

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

**TUESDAY, 21 APRIL 2015
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP
Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Suzanne Pentz
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Jonathan E. Farnham, Executive Director
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner I
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Charles Wright, CG Wiring LLC
Jeremy LeCompte, Harman Deutsch Architecture
Derek Spencer, Harman Deutsch Architecture
Jerry Ginsberg
Joel Spivak
Gili Ronen
Alexandra Brinkman, BLT Architects
Cindy Wilson Hamilton, Heritage Consulting
David Smalleys, BLT Architects
Charles B. Norman, National Real Estate Development
Janet Kalter
Joe Schiavo
Greg Diehl
Eric Robbins
Aaron Kavulich
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Architecture
Yao Huang, YCH Architect
Helen Heintz
Frank Graff, MFD Developers
Jason Solinsky, John Hubert Associates
Judy Robinson, Continuum Architecture
Eddie Ross, Core Property Development
Josh Horvitz, Fineman Krekstein & Harris P.C.
Charles Longacre, City Sign
Lauren Calisti, Hyperion Bank
John Edwards, Varenhorst
Neil Garrioch, Varenhorst
Arrus Farmer, PMC Property Group

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Meses. Gutterman, Pentz, and Stein and Messrs. Cluver and McCoubrey joined her.

ADDRESS: 940 E WASHINGTON LA

Project: Install solar panels

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Gili Ronen

Applicant: Gili Ronen

History: 1914; Jean Smith House

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Awbury Arboretum Historic District, Significant, 5/14/2010

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install ten ground-mounted solar power panels at a private residence located in Awbury Arboretum. The panels will be located along the northeast property line near a fence. This application proposes to shield views of the solar panels with shrubs of various sizes. Although the application provides information about the arrangement of the equipment in plan, it does not provide complete information about the heights of the panels. Additional information should be provided to determine whether the panels will be visible from public portions of Awbury Arboretum.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: No recommendation until additional information is provided.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Committee. Gili Ronen, owner, and Charles Wright, electrician, represented the application.

Mr. Wright stated that the height of the panels off the ground would be approximately four and a half feet to the top of the panel; the panels will be five feet and five inches high but will be mounted on an angle. He stated that they plan to get the panels as close to the ground as possible while maintaining their rotational abilities. He stated that the panels themselves are four feet tall but they will be mounted on an angle.

Ms. Ronen informed the Committee that they will be planting hedges all along the property line shared with the Awbury Arboretum meadow as well as shrubbery around the solar panels. Mr. Cluver verified that the height of the screening shrubbery around the panels will be higher than the panels. Mr. Wright stated that, from 90 percent of the vantage points, the screen of shrubs will block views of the panels. He stated that panels will be visible from some points in the Arboretum, given that the grade rises away from this property. He stated the fence along the property line is six feet tall.

Ms. Stein asked if the panels would generate any noise. Mr. Wright stated that they would produce no noise. He clarified that the array will include ten posts with two panels each, twenty panels total. Ms. Stein asked about the landscape surface under the panels and how the landscape will be maintained. Mr. Wright stated that the ground will most likely be covered in wood chips around and under the panels. Ms. McCoubrey asked why they will be placed eighteen feet apart. Mr. Wright responded that they arranged a certain distance apart to allow them to move with the sun as well as not shade each other. Mr. Cluver stated that he sees this

proposal as well screened and completely reversible. He stated that it seems as inconspicuous as solar panels can be.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the staff should review a mock up to determine the visibility of the panels and to determine their maximum height. She suggested that this should be done before the Historical Commission meeting.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the shrubbery should be evergreen or some other type of planting that is full and green all year round.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the shrubbery is planted to create a dense screen and the height of the panels is no taller than six inches below the fence, pursuant to Standard 10.

ADDRESS: 704-12 N BROAD ST

Project: Replace existing sign with new LED sign

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Greater Exodus Baptist Church

Applicant: Sterling McCray, II, Greater Exodus Baptist Church

History: Greater Exodus Baptist Church, Our Lady of Blessed Sacrement

Individual Designation: 11/2/1972

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace an existing sign mounted at the ground-floor level on the front façade of the church. The proposed sign would have an LED animated face within a sign cabinet of the same dimensions as the existing sign, and would be installed into the masonry at the same location. The staff suggests that a freestanding sign on the sidewalk may be more appropriate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Committee. Deacon Sterling McCray represented the application.

Mr. McCray stated that they propose to replace the sign because they are have difficulties with the mechanics of the existing sign and it would be cost prohibitive to have it repaired. He stated that they prefer an LED sign, which is changeable by computer and can be installed in the jacket of the existing sign. Ms. Hawkins asked what was wrong with the existing sign. Mr. McCray stated that it is difficult to maintain the lighting and lettering of the existing sign. He stated that they would like a sign to reach the pedestrian traffic on Broad Street as well as to inform the church members and community.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there were any plans for the other sign on the façade. Mr. McCray stated that it will most likely be removed if the install the electronic sign. Ms. Gutterman asked if the sign could be freestanding rather than mounting in the same location as the existing sign. He stated that they explored that question and decided that mounting in the same location would make the sign less intrusive.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the mounting requires a certain degree of space between the sign and the wall and, based on the information provided, the sign would need to be mounted four inches off the building. She stated that she is concerned that using the same sign jacket would not allow enough space between the wall and the sign for ventilation. McCray stated that the existing cabinet sits out about a foot from the building. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the LED sign appears to come as one unit and looks like it is not meant to fit within an existing sign frame. Mr. McCray stated that the installer has coordinated with the manufacturer and they are, in fact, able to use the existing frame. Ms. Hawkins stated that the LED sign is going to weigh more than the existing sign and will likely require more holes in the masonry to support the sign.

Mr. Cluver stated that there are two distinct issues before the Committee. He stated that one is the appropriateness of the sign and the other is how it would be installed. He asked if it could be installed in a way that is sensitive to the building and does not add new anchor points and new holes in the masonry. He suggested that the staff could confirm this. He stated that the LED light is such an aggressive light. He opined that a backlit sign is much more attractive to the eye. He suggested that such a proposal could be approved, provided that the second sign was removed. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the LED sign may not be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, but might be acceptable owing to the circumstances. Ms. Gutterman concurred. She suggested that, given the unique location and use, the Committee could consider it. She agreed with the proviso that the second sign be removed. Ms. Stein stated that, if the Commission does accept the LED sign, it would be more appropriate for it to be freestanding on the sidewalk and not attached to the building. She suggested that a freestanding sign should be placed on either side of the window. She stated that the sign would need to be smaller to fit in these locations. Mr. McCray stated that the sign would not be seen. Mr. Cluver stated that the LED is so bright that it would be seen. Ms. Pentz stated that, given that the sign is replacing an existing sign, a new sign that is the same size would be appropriate. She also agreed that the second sign should be removed. She suggested that the staff should review the attachment details.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she is opposed to the LED sign. She stated that the existing signs can be relamped to have LED bulbs to reduce energy load and provide brighter light. She opined that movable and changeable signage on historic buildings of this nature is inappropriate.

Mr. Cluver stated that he is envisioning the sign parallel to the building face but post mounted rather than building mounted. Mr. McCray stated that such a sign would be excessively costly. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the applicant provide information on the cost associated with the freestanding sign at the Historical Commission meeting. She also suggested that they provide more detailed photographs of the existing signs and their attachments to the building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted but approval of a freestanding LED sign in a location that does not block the windows, provided the second sign is removed, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 302 MARKET ST

Project: Construct building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owners: Jerry Ginsberg

Applicant: Joel Spivak

History: c. 1830, destroyed by fire 2014

Individual Designation: 11/14/1976

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 to construct a two-story building on the site of an historic four-story building destroyed by fire. The proposed new building has a light stone facade and large plate glass windows that neither resembles the lost building nor is compatible with the historic district. The design is incompatible in materials, massing, and scale with the historic building that stood on the site, its twin to the west, and the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Committee. Expediter Joel Spivak, owner Jerry Ginsberg, architect Lawrence Gilbert represented the application.

