

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

**TUESDAY, 24 JULY 2018  
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029  
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

**PRESENT**

Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair  
Nan Gutterman, FAIA  
Suzanne Pentz  
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III  
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I

**ALSO PRESENT**

Claire Donato, Mark Thompson Associates  
Meg Wise, Smith Playground  
Tina Geary, inhabit Architecture & Design  
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Juanda Myles  
Dan Greenberg, North Broad Living Management  
Ian Cope, Cope Linder Architects  
Greg Johnson, Metropolitan Baptist Church  
K. Rose Samuel Evans, Metropolitan Baptist Church  
Georgia M. Baxter, Metropolitan Baptist Church  
Shirley Baxter, Metropolitan Baptist Church  
Elbert Mason, Metropolitan Baptist Church  
Bernice Mason, Metropolitan Baptist Church  
Helen Gallman, Metropolitan Baptist Church  
Joseph Milano, Milano Glassworks  
Amy Lambert, UCHS

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman, Pentz, and Stein joined him.

**ADDRESS: 3500 RESERVOIR DR**

Proposal: Reconstruct parapet wall; extend terrace for accessibility; alter windows and doors; install retaining walls and mechanical equipment

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Fairmount Park Commission

Applicant: Claire Donato, Mark B. Thompson Associates LLC

History: 1899; Smith Memorial Playground; James H. Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: 5/5/1977

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, with the recommendation that the south elevation doors be retained and pinned open and full-lite double doors installed in the center opening, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9, and the Accessibility Guideline.

**OVERVIEW:** This application, for the fourth phase of work to Smith Memorial Playground and Playhouse, proposes rehabilitation, restoration, and alterations to the terrace and lower levels of the property. While the masonry and window restoration work could be approved at the staff level, other aspects of the proposal exceed the staff's authority to review. The application proposes to alter window and door openings at the lower level to provide light and access to a new nature preschool space, and to extend the north terrace to create ADA accessibility. On the south elevation of the lower level, the application proposes to replace three central sets of sliding wood doors with full-lite steel doors and divided-lite windows, and to cut two new doors from windows at either end of the elevation. The existing sliding doors would be relocated to the interior of the Smithville Playroom (040) space. On the east elevation, the application proposes to modify the grade and construct a brick retaining wall to allow for the installation of two new restroom entrances, cut down from existing window openings. On the west elevation, the application proposes to cut one new entrance from an existing window, and to install mechanical equipment and louvers, which would be concealed behind a painted metal equipment enclosure. On the north elevation, the application proposes to extend the terrace approximately 17 feet beyond the existing walkway to allow re-grading along one side for ADA accessibility to the terrace. The existing granite step would be relocated to the end of the extended walkway. A new 12 inch metal safety railing in a matte dark bronze finish will be installed on top of reconstructed parapet walls around the terrace.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Claire Donato and Meg Wise, Executive Director of Smith Memorial Playground, represented the application.

Ms. Donato explained that, since 2008, Smith Memorial Playground and Playhouse has undertaken a comprehensive campaign to rehabilitate the Playhouse building. Smith has a vibrant and growing user group, and is working to make currently unusable space available to the community with both the expansion of existing play spaces as well as new programs. She noted that the Playhouse building was designed by architect James H. Windrim and opened in 1899. It has been in continuous operation and use for its original purpose for 119 years.

Ms. Donato explained that, beginning in 2008, the restoration of the exterior has included three prior phases. The work completed during these phases included: replacement of the slate roof; restoration of original wood windows and doors; restoration of original paint colors; masonry

restoration of the main block of the building; and restoration of the side porches, loggias, and balconies. She noted that the work has been and continues to be guided by analysis and review of the original surviving documents prepared by Windrim, as well as materials analysis and investigations of the original physical evidence, including mortar and plaster analyses, and interior and exterior finishes analyses.

She explained that Smith is now proceeding with an additional phase of work which will focus on the lower level and terrace repairs which are needed to make the more than 4,000 square feet of space below the terrace usable for new and existing programs, including a new nature preschool.

Ms. Wise reiterated that Smith Memorial Playground opened in 1899 and has been independently operating in Fairmount Park since that time. She noted that in her eight years there, Smith has doubled its audience, serving 200,000 visitors a year from every neighborhood in the city. She explained that in their strategic planning process in 2012, knowing that they had to make more substantial investments in the building, even after what had already been done, the staff and board worked on a process to identify new programs for the building to justify spending an additional \$7+ million on the building restoration. As a result of that process, they identified an urban nature preschool that will occupy space that is currently unusable owing to deterioration. She noted that it will not take away from the public space, but actually will increase space on the main level. It complements the organization's mission and history, and is an exciting way to expand the scope of services to a diverse public.

