arch, then at least the evidence of the arch in the brick should not be obliterated with a reconstruction of that brickwork. The Committee members agreed.

The Committee members asked about the material on the side of the mansard facing the neighboring porch. The architect said that they could install zinc shingles or brick. Claire Pouncey, the neighbor, said that she is opposed to the zinc because it will cause her plants to overheat. She stated that she favors brick.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she would make a motion to approve the proposal, provided the first-floor transom is modified to have a better proportion by raising the door. Mr. Cluver agreed with Ms. Gutterman on the condition that the side of the mansard is stucco and the windows are narrow profile metal units.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, provided the proportions of the first-floor transom are improved by raising the door, the sides of the mansard are faced in stucco, and the windows are metal with narrow profiles, the brick above the second-floor windows is not rebuilt, and the façade is painted grey, with the staff to review details.

ADDRESS: 249 S VAN PELT ST

Project: Construct third-floor addition

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: Jon Merz

Applicant: Andrew Lengel, Blackney Hayes Architects

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: The Commission approved in concept a proposal to construct an addition on a nineteenth-century carriage house. The addition would have a seven-foot set back from the front façade; a small deck would be located in this area. The deck would have a metal railing. The addition would be clad with tan brick tiles on the front and stucco on the sides. The design of the addition is very reminiscent of the historic façade of the carriage house. The Commission approved the design provided it was clad with a material that better differentiates the addition from the historic building. The Commission suggested a different color brick or stone. The applicants have proposed a light color brick tile for consideration.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects John Hayes and Andrew Lengel represented the application.

Mr. Hayes presented the project to the Committee. He explained that they intend to install a crown molding cornice and an end corbel on one end of the cornice. Ms. Hawkins asked about a return of the brickwork on the side façade. Mr. Hayes explained that an eight-inch return would be typical for Philadelphia facades. He said that the brick would be affixed to stucco on metal lathe.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the addition with the tan brick tile façade and an eight-inch brick return on the side façade, with the staff to review details.

ADDRESS: 626 S. FRONT ST

Project: Demolish former garage structure, construct 4-story house, restore original house

Review Requested: Final

Owner: Pablo Meninato

Applicant: Pablo Meninato

History: house 1760, garage structure c.1920, modifications to rear structures 1975

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: The application proposes the partial restoration of this c. 1760 Georgian house. The building, which had been converted to restaurant, has been vacant for many years. The new owners would reroof the house with appropriate shingles and install new wood windows. The ground floor, which has been covered in a modern brick, would be revealed and the original openings reconstructed. Two pent eaves at the second and third-floor lines on Front Street would be reinstalled. The frontispiece on Bainbridge Street would be reconstructed based on the historic photograph of 1868.

The plans do not show a complete restoration. For example, the applicants do not propose to rebuild the horizontal cornice or pent eaves on the Bainbridge Street façade. The reconstructed door opening on Front Street would be infilled with recessed brick. The window muntin configuration will need to be adjusted for historical accuracy. They are proposing to stucco the base of the building.

A section of the existing structure to the west along Bainbridge, originally constructed as a garage in the twentieth century, will be demolished. In its place, the applicants propose to construct a new house. The Commission has previously approved a similar plan for a different applicant for this section of the structure. The sale of the new house will help to make the restoration of the old house economically feasible. The design of the house appears to be compatible with the historic structure and the streetscape.

The historic two-story rear ell of the old building has been modified over the years with a ground-story extension. The applicants plan to reconstruct that ground-story extension with new brick and make it part of the new house to the west. They also plan to construct a section of the new house that would cantilever over the roof of the ell.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the door on Front Street is accurately reconstructed and the new building does not cantilever over the rear ell, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Pablo Meninato and Ivano D'Angella represented the application.

The discussion focused first on the new house and the piece of that house that would cantilever over and in front of the historic rear ell. Mr. Baron showed how it would be possible to pull back the cantilever by shifting a bathroom partially onto the east end of the rear deck. Mr. Meninato explained that they had moved the deck to the back to avoid shading the neighbor's rear yard. Mr. Baron showed how the neighbor's yard could still be protected by retaining the deck at the west end of the building. The applicants agreed to this modification.

The Committee members discussed the area of the historic door on Front Street. The applicants intend to restore the masonry opening, but not the door itself. They plan to install a window in the upper part of the opening and infill the lower part of the door opening with recessed brick. The historic photograph shows the historic door. The Committee members thought that it would be acceptable to convert the opening to a window with a recessed brick panel below.