Mr. Spivak stated that finances are driving this project. He stated that Mr. Ginsberg has had a family business at the site since before the Bicentennial. He stated that the building was destroyed by fire in 2014; the owner has been operating the business out of a building at 600 Market Street since the fire, but would like to return to his original location. He stated that at his age, 74, Mr. Ginsberg is not comfortable borrowing more than \$1 million to construct a four-story building like the one that stood on the site. He stated that, at this time, they are proposing to build a two-story building, which is similar to other buildings on the 100, 200, and 300 blocks of Market Street. He indicated that he included photographs of a number of two-story buildings on these block in the submission. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee has not suggested that the new building should be a four-story building.

Mr. Cluver asked why the proposed material is limestone rather than brick, which is more in keeping with the historic district. Mr. Spivak stated that the owner and the architect decided that limestone would look nicer on this modern building. He opined that it would inappropriate to replicate a colonial building. Mr. Cluver disagreed, stating that red brick is not necessarily colonial. Mr. Gilbert stated brick would only be appropriate for a four-story building. Mr. Gilbert stated that when he met with Randy Baron of the Historical Commission's staff and Mr. Baron suggested that a four-story building would be the most appropriate because it would have the same scale as the former neighboring buildings. Mr. Gilbert stated that he felt that the limestone would be appropriate for this retail use. He noted that the front façade of the building would be mainly glass. Mr. Cluver asked how limestone relates to the district. Mr. Gilbert stated that it does not, but, in his mind, a two-story building with a lot of glass and brick would not relate to the district either. Mr. Cluver suggested that the design is not compatible with the historic district. Mr. Gilbert agreed that it is not compatible with the older buildings in the district. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee is charged with determining the compatibility of the proposed building with the historic district. Mr. Gilbert stated that there are many newer buildings in the district.

Ms. Hawkins stated that scale is only one component of compatibility. She stated that she found it refreshing to have an applicant who did not want to build to the maximum height. She stated

that there are other components of compatibility, such as materials, fenestration patterns, and proportions that allow a building to contribute to the larger district. She stated that the proposed building is not compatible with the district. She stated that all buildings must serve a use, but they also have to sit comfortably within a larger context. Ms. Gutterman concurred. She suggested that the design could include darker masonry and punched openings. Mr. Gilbert asked about more glass on the first floor but brick and punched openings on the second floor. Mr. Cluver stated that a first-floor storefront and brick and punched openings above is common and compatible with the district.

Ms. Stein stated that she would like to see more details on the limestone. She suggested that that a six-inch base is not going to hold up to the nighttime activity in Old City. Ms. Pentz suggested that a masonry spandrel between the first and second floor will help the design in terms of compatibility with the district and will provide for a signage location. Mr. Gilbert stated that, since the historic building was lost, the new building should be modern. Mr. Cluver stated that a building can be of its time as well as of its place.

Janet Kalter of Old City stated that she is opposed to a back-lit sign.

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

ADDRESS: 19-25 S 12TH ST

Project: Restore/rehabilitate facades, add bridge
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owners: Stephen Girard Estate Trusts
Applicant: Alexandra Brinkman, BLT Architects
History: Constructed 1896, James Hamilton Windrim, Architect
Individual Designation: 12/12/2008
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate the exterior envelope of this office building, while reinvigorating the first floor with new commercial spaces

The first-floor 12th Street façade entryway and storefronts will be partially restored based on historic photographs. New entries will be cut on the other three facades to allow for a variety of new uses. The north façade will have later bays removed and storefronts installed that will more closely replicate the original large plate glass windows, but with some added doors. Sections of a stone base and tripartite stone window mullions will be removed from the east façade, which is the least public façade, to create new entrances. The standards would suggest that more of the original stonework and design should be retained, but it is a rear façade on a service alley. A bridge will be added to the east face of the building to connect this building to the one to its east. This bridge is in an area not currently seen by the public. The bridge should be attached in such a way as to not remove the stone beltcourse cornice. Finally, a basement entrance will be altered and a later metal railing will be relocated for safety reasons from the north to the east façade.

At the top of the building, the terra-cotta cornices and parapet will be partially repaired and retained and partially replaced with glass fiber reinforced concrete (GFRC). GFRC has been

chosen over real terra-cotta for scheduling reasons; new terra cotta has a very long lead time. New HVAC units will be placed on the roof in an inconspicuous area.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided more stone is retained at the first-floor east façade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Alexandra Brinkman and David Smallets, preservation consultant Cindy Wilson Hamilton, and developer Charles B. Norman represented the application.

Mr. Norman stated that they are very happy to be the stewards of this significant building and look forward to restoring some of its original details and well as incorporating it into their larger development plans for the East Market site.

Ms. Gutterman asked for information on the anchoring of the lighting and signage. Ms. Brinkman distributed drawings that detail the proposed lighting and signage. She stated that the type of light fixture is on a swivel so it will be anchored to a vertical surface. She stated that the fixture will be used in a number of locations, along the cornice and along the parapet at the roof. She stated that they are four-foot linear lights. Ms. Hawkins asked how many penetrations would be made for electrical connections. Ms. Brinkman stated that the lighting can be daisy chained, each fixture will need to be fastened to building but will not require its own penetration for wiring. Ms. Gutterman asked about the number of penetrations. Ms. Brinkman stated that there would be four fastening penetrations for each fixture. Ms. Hawkins asked about the number of electrical penetrations at the top cornice. Ms. Brinkman stated that the number is unknown at this time. Ms. Hawkins stated that she does not have an understanding of the impact of the lighting on the physical historical fabric. Ms. Gutterman asked if the fixtures could be attached to blocking and the blocking affixed to the building to reduce the number of penetrations. Ms. Hamilton stated that they could look into that. Mr. Cluver questioned why they would want to light the parapet. Ms. Brinkman stated that they are relamping the lighting in the coiffures and there would be no additional penetrations for this lighting. Ms. Hawkins asked about the proposed lighting at the Stephen Girard sign. Ms. Brinkman stated that that lighting has yet to be worked out and the intent is to have as few penetrations as possible and to mount the lighting to vertical surfaces rather than horizontal surfaces. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the lighting proposal should be better developed.

Mr. Cluver asked about the entrance on the west façade. Ms. Brinkman stated that the original entrance had three single doors. She stated that they wanted to have central double doors for better circulation; therefore, this design allows for the double doors but has a tripartite nature. Mr. Cluver observed that the current configuration has four doors. He suggested that the entrance should have either three or four doors, but not something in between as shown in the proposed design.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the signage. Ms. Brinkman stated that there would be blade signs with down lights along the north and south elevations. She stated that on the east and west facades would have swing signs attached to the new pieces of the storefront. Mr. Smallets stated that the plan is to provide the tenants with the sign armature to control the sign sizes and locations throughout the building.