Ms. Donato spoke to the proposed changes, explaining that the parapet wall was modified at some point in the prior 40 years with brick piers and metal railings that are not in character with the original building materials. These sections along with the original sections are in poor condition and need to be reconstructed. The parapet will be fully reconstructed to the original design with historic and matching materials. The mortar will be based on a mortar analysis, and a 12-inch high railing will be added on top of the wall to increase the level of safety protection. Ms. Gutterman questioned the existing and proposed material for the top of the parapet wall. Ms. Donato responded that the historic material is limestone coping, the existing portions of which will be salvaged and reinstalled, and new limestone coping to match the historic material will be added where it is missing. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the railing will be anchored into the limestone coping. Ms. Donato responded that the railing design only has posts at fairly wide spacing and that they will try to limit the number of penetrations into the material. Ms. Gutterman asked whether there was any consideration of attaching it to the back side of the wall. Ms. Donato responded affirmatively, but noted that that creates other design concerns, including making the railing more obtrusive, as it would have to project out enough to pass by the overhang of the coping.

Ms. Donato explained that other items included in the application are the removal and reconstruction of the terrace floor structural assembly, which is required due to its degraded condition. The finished exterior surface of the assembly will be scored concrete to match the original material. The terrace will be extended to provide accessibility to the terrace level, which is the main floor level.

Ms. Pentz questioned the structural support of the terrace, noting that it appears to be made of terracotta arches. Ms. Donato responded that the support system is terracotta flat arches with

steel spaced at about four feet on center. Ms. Pentz asked whether they will retain the steel. Ms. Donato responded that they are trying to, but do not know the complete condition of it yet. She noted that it is highly corroded in some areas, but explained that they are working with the construction manager now to see if they can retain the steel. Ms. Pentz noted that that is a key question, because if they cannot retain the steel, they have to bear the slab on something. Ms. Donato responded that the investigations they have done appear to allow them to reuse original pockets, and since the wall has to be entirely rebuilt on the perimeter, that will provide reconstructed masonry to bear on at the exterior wall.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that in general the project proposes a considerable amount of restoration work, which the staff can review. He suggested focusing on the railings, new openings, and other changes. Ms. Donato replied that a few lower level exterior window openings will be modified to door openings to support the proposed reorganization of interior spaces for the preschool and restrooms that serve the playground. She noted that in some cases they will be restoring openings that have been previously infilled or modified. She explained that the proposed door openings are programmatically important to make the related spaces usable. This includes locating the Preschool in the spaces where there is the greatest access to natural lighting and ventilation, and access directly to grade. She noted that they are proposing doors that are made of a hot rolled steel system to differentiate these doors and windows from the existing original windows and doors, but given a similar sightline and profile, and painted dark brown. She noted that the historic doors on the upper floors are full-lite glass wood doors, which the proposed doors will try to mimic in appearance. She explained that the three sliding wood doors in the center openings will be restored and re-used inside the lower level of the building.

She noted that the west side of the building was previously regraded when a City swimming pool was constructed about 30 or 40 years ago. The pool was removed several years ago, and the proposal is to formalize the rough grading left from its removal, and create new walkways to the lower level and Preschool, which will require a small retaining wall on this side of the building. New underground utility services will enter the mechanical room on this side of the building, and an equipment enclosure will be set into the grade at the lower level. A similar relationship with grade will be created on the east side to provide an entrance from the Playground to the new restrooms.

She explained that, in line with the restoration items, they will be restoring the wood windows and painting them the original paint colors based on detailed paint color analysis and the colors that have been restored on the main block of the building.

Ms. Gutterman commented that she does not mind the full-lite doors, but feels that the sidelites are out of keeping with the design of the building. Ms. Donato noted that the staff had made the same comment, and distributed a revised drawing showing full-lite double doors in the center opening. Ms. Gutterman opined that the revised drawings are much more appropriate. Ms. Gutterman asked whether they could apply the same double door scheme to the restroom doors. Ms. Donato responded that that might be more difficult. Ms. Gutterman replied that maybe the restroom entrances could use an uneven leaf configuration with a solid panel.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the dark bronze color for the doors and windows and asked the original color of the windows and doors. Ms. Donato displayed the original paint color matches,

noting that they are visible in the upper floors that have been restored. She noted that the wood windows and frames are dark brown, and the sash are picked out in a lighter beige.