The Committee then discussed the proposal to restore the pent eaves along Front Street. Mr. Cluver objected to the restoration of them. Mr. Baron pointed out that the brickwork on the Front Street façade is different in the area where the pent eaves were located. There is evidence of the former joist pockets that would have supported the pent eaves. Mr. Baron contended that the restoration of the colonial segment of the house including the pent eaves was part of the justification for allowing the attachment of a large new house on the end of this building. He said that the pent eaves were protective and covered the salmon brick portions of the wall that were never meant to be exposed. Although Mr. Cluver and Ms. Hawkins agreed that the building once had pent eaves, they both thought that the building had a substantial history without them. They are not pictured in the 1868 photograph. Mr. Cluver thought the damaged brick areas should be repaired. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz thought that the eaves should be restored as proposed by the applicants.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested recommending approval of the application, provided the cantilever is pulled back from in front of the ell, with the staff to review details. Two members supported this recommendation, but three did not.

Mr. Cluver suggested recommending approval of the application, provided the cantilever is pulled back from in front of the ell and the pent eaves are not restored, with the staff to review details. Three members supported this recommendation; two did not.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided the cantilever is pulled back from in front of the ell and the pent eaves are not restored, with the staff to review details.

ADDRESS: 703-707 N. 8TH STREET AND 709-721 N. 8TH STREET

Project: Install vinyl windows rear and side facades 15 buildings

Review Requested: Final

Owner: Friends Housing Cooperative

Applicant: Paul Stone, Emerald Window

History: c.1851

Individual Designation: 4/24/1962

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: These applications propose the installation of vinyl windows in every side and rear opening of these 15 twin houses which comprise all but one house on this block. The houses face 8th Street and Franklin Street. Because they are twins, the side windows are quite visible from the streets. Even the rear windows are visible from streets as well as the shared courtyard space of this historical Quaker housing cooperative. The property owner replaced the historic windows on the front facades in vinyl without permits. Although they eventually hope to restore those windows to wood, they have decided to replace the windows that are not in violation ahead of the windows that are in violation. The application itself is incomplete and lacks shop

drawings as well as any clear specification of which windows will be replaced with which units. The vinyl windows lack the depth of glazing and muntins of wood windows. This would be quite apparent from the side angle from which that they would be viewed from the street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and owing to incompleteness.

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

The Committee reviewed the application and decided that the proposed windows did not meet the Standards with regard to material, dimension, profile, and configuration.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and owing to incompleteness

ADDRESS: 1929 SPRING GARDEN ST

Project: Legalize vinyl windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Constantine & Helen Tsikos

Applicant: Constantine Tsikos

History: 1875

Individual Designation: 11/6/1975

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of vinyl windows on the façade of this building without the approval of the Historical Commission or a permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections.

In November 2001, the Commission reviewed and approved an application to install vinyl windows on the rear elevation only. A photograph from 2009 shows the wood windows that were in place at the time of designation. In March 2012, the staff received a neighbor complaint, performed a site visit, and observed that vinyl windows were installed.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Constantine Tsikos represented the application.

Mr. Tsikos stated that he purchased the property on 10 June 2010 and received a City certification showing that the property had no violations on record. He explained that he did not change anything on the building. He stated that he removed the security bars on the first-story windows and power-washed the front façade in March 2012. He showed photographs of the property and a neighboring property at 1933 Spring Garden Street with existing security bars. Ms. Hawkins asked if he purchased the property with vinyl windows installed. He affirmed that they were existing when he purchased the property. She explained that the Committee does not distinguish ownership of the property, but that the Commission may take that issue into account. She summarized that at the time of designation the building had wood windows and at some point after which time vinyl windows were installed without a permit. She explained that while there is a certification of no active violations on record, it does not mean that there are no