Mr. Cluver asked about the bridge on the east elevation. Mr. Norman stated the bridge is needed to provide access to amenities that would be in the 11th Street building. Ms. Hamilton reported that they had worked with staff to develop a design with the least impact on the

masonry. Ms. Brinkman stated that it is designed to maintain a portion of the cornice because they are unable to maintain the entire cornice. Mr. Smallets stated that the floors in each building are almost inline at this level. He stated that the original design eliminated the whole cornice, but they have worked to maintain the upper cornice as shown in the current design. Ms. Hawkins asked if the ceiling height could be reduced to maintain the cornice. Mr. Cluver stated that the windows are not tall enough and will need to be cut.

Mr. Cluver asked about the two types of granite proposed for the storefronts. Ms. Brinkman stated that they chose the two types for architectural reasons. She stated that there is a textural difference; one is honed and one is polished, but both would match the original building. Ms. Gutterman stated that the storefront drawing does not show where the polished granite will be installed. Ms. Brinkman apologized for a typographical error in the drawings.

Ms. Pentz asked how the weight of GFRC compares with terra cotta. Ms. Brinkman stated that she did not know. Ms. Pentz asked about the comparative costs of the two materials. Ms. Hamilton stated that the terra cotta would be \$136,000 more than the GFRC. She stated that the GFRC can be fabricated by June 2015, but the terra cotta not until October 2015.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that applicants withdraw the lighting and signage components of the application and resubmit them at a later date with more details and renderings showing the lighting scheme at night. She stated that the impact of the lighting on the building is not clear. Ms. Hawkins noted that most of the details about the lights and signage were submitted at this meeting, not in advance as required. Ms. Gutterman stated that critical details like the numbers of fixtures and penetrations to the façade are missing. Mr. Cluver stated that the Committee should recommend denial of the bridge, owing to its impact on the cornice.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the bridge, pursuant to Standard 2; denial of the lighting and signage, owing to incompleteness; approval of the remainder of the application, provided more stone is retained at the first-floor east façade and the west entrance has either three or four doors, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 1800 DELANCEY ST

Project: Construct/modify roofdeck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owners: 1800 Delancey Street Partners L.P.

Applicant: Yao Chang Huang

History: c. 1855

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: This application proposes to modify and legalize a deck that was not constructed according to approved plans. The deck, which was approved by the Historical Commission in 2014, was required to be set back to the point where it would not be visible from the public right-of-way. In fact the deck is currently constructed so that it is highly visible currently from every side. The applicant proposes to correct the as-built design by changing the handrail to vertical pickets, removing the planter, and setting the deck back farther from the facades. Despite the revisions, the deck will still be visible from the street, particularly from east on Delancey Street. The staff recommends that the deck could be made inconspicuous by setting it back an

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 APRIL 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

additional 7 inches on the east side. It may not be possible to make the deck invisible from the street, but the Standards require inconspicuousness, not invisibility.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the deck is set back an additional 7 inches from the plane of the façade on the east side, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Committee. Developer Jim Bennett and architect Yao Huang represented the application.

Mr. Bennett noted that the deck on the main rooftop is the primary matter, but also noted that the lower decks are not in compliance. He explained that his construction partner had chosen to install inappropriate railings that were not approved by the Commission or by the other construction partners. The glass railings, he noted, have since been removed, and they agree to install vertical metal picket railings on the second and fourth-floor lower decks as approved by the Commission in January 2014. He further noted that, for the upper deck, the glass would be removed, and they agree with the staff's recommendation to pull the railing back an additional seven inches from the 18th Street side.

Ms. Hawkins commented that the stipulation from the previous Committee and Commission reviews were extremely clear in that no part of the railing was to be visible from the public right-of-way at all. "At all," she continued, does not mean inconspicuous; it means "at all." She opined that the upper deck should not be visible at all from the public right-of-way since there is already access to exterior space on the second and fourth floors.

Mr. Cluver asked whether there were any circumstances that had changed since the original review and approval. Mr. Bennett noted that the construction partner, Mark Travis, was extremely challenging to work with, and had disagreed with the original architect. Communications between the partners and the consultants were not good, and Mr. Travis built what he wanted without consultation. As a result, Mr. Bennett continued, Mr. Travis has subsequently been relieved from the responsibility of completing the project. In response to Mr. Cluver's question, Mr. Bennett claimed that, pulling the railing back to the point where it was completely invisible from any street would render the deck unusable. He referred the Committee members to the photographs in their packets showing the location of the proposed modified railing location, mocked up with yellow caution tape. The railing, he noted, would not be visible until a viewer went as far as the south side of Pine Street. He noted that the incorrectly-built deck railing was extremely visible, and that he had been extremely concerned when he saw it, as he realized that was not what had been approved. The 18th Street side of the proposed railing would only be visible for a short stretch east on Delancey Street. He pointed out that the staff believed that, if the railing was brought back an additional seven inches from the 18th Street façade, just the top railing would be visible from Delancey Street, and would blend with the cornice.

Mr. Cluver asked whether there was a plan of the previously approved roof deck. Ms. Hawkins responded that the previous approval was not correlated to a specific plan, but simply stated that the railing would not be visible from any public right-of-way, and would be field-checked by the staff.

Mr. Bennett noted that the staff felt that the previously requested planter boxes around the perimeter of the deck were a greater visual barrier, and that the use of a simple metal picket railing around the deck would be less visible.

Mr. Cluver observed that the Committee should not undercut the Commission's earlier decision, but should simply leave the decision to the Commission. If the Commission wants to revise its decision, he noted, it can.

Mr. Huang presented a sight-line drawing of the building, and noted that the deck would not be visible from directly across the street. Ms. Hawkins responded that the drawing does not represent the ways in which pedestrians experience their environments. Mr. Huang noted that, theoretically, the roof deck could be visible from very far away. Ms. Gutterman commented that certain restrictions were placed on the approval of this deck, which have not been met. The Commission, not the Committee, has the authority amend those restrictions. Mr. Cluver agreed, noting that the Commission can determine whether the photographs of the revised deck satisfy them, the Committee cannot.

Mr. Bennett noted that it would be difficult to move rear railing along Panama Street, as it would obstruct the pilothouse door. On the 18th Street and Delancey Street side, it could be pulled in a little more. From the northerly direction, Mr. Bennett continued, it would be extremely difficult to see the railing during foliage months, and during non-foliage months, the railing would blend with the tree branches. The area where the railing would be most conspicuous would be along a 20-foot stretch of sidewalk in front of 1739 Delancey Street. To minimize that visibility, they agree to pull the railing back from that façade, as the staff recommended.

Ms. Hawkins noted that deck approvals are not automatic; decks must be reviewed in their contexts. Ms. Hawkins noted that the Commission allowed visibility of the pilothouse, owing to the fact that it blended with the neighbor's pilothouse. She observed that the Commission discussed the visibility of the railing for the deck at length. At the time, she noted, it was unclear how large or small the deck would be as a result of the railing being invisible, but it was clear that it could not be visible at all from the public right-of-way. Only the Commission can step back from its earlier decision.

Mr. Huang asked whether the Commission had specified the locations from which the deck must be invisible because, theoretically, it could be partially visible from many different locations. Ms. Hawkins and Ms. Gutterman emphasized that the Commission said it was not to be visible from any portion of the public right-of-way. Ms. Hawkins responded that the applicant was welcome to listen to the recording or read the minutes of the previous meeting.

Ms. Stein asked whether the second and fourth-floor decks were in a different category and were allowed to be visible. Ms. DiPasquale responded that they were approved with a metal picket railing. Ms. Stein noted that the upper deck should be invisible. The applicant can either pull the railing back or drop the height of the railing. Mr. McCoubrey concurred, and asked whether the railing had to be 42 inches tall if there was roof on the other side of the rail. Ms. Hawkins responded that it was up to the applicant to determine the technical requirements.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

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

ADDRESS: 32 S 22ND ST

Project: Modify roof to correct violation

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owners: Wilson Eyre Condominium Association

Applicant: Helen Heintz

History: Architect Wilson Eyre 1888 for St. Anthony's Club

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a new roof on this building. The current, inappropriate roof was installed without the Commission's approval or a building permit. The illegal work was cited in a violation issued on 5 November 2010. The property owners submitted a legalization application, of which the Architectural Committee recommended denial in September 2011, but that application withdrawn before being reviewed by the Commission.

The application proposes a Grand Manor bevel-cut asphalt shingle roof in red or grey. The roof was originally clad in red barrel or Spanish tile. The application includes samples of several asphalt shingles as well as pricing for tile, metal faux tile, and asphalt. The property owners do not wish or cannot afford to install real tile. One option that could minimize cost as well as provide the appearance of the barrel tiles and ridge details would be to install real tile on the small front slope and the two ridges and use the "Monaco" red asphalt tile on the rest of the roof. It has been reported that the real tile would cost approximately an additional \$450 for the material, exclusive of labor, for the small front pitch and that it is possible to marry two different roofing materials at those ridges.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of asphalt shingles on the entire roof, but approval of a compromise that would allow the barrel shape and color of the Spanish tile to be expressed at the front façade with a less expensive material on the remainder of the roof, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Condominium association representative Helen Heintz represented the application.

Ms. Heintz disputed the claim made by Randal Baron of the staff that regarding the cost to install real terra cotta on the small front pitch. Ms. DiPasquale explained that Mr. Baron was on vacation and she had no firsthand knowledge about his claims regarding cost. Ms. Heintz noted that the only estimate she had been given was \$110,000-120,000 for recycled Spanish tile for the entire roof. Ms. Hawkins asked about the pricing for tile for the front pitch, and Ms. Heintz responded that she did not look into the cost for the front pitch only, as she is strongly opposed to the idea of using multiple materials on the roof. Mr. Cluver questioned where the line of the materials would be drawn, and Ms. DiPasquale responded that Mr. Baron had suggested using real tile on the front slope only. Mr. Cluver responded that he did not like that idea.

Ms. Heinz presented the asphalt-shingle options designed to resemble Spanish tiles. She also presented a pressed metal tile that Mr. Baron had suggested, which she did not think was an acceptable option. She noted that she preferred the CertainTeed Grand Manor shingles, which have a 50-year warranty and appear to be higher quality than the GAF Monaco shingles that have a 30-year warranty.

Ms. Pentz asked whether the tiles would be placed on sleepers to give them any depth, and Ms. Heintz responded that they would not be. Ms. Heintz commented that she would prefer to do one continuous material, the CertainTeed Grand Manor asphalt shingles, on the entire roof. She again rejected Mr. Baron's suggestion.

Ms. Hawkins noted that Ms. Heintz seemed concerned about the warranty and asked about the warranties of the various materials. Ms. Heintz responded that she believed the CertainTeed shingles had a 50-year warranty while the GAF had a 30-year warranty. Ms. Hawkins responded that Ms. Heintz should provide the Committee with complete information about the warranties.

Mr. Cluver commented that he did not know that the Committee had the authority to approve an alternative material, but that the Commission could take a more liberal interpretation. Ms. Hawkins disagreed with Mr. Cluver, noting that, as long as the Commission had not ruled on this matter, the Committee was free to offer an opinion. Ms. DiPasquale noted that the Committee's recommendation should be "guided by" the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Ms. Stein asked about the flashing for the roof, and Ms. Heintz responded that they are planning to use copper flashing. Ms. Stein asked whether the applicant had provided details of the flashing, and Ms. Heintz responded that she did not. Mr. Cluver commented that that is a matter for the staff to review as part of the standard "staff to review details" requirement, particularly if it is a replacement in kind. Ms. Heintz responded that it would not be a replacement in kind, as the existing flashing is an inappropriate white aluminum flashing. Ms. Stein asked whether the downspouts would be replaced, and Ms. Heintz responded that the downspouts are internal.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the applicant install real terracotta along the ridges, with a finial on top, to provide three-dimensionality to the roof. Ms. Pentz commented that she did not object to the mixing of materials on the roof, and that she would rather see terracotta tiles on the front slope and the ridges. She further noted that she would like to see the cost estimate for real tile on the front slope. Ms. Heintz responded that the price would still be substantial, and Ms. Hawkins replied that, given the proportion of the front slope to the rest of the roof, it would be considerably less.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of real terracotta tile on the front slope and CertainTeed Grand Manor shingles on the remainder, with copper flashing, with the staff to review details.

2001 SPRING GARDEN ST

Project: Renovate former church building for multi-family use

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Carkim Holdings LLC

Applicant: Rotciver Lebron, Harman Deutsch Architecture

History: 1864; Spring Garden Methodist Church

Individual Designation: 5/1/1975

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to adaptively reuse a church building for as a multi-family residence. The project would install a third-floor system at a current mezzanine level within the sanctuary space to create three full floors of livable space, with six units per floor.

The only proposed changes to the exterior are the replacement of windows, two side doors, and the roofing of the eastern tower. The application does not propose any modifications to the front façade on Spring Garden Street, but does propose the replacement of nearly all windows on the other three elevations, the majority of which are stained or painted glass, with clear glass.

The application proposes to restore the ground-floor windows on the 20th Street facade, which are currently rectangular vinyl replacement windows set within arched openings, to their original material and configuration. The tall arched windows within the sanctuary space, which are currently non-operable stained-glass windows, would be replaced with sets of two clear-glass, single-hung, wood windows and a clear-glass arched transom. Windows on the north and west facades, which are only marginally visible from the public right-of-way, would be replaced with similar treatments.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the stained glass arched transoms on the 20th Street façade are retained, and, if feasible, additional stained glass on the 20th Street façade is retained, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Jeremy LeCompte and Rustin Ohler represented the application.

Mr. LeCompte presented color renderings of the building, and described the changes in use to the property. He noted that they propose to restore all of the stained glass windows on the primary, Spring Garden Street elevation as well as some of the windows in the side elevations of the towers. On the 20th Street elevation of the eastern tower, the first-floor lower-level window that is currently filled with a vinyl replacement window would be replaced with an appropriate arched wood window, while the stained glass upper windows would be restored. The rest of the windows on the 20th Street elevation would be replaced with two sets of double-hung windows. Mr. LeCompte noted that many of the stained glass windows are in poor condition, with broken panes and damaged leading. The unbroken windows are very wavy. The windows have all been covered with Plexiglas on the interior and exterior, making them difficult to see from the exterior. The Plexiglas was installed because the windows are not waterproof or insulated. The proposed replacement windows would satisfy energy requirements, but also be operable, since the building will be converted to residences.

Mr. Cluver noted that the drawings do not include a section of the proposed window, but that he assumed the mullion between the two sets of single-hung windows will be physically attached to the balcony structure to create a sound and fire barrier. He asked where the operable sash

would be, and Mr. Ohler noted that the drawings show directional markers, but that the lower sash would be operable in the lower window, while the upper sash would be operable in the upper windows. He noted that, for the mullion between the windows, they have worked through a detail where they can provide a fire-rating with approximately a three-inch depth.

Mr. Ohler noted that they did explore the staff recommendation to retain the arched transom, but that it is difficult to do so, because the arched portion of the glass is incorporated into the full window, with just a thin lead separation. He noted that the reason they did not create an arched sash was because they wanted operability.