problems with the building. Mr. Tsikos asked about the value of a certification. He explained that he appealed the violation to the Board of License & Inspection Review and that the case was remanded to the Commission. Ms. Hawkins explained that the Committee must review the application based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and determine whether the window alteration was an appropriate change. Ms. Sell clarified that, based on photographic evidence, it appears as though the previous owner installed vinyl windows between 2009 and when Mr. Tsikos purchased the property in June 2010. She explained that the City certification was clear at the time of purchase because the violation was not discovered until 2012, while under his ownership. Mr. Tsikos stated that Ms. Sell suggested that he pursue the previous owner to mitigate the violation. He argued that the City certification will be used to prove that there was no violation in place. Ms. Gutterman stated that the previous owner changed the windows without a permit or approval and that the certification does to absolve the previous owner of responsibility for the change. Ms. Hawkins explained that the Committee review is limited to how the application meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Tsikos stated that, if he had not removed the security bars, his property would look the same as 1933 Spring Garden Street. Ms. Sell explained that the vinyl windows and security bars that exist on 1933 were in place at the time of designation and therefore grandfathered. Ms. Sell clarified that the Commission staff would have approved the removal of the security bars and that their removal likely alerted a member of the neighborhood to the vinyl windows. Ms. Hawkins clarified that the Commission can take into account varying issues, but the Committee can only review the technical aspects of the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 2525 S GARNET ST

Project: Replace roof

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sarah J. Lewis

Applicant: Vincent Mancini, Landmark Architectural Design

History: 1910; John T. Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Girard Estate Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the terracotta roof with red asphalt shingles.

In December 2011, the Commission reviewed and approved an application to remove the terracotta tile roof and replace it with a high-quality synthetic slate shingle. The applicant claimed the terracotta tile roof had failed. Applications reviewed by the Commission for the past 10 years have confirmed that these tile roofs in the Girard Estate Historic District are at the ends of their lives. Research on the tiles concluded that replacement in-kind was extremely labor-intensive and expensive and there is no alternative material that would exactly match the original tile. The synthetic-slate shingle that was previously proposed and approved would closely mimic the original terracotta in color, shape, and dimension. The currently proposed asphalt shingle does not match the original in shape or dimension.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Sarah Lewis and architect Vincent Mancini represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked why the Commission found the synthetic slate shingle acceptable. Ms. Sell explained the Commission reviewed the details of the proposed material and, while not an exact match, found that it was the closest available material to the original terracotta tile.

Ms. Lewis explained that the Commission approved several exterior alterations of her property including installation of a side door and stucco. She stated that the results were fantastic. She asserted that she has complied with the Commission's approvals at great expense. She stated that a new leak has occurred in the kitchen and, in researching the proposed synthetic slate replacement, they found that the material is very expensive. She explained that, during the discussion at the last Commission meeting, it was said that about four to five other roofs in the Girard Estate Historic District had come before the Commission and were approved for a material less expensive than what they had proposed in December. She stated that she surveyed the neighborhood and discovered no existing terracotta or slate roofs within a two-block radius. She explained that she decided to return to the Commission to ask for a reason why the other roofs were approved. She asserted that the synthetic slate exceeded their expectations and financial ability.

Ms. Hawkins asked the staff to explain the history of terracotta tile replacement with alternative materials in the Girard Estate Historic District. Ms. Sell explained that the staff has approved asphalt replacements for buildings that had lost their original roofing material by the time of designation.

Ms. Pentz asked about the shape of the proposed asphalt material. Mr. Mancini explained that the proposed material has a shadow-lined profile. He explained that the shingles do not lay flat and they considered this material to be a good alternative to the synthetic slate. Mr. Cluver asked if there was an exposure pattern on the existing roof. Mr. Mancini stated that there is a pattern and that the proposed asphalt material has a similar effect. He stated that he has some photographs of neighbors' houses that have red asphalt shingle replacement roofs. Ms. Hawkins explained that, without research, one cannot know the circumstances of the neighbors' roof replacements. Some may be grandfathered. Some may be illegal. Mr. Mancini stated that, if the Committee looks at the execution of the work already completed on the building, one would see that it is of a high quality. He asserted that it is the owners' intention to keep the historic character of the building. He asked the Committee to consider the intent and quality standards of the construction in this application. Mr. Cluver asked about the cost difference is between the synthetic slate and the asphalt. Ms. Lewis claimed that the synthetic slate costs \$8,000 to \$12,000 more than the asphalt. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if she plans to live in the house. She stated that she and her husband plan on living in the property for a long time. She explained that they purchased the property for more than other houses in that area are worth and with the additional construction costs, they would not see a return on the investment for a long time. She explained that she looked into grants, but they exceed the median income for the area, which is \$36,000.

Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Farnham the history of roof replacements in Girard Estate where the original terracotta roof was intact. Mr. Farnham recalled two examples of houses on Porter Street that face the park. He explained that both property owners applied to remove original red tile roofs. He stated that in the first application the Commission required a financial hardship application. He explained that the Commission found that requiring a new terracotta roof would create a financial hardship and approved its replacement with a red asphalt shingle. He

explained that in the second application, the Commission approved the replacement without a finding of financial hardship. He stated that, in that case, the Commission heard testimony from the owner and roofer that there were severe water infiltration problems. He explained that the roofer claimed that the roof had reached the end of its life and, although the tiles could be repaired and replaced, the cost of removal, replacement of the sheathing, and re-installation of the tiles would be so expensive that it would not be feasible. He explained that, at the time, the staff did extensive research and could find no alternative material that could replicate the original appearance of these specific terracotta tiles, which are unusual. Therefore, he explained, the Commission allowed for those roofs to be replaced with red asphalt.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the roofer's testimony is missing from this application. Ms. Lewis explained that the testimony was presented to the Commission in December 2011 and was the basis for the previous approval. Ms. Sell asserted that the applicant proved to the Commission's satisfaction that the roof was in need of replacement. Ms. Hawkins stated that the cost information of synthetic slate compared to asphalt from a roofer is missing from this application. Ms. Hawkins suggested the applicant bring cost estimates from a roofer to the Commission meeting.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 244 S HUTCHINSON ST

Project: Paint brick façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Thomas & Kristen Manning

Applicant: Kristen Manning

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 1/31/1961

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to paint the side elevation. The wall is brick and was previously painted a cream color. The application proposes to repaint the wall with this same color. Brick red would be the appropriate color to match the original material.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Thomas Manning represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked if this was a corner property. Mr. Thomas stated that it is a corner property and the paint on the side wall is in bad condition. He stated that they want to keep the existing color for continuity with the rear stucco wall.

Mr. Cluver asked if the wall was painted at the time of designation. Mr. Danta stated that the staff was unable to determine whether it was painted at designation, but it appears that the wall has been painted for a long time.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she deemed the proposed color to be appropriate. The Committee members determined that, given the conditions and context, the proposal satisfies the Standards.

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

ADDRESS: 332 SPRUCE ST

Project: Cut opening in garden wall, install gate

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Marc Shaw

Applicant: Murat Aslanan, Masa Construction

History: 1831; Girard Row; William Struther, marble mason

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to breach a historic brick wall at the rear of the property. The wall faces Cypress Street, and it is directly across the street from Three Bears Park and the gardens of the Physic House. Cypress Street along this stretch of the Society Hill Historic District is not a service alley, but a heavily trafficked street. The property is part of a row of five Greek Revival townhouses. The garden wall at the back of the subject property is connected to the rear walls of the other four properties. They all retain their historic appearance. This continuous wall runs unbroken behind all five properties. It only contains person doors, not vehicular entrances. The rear yard of the subject property retained its original privy until recently. It was apparently demolished without any permit or approval. The privy was connected to its neighbor's privy at 330 Spruce Street. The site plan submitted with the application does not delineate the footprint of this historic feature. It appears, however, that the proposed doors would be located in an area where the privy recently stood. The application does not include any information related to the proposed demolition of this historic feature.

The Historic American Buildings Survey, the arm of the U.S. Library of Congress that documents historic buildings throughout the country, photographed this property about 10 years ago, and the survey includes photographs of the historic privy and rear wall. The property was individually designated a historic property in 1957, and classified a Significant historic resource within the Society Hill Historic District in 1999. The alteration of this original brick wall, part of a larger unit, and the demolition of an original privy would adversely alter the rear of this property as well as the historic streetscape of Cypress Street

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. The Commission should require the reconstruction of the historically-significant, illegally-demolished privy.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developers Mark Shaw and Murat Aslanan represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants what they propose for the privy. Mr. Aslanan stated that the privy had been demolished when they purchased the property two months ago. He stated that there is a concrete pad with three condenser units on it. They have since re-graded the rear yard to make it level. It was noted that the Historic American Buildings Survey photograph of the privy shows the condensers adjacent to the privy.