Ms. Stein asked whether they had considered casement windows, which better maintain the profile and plane of the existing windows, as opposed to double-hung windows which break the plane of the window. Mr. LeCompte responded that they did consider casement windows, and chose uneven sash windows to incorporate the lines of the existing stained glass windows. The horizontals of the original stained glass, he noted, read more in the photographs of the windows than in the existing conditions drawings. The issue with casements, he continued, is the operability and the relationship to the floor, which would require four-inch restrictors on the upper windows, and substantial hardware on the upper floors.

Mr. Cluver commented that he appreciated the attempt to mimic the original window pattern, but contended that the lack of rhythm in the windows was inappropriate. To really replicate the pattern, he suggested, the applicant could create five equal sections/bays in the window, and turn the center bay into a solid glass panel at the floor level, with double-hung windows above and below. Mr. Cluver asked whether the window manufacturer could make a single-hung window with an operable upper sash, and Mr. Ohler responded that it could.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether there was a need for an elevator or boiler flues, and Mr. Ohler confirmed that there would not be. Ms. Gutterman asked whether there would be any roof penetrations for any reason, and Mr. Ohler responded that there would be plumbing vent stacks only.

Ms. Pentz asked how the attic is currently accessed, and Mr. Ohler responded that they had limited access to the building, so they were unsure how exactly it is accessed. Ms. Pentz noted that the applicant should be sure not to cut off access for future access and maintenance.

Ms. Pentz questioned the structural layout of the building, and Mr. Ohler described the interior work.

Ms. DiPasquale asked where the applicant proposed to put the condensing units, and Mr. LeCompte responded that they intend to place the condensing units in the alley along the west side of the building. He noted that he had not yet received Streets Department approval to place them on the ground of the alley, and that there may be a need to elevate them to wall between the first and second-floor windows on an equipment rack. Mr. LeCompte noted that they had considered placing the units in the towers, but that there was not sufficient airflow in those spaces. Ms. Gutterman asked whether there is access to the tower, and Mr. Ohler noted that it is not readily accessible, but is accessible through a hatch, and that there is cellular equipment in the tower.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance asked whether there was any discussion of salvaging the stained glass windows, particularly those along the 20th Street façade. Mr. Ohler responded that they would be willing to donate the

windows to a salvage company. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the windows could also be stored in the basement of the building, and Mr. Ohler responded that that would be acceptable as well.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that storing the stained glass windows on site is considered; the rooftop plumbing vents are combined as possible and painted a dark color; and the replacement window pattern is regularized and spandrel glass is considered between two single-hung windows; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

ADDRESS: 2001-21 NORTH ST

Project: Convert industrial building to residential, demolish warehouse, construct townhouses

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joe Valones

Applicant: Michael Loonstyn, MJL Contracting LLC

History: 1947; Potts Ice Cream

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the partial demolition of an existing industrial/warehouse building in the Spring Garden Historic District. The application proposes to retain the large two-story, buff brick and cast stone Art Moderne portion of the building at the corner of 20th and North Streets, but to demolish the red-brick portions of the building that extend west along North Street.

Despite the fact that the Spring Garden Historic District's period of significance extends from 1850 to 1930, and this building was constructed in 1947, the property is listed as Significant in the district inventory. By definition, a building constructed outside the period of significance cannot contribute to a district's significance. Preliminary historic map and zoning research indicates that the red brick portions of the building proposed for demolition were constructed circa 1960, and as such, the staff does not consider them a contributing portion of the historic resource.

The application proposes to make the following modifications to the Art Moderne structure: painting or coating the buff brick on both facades; reconfiguring the windows on the 20th Street elevation from three bays to five bays, and replacing the original glass block with fixed, plate glass and awning windows; expanding the window openings on the upper floor of the North Street elevation by cutting decorative brickwork; and eliminating one window opening on the first floor of the North Street elevation to add a garage entry with wood panel surround. The application also proposes to construct a rooftop addition with deck. The proposed addition would be flush with the north façade, but would be set back from the east (20th Street) and south (North Street) elevations.

The application also proposes to demolish the red-brick loading dock and garage portions of the building and to construct seven, four-story townhomes in their place. The proposed townhouses would feature front-loading garages, ground-floor entry doors, central bays with asymmetrical windows, and roof decks with pilot houses.

The application was submitted without any consultation with the staff. The application lacks necessary details such as existing conditions drawings and is internally inconsistent. The

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 APRIL 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

architectural drawings lack annotations beyond “existing 2-story building to be renovated,” and visual comparison between photographs of the existing building and the proposed drawings indicate some inconsistencies and inaccuracies. While the demolition of the non-historic loading docks and garages for the construction of new townhomes is appropriate, the design of the proposed townhouses, particularly the front-loading garages and fenestration pattern warrant reconsideration.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept, but denial as submitted, pursuant to Standard 9 and incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Michael Loonstyn and contractor Francis Graff represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether the applicants had any additional materials to present, and Mr. Loonstyn responded that they did not. Mr. Loonstyn noted that they did not currently have access to the building or to photographs of the building belonging to the current owner, but that there is evidence of an original store that is attached to the portion of the building proposed for renovation.

Mr. Cluver noted that, looking at the portion of the building proposed for renovation, the window replacement along 20th Street is proposed as five bays of windows rather than the historic three. He asked whether there was any reason that they could not be made as three bays, and Mr. Loonstyn responded that he would not be opposed to modifying the plans to three bays instead of five.

Mr. Cluver also noted that, along the South façade, the drawings depict four windows in place of two existing windows with decorative masonry between them. Mr. Cluver commented that there should be more respect for the existing openings and their character. He noted that he did not expect the applicant to install new glass block to recreate what was there historically, but that the openings and rhythm should be maintained. Mr. Loonstyn responded that he was planning to convert the building into his own residence. He stated that he appreciated Mr. Cluver’s suggestions.

Mr. Cluver asked why Mr. Loonstyn proposed a third-floor addition, and Mr. Loonstyn responded that the first floor would be used as garage space, while the existing second and proposed third floors would be living space. The third floor, he noted, would have amazing city views.

Ms. Hawkins commented that she was struggling with the lack of information presented on the drawings for the proposed new construction, particularly that there was no information regarding the proposed materials. She noted that the drawings are acceptable as a preliminary concept and point of discussion, but not as a final approval. More information, she noted, needs to be presented on paper.

Regarding the big picture ideas, Ms. Hawkins noted that she is highly opposed to front-loading garages. She applauded the use of a garage door that included glazing in it, but remained opposed to the presence of garage fronts along the street. She also encouraged the applicant to explore a rotating rhythm to the townhouses, where the doors of adjacent properties are next to each other. She pointed to an aerial photograph of the block, and urged the applicant to continue that rhythm on the proposed construction. Overall, Ms. Hawkins noted that the current drawings are preliminary, and are not suitable for final approval.

Ms. Gutterman pointed out that the application proposed to paint the masonry of the existing corner building, which she noted is inappropriate for historic masonry. Mr. Loonstyn stated that he would prefer to replace the brick instead. Ms. Gutterman noted that the drawings did not accurately depict the existing materials of the building, and underscored Ms. Hawkins' position that there is not enough information on the drawings to fully understand the proposed project, both on the existing building and the proposed buildings.

Ms. Gutterman asked why the garages had to face the street, and Mr. Loonstyn responded that there would be no way to access the proposed buildings from the rear. Ideally, he noted, if they were able to demolish the entire building, they would provide access off of 20th Street, but, since the building on the corner is to be restored, that is not an option. Many of the other homes on the block, he noted, have front-loading garages, and that the proposed townhomes would face garages. He acknowledged that the front-loading garages are not the ideal or most attractive solution, but that they are the only way to have parking on the block. Ms. Hawkins responded that context photographs showing the area would be helpful in presenting that argument.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the applicant explore incorporating green space between the garages. Others questioned the suggestion.

Mr. Loonstyn attempted to sum up the recommendations, noting that the Committee had suggested marrying the front doors and incorporating flower beds into the design of the new buildings. Ms. Hawkins responded that these were simply suggestions, and that the design needed to be more fully thought through.

Mr. Cluver asked whether the units would be sold or rented, and suggested that the applicant could minimize the number of garage entries to two, perhaps at lots 7 and 3, but noted that that might be difficult to sell. Mr. Loonstyn responded that, by right, they could have demolished the structures and replaced them with a commercial property with one vehicular entrance, but that was not their preference, nor that of the neighborhood association.

Ms. Hawkins opined that the application is incomplete. Conceptually, however, she supported demolishing the red brick portions of the building, but stated that more information on the renovation of the existing building is needed. What is there? What are they proposing? What will the treatments be? Mr. Cluver agreed, and noted that existing conditions drawings showing the current building versus proposed drawings are always helpful. Mr. Loonstyn asked whether they could submit those materials to the full Commission or whether the Committee needed to review the project again. Ms. Hawkins responded that that was his choice, but that she would like to see the application again at the Committee level. Ms. Gutterman concurred, noting that so much information is missing that it would be in the best interest of the applicant to resubmit.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in-concept, but denial as presented, owing to incompleteness.

ADDRESS: 2108 MOUNT VERNON ST

Project: Construct third story over existing two story rear ell
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Francis & Deborah Bobb
Applicant: John Hubert, John Hubert Associates
History: 1855
Individual Designation: 2/7/1974
District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000
Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third story over an existing two-story rear ell on a four-story rowhouse located within the Spring Garden Historic District. The new addition will require the removal of the half gable roof of the existing rear ell, and is proposed to have a stucco finish. The new story will not be visible from Mount Vernon Street, but will be visible from Clay Street, a service alley at the rear of the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jason Solinsky represented the application.

Mr. Solinsky commented that there are two third-story rear additions on this block of Clay Street that were approved by the Historical Commission, but there are eleven different third-story rear additions on this block of Clay Street in total. Ms. Broadbent noted that some of the rear additions were added prior to historic designation.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

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

ADDRESS: 905 PINE ST

Project: Construct rear addition, rehabilitate front façade
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Core Property Development, LLC
Applicant: Edward Ross, Core Property Development, LLC
History: 1836
Individual Designation: 11/24/1959
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear addition onto a three-and-a-half story rowhouse. The existing rear addition, rear roof slope, and a rear dormer would be removed to accommodate the new addition, which would be built on the existing foundation and would have a deck on the roof of the third floor. The rear of this property is not visible from any public right-of-way. This application also proposes restoration work to the front façade, including new windows and repair and painting of wood elements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Edward Ross and architect Judy Robinson represented the application.

Ms. Broadbent explained that the existing rear addition is proposed to be rebuilt, using the existing foundation, owing to proposed interior reconfigurations where the floor levels will be aligned from the front of the house through the rear. Mr. Ross explained that the new rear window configuration is based off of the placement of the front façade windows. Ms. Hawkins commented that it may be helpful to show the existing condition drawing and the proposed drawing together when the project is reviewed by the Historical Commission.

Mr. Cluver asked about visibility of the rear addition. Ms. Broadbent responded that the addition will not be visible from any public right-of-way.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

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

ADDRESS: 1201-09 N 02ND ST

Project: Install 11 banner signs

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mercedes Sanchez

Applicant: Lauren Calisti, Hyperion Bank

History: c. 1871; 8th National Bank; Thomas S. Levy, architect

Individual Designation: 5/9/2001

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install eleven banner signs onto the second floor of Hyperion Bank, located at the corner of West Girard Avenue and North 2nd Street. The signs would be mounted into mortar joints at each cove between the bays. The banners are nine feet tall and two feet wide.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. City Sign representative Chuck Longacre arrived while the review was underway. Hyperion Bank representative Lauren Calisti arrived after Mr. Longacre.

No one represented the application at the start of the review. Ms. Broadbent asked the Committee for guidance regarding quantity of the signs, or additional comments that will assist the applicant with this proposal. Ms. Gutterman opined that the number of proposed signs is too great, and asked why the bank needs eleven large banner signs. She suggested that the quantity be reduced to two signs at the corner. She expressed concern regarding the proposed anchor and the narrow mortar joints, and whether the attachment method will damage the masonry when the wind blows.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the letters at the entry surround are existing. Ms. Broadbent responded that they are, and also noted that there is an existing blade sign mounted to the corner of the second floor, which was omitted from the rendering supplied by the applicant.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 APRIL 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Ms. Stein made a motion of denial, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Longacre arrived late to the review, and explained that his company was hired to mount the banners. He confirmed that the narrow joints are only one quarter of an inch, and the anchor is 3/8 inch. He stated that the proposed Hilti anchor is meant to be used in mortar joints and not brick face.

Ms. Stein asked Mr. Longacre if he is aware of the existing blade sign at the corner of the second story. Mr. Longacre responded that he is not aware of the sign, and was provided the photograph used in the application, which shows no sign at the second story. Ms. Hawkins asked if Mr. Longacre has a current photograph of the building. He responded that he does not have that with him. He asked if the Committee has suggestions that he can take back to the client.

Mr. Cluver used Google Street View to obtain an image of the building that shows the existing blade sign at the corner of the second story. Ms. Gutterman questioned why the existing sign is not satisfactory for the bank's marketing needs, and why the proposed solution is eleven banner signs instead of two signs. Mr. Longacre responded that he is not apprised of the marketing goals, and if someone from the bank were present, they could speak to this concern.

Ms. Pentz commented that the two different colors of the proposed banner signs are distracting. Ms. Stein commented that the banners should be reduced in height so as to not obscure the brick detailing.

Ms. Hawkins stated that a photograph of the existing conditions for the Commission will be helpful, and having a representative from the bank at the Commission meeting to explain their marketing goals will be beneficial. Ms. Gutterman commented that, if there are fewer signs proposed, perhaps bricks can be removed and stored to install a different type of anchor, and those bricks can be reinstalled when the signs are removed in the future.

Ms. Calisti arrived late to the review. Ms. Hawkins summarized the comments from the Committee. She asked why the existing blade sign is not sufficient for the bank. Ms. Calisti responded that the existing sign is small, and there are many people who walk by the building and do not know that it is a bank. There are also trees that obscure the building. Ms. Gutterman asked if they have explored enlarging the existing blade sign on the corner. Ms. Calisti responded that they have not looked into that. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the existing conditions, including blade sign and trees, should be presented to the Commission.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

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

ADDRESS: 1100-02 SPRUCE ST

Project: Legalize aluminum door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Knockwood Associates, LP

Applicant: Joshua Horvitz, Fineman Krekstein & Harris P.C.

History: 1891; Hotel Colonial; alts. 1984

Individual Designation: 11/24/1959

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application requests the legalization of an aluminum entry door on the South 11th Street side of this corner property. The former door was removed and the new door was installed without permits or review by the Historical Commission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Joshua Horvitz, Studio Director Neil Garrioch, and architect John Edwards represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins explained that the Committee's jurisdiction is limited to reviewing the proposed modifications to the building and determining whether or not it is in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. If there are other reasons that the owner chose to make the alterations, being financial and/or otherwise, those reasons can be considered by the Historical Commission.