Mr. Shaw stated that it was a five-unit property and that they are working to bring it back to a single-family house as Stephen Girard intended.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants if they were proposing a parking pad. Mr. Shaw stated that they are proposing a carriage door that matches the neighborhood and that other properties along Cypress Street that connect to these five Girard Row properties have carriage doors in the brick wall. He stated that the Physick House, across Cypress, has a carriage door on Cypress Street. Ms. Hawkins asked if they will propose a carriage door for 334 Spruce Street, the adjacent property that they also own. Mr. Aslansan stated that there is an historic tree on that property that they do not wish to disturb. He stated the proposed carriage door for 332 spruce is designed to conserve as much of the wisteria as possible. He stated that the neighbors requested that the carriage doors are compatible with other doors on Cypress and that they do not install something modern.

Ms. Pentz asked if this was the home of noted preservationist Charlie Peterson, who died in 2004. Mr. Shaw replied that it was his home. Ms. Pentz remarked that he would never have demolished the privy. Mr. Danta noted that in an aerial photography taken two years ago shows the privy. He asked the applicants for information on its demolition. Mr. Aslansan opined that what is shown in the photograph is a concrete pad, not the privy. Mr. Danta disagreed. Ms. Hawkins stated that it appears that the privy was illegally removed at some point. She stated that the privy was an important historic feature that the Commission may require be reconstructed, which would preclude installing a garage door. Mr. Shaw stated that they purchased the property two months ago and the privy was gone. He stated that they have been restoring the property to single family and doing right by it and they would like to install the carriage doors. Ms. Hawkins stated that the applicants may have bought the property with an illegal condition, which does not absolve them of the responsibility for the illegal work. She stated that, most likely, the Committee will not recommend approval for a garage door with this outstanding issue. She stated that this issue needs to be rectified first.

Mr. Aslansan pointed out that the brick is in bad condition and that this could be seen in the submitted photographs. He stated that the brick is spalling. Ms. Pentz stated that the wall can easily be repaired. Mr. Danta stated that the fact that some of the brick is in bad condition does not mean that the wall should be demolished.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she was opposed to the garage door regardless of any resolution of the privy issue. The rear wall is an original brick garden wall that runs along the rears of five properties. Ms. Pentz concurred.

Bernice Hamel of the Society Hill Civic Association Preservation Committee stated that this is a strange situation. She pointed out that this alteration would occur at the rear and not on the front façade on Spruce Street. Mr. Danta noted that this block of Cypress Street is a fully functioning street and not a service alley; it runs along Three Bears Park and house face onto it.

Ms. Hawkins recommended that the privy issue should be resolved and that the applicant may want to bring additional information to the Commission.

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

ADDRESS: 569 N 20TH ST

Project: Construct roof deck

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bromley Investments Group, LP

Applicant: Hal Kessler, D&D Drafting and Designs

History: 1886

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck over a garage/carriage house that faces Wilcox Street. A window would be cut down and made into a door to access the deck. It appears that there is an existing door, but the drawings do not indicate how this will be treated. There has been no information provided regarding the material of the proposed deck and railing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the appropriate material is used, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Hal Kessler represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the drawings and photographs were confusing. Mr. Kessler stated that he included a drawing of the proposed deck as well as elevations of the main building that have been previously approved for reference. Ms. Hawkins asked if the proposed deck will be aligned with the front of the garage. Mr. Kessler confirmed that that is what is proposed. The Committee members asked Mr. Kessler to draw a section to help explain the proposal. Ms. Hawkins asked about the height measurements. Mr. Kessler explained that the difference between the height of the garage and the height of the deck will be about five feet. He stated that the deck would be wood.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that details of the framing of the deck should be submitted. She was concerned that might not be enough clearance from the door to access the deck and meet code. Others suggested that Ms. Gutterman focus on the preservation issues and leave the building code issues to the Department of Licenses & Inspections.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she had concerns about how much of the structure of the deck will be visible about the parapet because those details have not been worked out yet. Mr. Kessler stated that seven inches of the structure will be visible above the parapet. Mr. Cluver stated that that dimension is in conflict with the drawings.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there were other decks on this block of Wilcox Street. Mr. Danta stated that there are many other decks on this block. He noted that this is a service alley, where decks and garages are ubiquitous.

Ms. Gutterman stated that the Committee does not have enough information to understand the appearance of the deck. She claimed that the application is incomplete. Ms. Hawkins concurred. Mr. Cluver suggested that the deck be set back from the façade a small amount, perhaps two feet. The Committee suggested that the applicant make revisions based on their comments and present them to the Commission.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

Standard 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.