Ms. Gutterman noted that the historic transom has also been removed, in addition to the historic doors. Ms. Hawkins asked if the wood surround shown in an earlier photograph is remaining. Mr. Edwards was not sure to what extent the wood surround has been modified. Ms. Pentz asked about the material that fills the transom space now. Mr. Edwards responded that it is a stucco finish over metal studs. Mr. Cluver opined that the replacement door is not appropriate, and the doors should be reconstructed using the earlier photograph that clearly shows the doors prior to their removal.

Mr. Edwards confirmed that the step shown in an earlier photograph is still there, but it is not represented in the drawing because it is blocked from view in the elevation.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

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

ADDRESS: 406 AND 408 S 09TH ST

Project: Legalize vinyl windows and removal of shutters

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Knockwood Associates, LP

Applicant: Joshua Horvitz, Fineman Krekstein & Harris P.C.

History: 1840

Individual Designation: 1/31/1961

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application requests the legalization of vinyl windows and the removal of shutters on two rowhouses. The vinyl windows were installed and the shutters were removed while these two properties were undergoing renovations. The staff of the Historical Commission approved permit applications for interior-only renovations during this time.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Joshua Horvitz and Studio Director Neil Garrioch represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins explained that the Committee's jurisdiction is limited to reviewing the proposed modifications to the building and determining whether or not it is in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. If there are other reasons that the owner chose to make the alterations, being financial and/or otherwise, those reasons can be considered by the Historical Commission.

Mr. Garrioch explained that Varenhorst was hired by the client to document what was installed.

Mr. Cluver asked about the design and material of the shutters that were removed, and opined that the removal is not a loss of historic fabric. Ms. Hawkins asked if the owner can provide documentation for the shutters prior to the Commission meeting. Mr. Horvitz responded that the owner may be able to provide that information, or it may be found in the Historical Commission's files.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the extent of the window removal. Mr. Garrioch responded that he believes the entire window was removed. Ms. Broadbent commented that the frame has been cased.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the vinyl windows, pursuant to Standard 6; approval of the removal of the non-historic shutters.

ADDRESS: 323 S 06TH ST

Project: Legalize vinyl windows, legalize window and infill in place of door
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Knockwood Associates, LP
Applicant: Joshua Horvitz, Fineman Krekstein & Harris P.C.
History: c. 1835
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999
Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application requests the legalization of vinyl windows and the infill of a historic door opening with a vinyl window with bricks below on this corner property in Society Hill. This work was performed without permits or review by the Historical Commission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Joshua Horvitz, Studio Director Neil Garrioch, architect John Edwards, and PMC Property Group Senior Vice President Arrus Farmer represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins explained that the Committee's jurisdiction is limited to reviewing the proposed modifications to the building and determining whether or not it is in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. If there are other reasons that the owner chose to make the alterations, being financial and/or otherwise, those reasons can be considered by the Historical Commission.

Mr. Cluver asked if all of the windows have been replaced. Mr. Farmer confirmed that they had been replaced, and explained that new one-over-one windows were installed where there were existing one-over-one windows. Similarly, existing six-over-six windows were replaced with six-over-six windows. He stated that the old and new windows are vinyl.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the new shutters that are not present in a photograph from April 2014. Mr. Farmer responded that new shutters were added recently to the ground-floor windows.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

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

ADDRESS: 201 S 13TH ST

Project: Legalize removal of balcony, stain brick on east façade, patch and paint masonry

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Walnut Square Partners

Applicant: Joshua Horvitz, Fineman Krekstein & Harris P.C.

History: 1900; St. James Hotel; Horace Trumbauer, architect

Individual Designation: 8/2/1973

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes:

- the legalization of the removal of a balcony at the seventh floor, north façade and the installation of infill where the balcony was removed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit;
- the application of a stain to new brick installed in the east façade with a building permit, but without compliance with conditions placed on the Historical Commission's approval; and,
- the legalization of the installation of masonry patches and paint to repair deteriorated ornament on the facade.

After the Historical Commission's staff witnessed work underway without and/or in excess of permits or approvals, the Historical Commission's staff advised the contractor and owner of the necessity for approvals and permits and the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a verbal stop work order at the request of the Commission. The work was completed despite the City's efforts. The City initiated an enforcement action in court; the court ordered the property owner to seek the Commission's approvals for remedies for the work undertaken without permits and approvals. This application results from that order. In addition to the Architectural Committee, the Committee on Financial Hardship will review application before it is presented to the Historical Commission.

With regard to the legalization of the removal of a balcony, the application requests an exemption from the requirements of the historic preservation ordinance because repairing or replacing the balcony in kind would have imposed a financial hardship and an unnecessary hardship on the property owner. The terra cotta clad balcony was removed, the opening infilled, and Dryvit installed over the infill without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit.

The application proposes to apply a stain to new brick installed in the east façade to change the color of the new brick to a better match for the surrounding, original brick. In January 2013, the Historical Commission approved masonry repairs to the east façade, with the condition that the Commission's staff would review pointing and brick samples in the field for approval. The work was completed without the requisite staff reviews and the brick that was installed does not match the surrounding brick. The application proposes to stain the brick, but offers no details about the selected stain or the area or method of application. In concept, the stain may be the appropriate fix, but a final decision cannot be reached without additional details.

The application proposes to legalize repairs to ornament on the building undertaken without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit. Ornament was removed and replaced with a "cement material." The cement material was then painted. The repairs do not replicate the appearance of the removed ornament. The application neither provides an inventory of the

repairs nor information about the repair materials. This segment of the application should be deemed incomplete.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends the following:

- The removal of the balcony and installation of the infill does not satisfy Standards 2, 5, and 6.
- Approval in concept of the stain at the east façade, pursuant to Standard 6.
- Denial of the installation of masonry patches and paint, owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owners' representative Arrus Farmer and attorney Josh Horvitz represented the application.

Mr. Horvitz stated that the balcony was removed, owing to an imminent danger. The balcony had to be removed for public safety reasons. Replacing the balcony in the original or replacement materials would result in a financial and undue hardship on the property owner. He stated that his clients made their best efforts to "put up what was financially feasible ... to the best they could with the historical character."

Ms. Pentz asked Mr. Farnham to explain the meaning of "unnecessary hardship" in the preservation ordinance. Mr. Farnham responded that the ordinance authorizes the Historical Commission to grant variances or exemptions for financial reasons in two cases. In the first case, the so-called financial hardship case, the Commission may approve an alteration or a demolition that does not meet preservation standards in a case when the property has an inherent defect that makes its use infeasible or unreasonable to use without the alteration or demolition. Financial hardship relates to the property, not the financial resources of the property's owner. Unnecessary hardship relates to the financial condition of the property owner, not to a defect in a property. The unnecessary hardship provision allows the Commission to grant a variance or exemption to a property owner that does not have the financial capacity to pay for work that meets preservation standards. It was designed primarily for low and moderate-income persons. Mr. Farnham noted that the Architectural Committee recently reviewed a window application for such a person, who claimed that she did not have the resources to replace her illegal vinyl windows with historically appropriate windows. Unnecessary hardship relates to a claim about the property owner, not the property. Mr. Farnham noted that, in this case, the applicant has claimed that installing an appropriate facsimile of the balcony would induce both a financial and an unnecessary hardship. Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission will have to determine whether this owner partnership can qualify for an unnecessary hardship exemption, which has typically been granted to low and moderate-income people only. Ms. Hawkins noted that, to initially qualify for an unnecessary hardship, one must demonstrate that their income is less than a certain percentage of the area's median income. Mr. Farnham agreed, noting that the Commission's Rules & Regulations stipulate that, as a first step toward qualifying for an unnecessary hardship exemption, the applicant must show that their income meets the HUD definition of low and moderate income for the statistical region. Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicant has submitted information showing that the owners qualify for the exemption. Mr. Farnham stated that some financial data was submitted for the partnership that owns the building. He also noted that the application includes cost estimates for replacing the balcony in various materials.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants to provide the date that the balcony in question was determined to be structurally unsound. Mr. Farmer responded that an engineer prepared a report regarding the balcony. Ms. Hawkins asked for the date of the report. Mr. Farmer

responded that he did not know the date. Ms. Gutterman asked when the scaffolding was erected and why the applicants did not apply to the Commission for approval of the work after the dangerous condition was abated, but before any new material was installed. Mr. Farmer replied that the engineer identified a dangerous condition. Ms. Hawkins disagreed with Mr. Farmer's portrayal of the situation and pointed out that the report from the engineer is dated 29 October 2014, but the report refers to the fact that the engineer knew in 2013 that the balcony posed a danger. She asked how it could be considered an emergency situation when the engineer was aware of the condition for 10 or 12 months. Mr. Farmer apologized that he misspoke and conceded that they were aware of the condition of the balcony. He stated that it was removed because the engineer notified him that it was a danger. Ms. Pentz asked whether the engineer's report was a result of the new City-mandated façade inspections. Mr. Farmer explained that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation to the property for problems with the brick on the east façade. He stated that he obtained the Commission's approval and a permit to replace some brick on the east façade with a brick that was a fairly close match for the original brick. He reported that he had scaffolding installed on the east façade to do that brick replacement. He stated that they then continued around the building, inspecting the façade. Ms. Hawkins asked if they had a report resulting from that inspection. Ms. Gutterman stated that such a report would have been filed with the Department of Licenses & Inspections and provided to the property owner. Mr. Horvitz stated that such a report was not submitted to the Commission, but could be provided.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants to explain how they investigated options for replacing the removed balcony. Mr. Farmer responded that documentation for the replacement options was submitted. Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants to describe the material that was inserted into the location where the balcony was removed. She asked if it was glazed CMU. Mr. Farmer stated that it was. Ms. Pentz noted that the application says that it is EIFS.

Mr. Cluver reported to the Committee that the materials in the vendor ledger in the application date the removal of the balcony. He read that emergency brick repairs were performed on 28 August 2013. The balcony was removed on 30 December 2013. Ms. Gutterman noted that the report from the engineer stating that the balcony was dangerous is dated 29 October 2014, ten months after the balcony was actually removed. Mr. Horvitz stated that he believes that the owner obtained an engineer's report before the balcony was removed stating that it was dangerous and needed to be removed immediately. He stated that he would find the report and provide it to the Commission. Ms. Pentz asked if other balconies on the building will need to be removed. Mr. Farmer replied that all of the balconies have been inspected. He stated that the balcony that was removed was in much worse condition than the others.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee has grossly insufficient evidence to make a determination. She stated that the Committee was not provided with sufficient photographs of the conditions. She stated that they have nothing about the condition of the balcony except the recollection of an engineer one year after the fact. Mr. Horvitz stated that some photographs were submitted. Ms. Hawkins stated that the engineer may be correct in his recollection, but the application lacks any real evidence. She stated that the applicant provided no photographs of the balcony showing its condition before it was removed. She noted that the owner did not contact the Historical Commission and seek approval of the work before it was undertaken. She asked if the owner installed scaffolding or erected street barricades to protect the public. Mr. Farnham explained that Randal Baron of the Commission's staff noticed that work that was not permitted was underway at the site and spoke to people at the site, advising of the need to obtain the Commission's approval and a building permit. The Department of Licenses & Inspections sought to stop the work, but it continued. The City then went to court seeking

enforcement in the matter. Mr. Farnham explained that the current permit application is in response to the court ordering the owner to obtain the Commission's approval and a building permit.

Mr. Cluver asked about the brick replacement. He asked if the surrounding original brick was clean or dirty. He stated that it would be inadvisable to stain the new brick to match the surrounding dirty brick. Mr. Farmer stated that the darker brick in the photograph is the original brick, which is dirty. Mr. Farmer claimed that the Commission's staff approved the lighter colored brick, the new brick, seen in the photographs. He stated that the approved application specified the lighter brick, which was approved. Ms. Gutterman stated that the new brick should not be stained because it will cause maintenance problems. She asked Mr. Farmer if he had cleaned any of the old brick. He stated that he had not. She suggested that cleaning the old rather than staining the new would be the best solution. Mr. Farmer stated that Mr. Baron of the Commission's staff had insisted on the staining. Ms. Hawkins and Gutterman opined that the staining is a bad idea. Mr. Farnham pointed out that Mr. Baron's overview of the application contends that the staining "may" be an appropriate fix, but sufficient information about how and where the wall would be stained has not been provided. Ms. Gutterman again asserted that the brick should not be stained.

Mr. Cluver noted that the Committee has not discussed the masonry patching and painting. He opined that the application does not provide adequate information to reach a decision on the masonry patching and painting. Ms. Gutterman noted that the patches are clearly the wrong color. Mr. Farmer reported that the patches have been painted since the photographs were taken. He explained that the entire surface has been painted. Ms. Gutterman asked if the Commission approved the painting. Mr. Farmer stated that it had not. She asked if the building had been previously painted. Mr. Farmer stated that it was previously painted. Mr. Farnham stated that Mr. Baron has reported that ornament on the building was removed and replaced with a "cement material." The cement material was then painted. The repairs do not replicate the appearance of the removed ornament. The application neither provides an inventory of the repairs nor information about the repair materials. Mr. Baron has advised that this segment of the application is incomplete. Mr. Farnham noted that Mr. Baron requested additional photographs of the work from the applicants, who provided numerous photographs. Mr. Farnham handed them to the Committee. Mr. Cluver selected a photograph of a balcony. He asked Mr. Farmer if this was the balcony that was removed and when the photograph was taken. Mr. Farmer replied that he did not know. Ms. Hawkins responded that the photographs are not labeled or dated. She stated that she could not discern when they were taken or what they were depicting. Mr. Farnham noted that some of the places depicted in the photographs can be identified as section of the south façade from the surrounding context; nothing on the south façade is the subject of this application.

Mr. Cluver concluded that the Commission would not have approved any of the work had it been proposed before it was undertaken. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the material used to infill the location where the balcony was removed. Mr. Farnham stated that the application calls it Dryvit. Ms. Gutterman stated that the patch was awkwardly scored. Mr. Cluver stated that the scoring is "arbitrary."

Ms. Pentz advised the applicants that they should have contacted the Department of Licenses & Inspections immediately after identifying the dangerous condition. She stated that, in her experience, the City responds quickly to dangerous conditions. Mr. Horvitz explained that his client was already working with Inspector Norman Mason of the Department of Licenses & Inspections, owing to the violation for the east façade. He asserted that the Department was

aware that the balcony, which was crumbling in the workers' hands, was being removed. Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicants have any document that shows that the Department ordered or approved of the removal of the balcony. Mr. Farmer claimed that the Department ordered him to address "any life safety issues that were eminently (sic) dangerous." Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Farmer if the Department ordered him to do it without a permit. He responded that he "would have to review that specific email."

Mr. Cluver noted that there was no one in the audience and therefore no public comment.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend:

- denial of the removal of the balcony and installation of the infill, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6;
- denial of the stain at the east façade, with the suggestion that the old brick is cleaned to allow for a comparison of the new and old brick colors, pursuant to Standard 6; and,
- denial of the installation of the masonry patches and paint, owing to incompleteness.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:38 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.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.