Ms. Gutterman noted that she is troubled by the railing being anchored into the historic limestone because it is irreversible. Mr. McCoubrey replied that it seems that the only limestone that is original is at the tops of the piers. Ms. Donato explained that they are trying to minimize the railing and any connections into the original limestone. She noted that the railing begins where the grade begins to drop off more than 30 inches, so there will be no railing along the front, north, elevation of the building. She noted that, where the entrance step is up to the terrace, on either side of that entrance step, no railing would be required. Ms. Donato noted that there is no original coping left on the south side or on the corners. She noted that the east and west sides retain some original material. She also noted that there are some metal inserts into the tops of the limestone, and they will attempt to reuse any prior inserts or penetrations into the masonry.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the new doors to be installed on the south elevation, which have the note “existing opening to be enlarged.” Ms. Donato responded that the openings will be lowered, but not widened.

Mr. McCoubrey thanked the applicants for providing such clear drawings. He opined that the lower level and podium were intended to be the work-a-day part of the building, so it is natural to expect it to evolve. He opined that the proposed changes are sensitive to the historic character of the building.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether the panels below the windows on the south elevation are panels or are louvers. Ms. Donato responded that they are fixed panels. She noted that there is a window seat for the Preschool on the interior. She explained that they originally proposed brick but the staff suggested that they maintain the original opening. Mr. McCoubrey confirmed that they are proposing steel window and doors to distinguish between the new materials and the historic wood windows and doors.

Ms. Stein asked if the applicants could address the staff recommendation to retain the original doors in the open position. Ms. Donato responded that they are proposing to relocate the sliding wood doors on the exact mirror opposite side of the building, in the space known as Smithville, so that they will stay in the building. To pin them open would impact the preschool classroom layout. She noted that they need to maintain a certain number of square feet per student in each classroom, and that the doors would have to end up behind a partition wall. Ms. Gutterman asked if the doors would be operable in the proposed location. Ms. Donato explained that the doors would cover a storage area, but would be prominent in the playroom.

Ms. Gutterman expressed concern over the dark bronze door and window color, and suggested that the applicants work with the staff to determine the appropriate color.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the revised design, with the recommendation to eliminate the sidelites of the restroom doors, with the staff review details, particularly of the door and window color.

**ADDRESS: 618, 620, AND 622 N 16TH ST**

Proposal: Construct three, three-story rowhouses

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Spring Garden Community Development Corp.

Applicant: Daniel Greenberg, North Broad Living Management Company

History: vacant lots

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, [megan.schmitt@phila.gov](mailto:megan.schmitt@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct three, three-story rowhouses on three lots within the Spring Garden Historic District. Historically, two of the lots were vacant, and the third was reclassified from a contributing structure to a non-contributing structure by the Historical Commission in May 2018. The non-contributing structure was subsequently demolished.

This application proposes to place the entrances to each of the three buildings on North Street and provide driveway access at the rears of the properties from North 16<sup>th</sup> Street. The fronts of the buildings would consist of a red brick veneer with a modest cast stone base, clad wood two-over-two windows, a two-story projecting wood bay, and roof decks. The rears of the properties would be clad in fiber cement lap siding and would feature decks at the second story that would project over the shared driveway.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, with the recommendation that the size of the windows at the east elevation's first and third stories be increased to match the windows at the second story, pursuant to Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Dan Greenberg of North Broad Living and architect Ian Cope of Cope Linder Architects represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked why the application was not for Review and Comment since the project was being built on two vacant lots. Ms. Schmitt responded that it was her understanding that since the two vacant lots were being developed along with a third lot that had had a building on it at the time of designation, it would require a Final Review rather than a Review and Comment. Mr. Greenberg stated that this was his understanding as well.

Mr. McCoubrey said that this current project appeared very similar to a project the Architectural Committee had reviewed two months prior, to which Ms. Schmitt responded that he was correct. Ms. Stein said that it seemed to her that the applicants had been very responsive to the comments the Architectural Committee previously made, and asked that the applicants explain the changes they had made to their proposal. Mr. McCoubrey clarified that this was a different project, and Ms. Gutterman added that she believed this was a different developer and site from the project that Ms. Stein was thinking of. Mr. Cope introduced himself and informed the Architectural Committee that the project that Ms. Stein was thinking of was one block away of the project currently under review.

Mr. McCoubrey said that the staff had commented on the scale and size of the windows at the first and third stories, and whether some or all of them could be made larger in order to be more

consistent with the other windows across the east elevation. Mr. Cope asked Mr. McCoubrey if he was only asking about the east elevation at 16<sup>th</sup> Street, and Mr. McCoubrey confirmed that was correct. Mr. Cope explained that at the first floor on the east elevation, the first two windows from the corner were located at a parlor or bedroom-like space, followed by three smaller windows located at the garage, where they typically kept the sills a little higher.

Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Cope about the windows at the third floor. Mr. Cope replied that because of the orientation of the house, there were many closets, to which Ms. Gutterman asked whether the windows could be made taller. Mr. Cope confirmed that they could be made taller. Ms. Gutterman said that if the windows could be made taller, even if they were narrower, they would look better, because as proposed they looked out of scale. Mr. McCoubrey added that they could also make the two windows at the front and the two windows at the rear larger, and they could leave the one in the middle smaller. Mr. Cope explained that they tended to put the windows higher at bed walls and closets, but that they could likely make an accommodation. Mr. Gutterman commented that somehow, the proposed windows just did not look to scale.

Ms. Gutterman asked for clarification about the details of the proposed cornices, saying that there was a reference to a wood profiled cornice but that her understanding was that metal was actually being proposed. Mr. Cope responded that they wanted to use a black, shallow profiled metal.

Ms. Gutterman said that, in her opinion, the flower boxes did not seem in keeping with the houses. Mr. Cope responded that he had designed approximately twenty other houses on the same block and many had flower boxes, and that many people used their Juliet balconies for flower boxes. Ms. Gutterman replied that the window boxes in this proposal were not located at Juliet balconies, but rather at the bays, and that there was something off about the scale of them. Ms. Gutterman asked about the downspouts, and Mr. Cope said that they were still working on the roofing detail to see if they could route all the water to the rear, but there were some issues with the proposed pent boxes on the roof. He further explained that they were planning on having a strike line and a joint between each house, so that the masonry would not just be pasted across, but rather there would be a reveal. Ms. Gutterman asked if there would be a gutter box, and Mr. Cope confirmed that there would be, and that if the downspout was going to be at the front, it would typically be placed in a cast iron boot.

Mr. Cope further clarified that the roof monitors would be decreasing in size but that the setbacks would not change. Ms. Gutterman asked what the setbacks were, and Mr. Cope confirmed 17'-8". Ms. Gutterman asked if the railing that she saw at the north elevation would be set 17' back from the edge of the roof, to which Mr. Cope replied yes, and that it would essentially not be visible from the street. Ms. Gutterman stated that it just sort of popped off of the rendering. Mr. Cope again explained that the roof monitors would decrease in size, from approximately 12' wide to 4' wide.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the off-center spacing of the small windows on the south elevation was based on the floor plan. Mr. Cope confirmed this was the case, because they were centered above bathtubs in the master bathroom. He stated that they were considering using larger windows that could extend significantly lower, just as long as they were 30" off of the floor. Ms. Gutterman commented that it was about the relationship of the windows to one another, including the tops of windows to one another. Mr. Cope said that the windows would be a pair of

double hungs, and confirmed that he would be able to match their tops to the tops of the balcony doors.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that, often times, the flower boxes could happen after the units go on the market. Ms. Gutterman remarked that other people could choose to not have a problem with them, to which Ms. Stein responded that she thought they were fine at the rear, but not at the front since they were a projection from a projection off of the bay. Mr. McCoubrey commented that he liked what Mr. Cope had done with the windows at the bay, which he viewed as an effective modern interpretation.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if there was any further comment from the Architectural Committee or from the public, of which there was none.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the sizes of the windows at the first and third stories of the east elevation are modified to be longer and wider where possible; that the windows at the rear are adjusted to align with the tops of the sliding glass doors of the balconies; and that the flower boxes are removed, with the staff to review all details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ADDRESS: 404 S 6TH ST**

Proposal: Construct fourth-story addition with roof deck; reconstruct side wall; modify window and door openings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dania Hallak

Applicant: Tina Geary, inHabit

History: 1925

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to add a fourth floor and deck to this three-story house. The Architectural Committee reviewed a similar application in March 2018 and voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. The application was withdrawn before the Historical Commission meeting. The withdrawn application proposed a fourth-floor addition covering the entire building as well as a roof deck at the fifth-floor level. The Committee rejected the proposal, asserting that the addition with deck added too much height to the building. The Committee suggested a partial fourth-floor addition with a smaller deck at the fourth-floor level. At the same time, one staff member suggested that a mansard-style addition might be appropriate.

The current application combines the Architectural Committee and staff advice and proposes a fourth-floor addition with a mansard roof set back 11 feet from the front façade with a roof deck at the fourth-floor level set back five feet from the two street facades. The mansard would cantilever out slightly at the rear to accommodate an elevator.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided that the mansard-style roof on the addition is eliminated and the addition rises directly up from the facades, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JULY 2018**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**



**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Tina Geary and owner Dania Hallak represented the proposal.

Mr. Baron explained the staff recommendation, noting that the staff felt that a full addition with a mansard roof may be acceptable, but with a setback, the mansard looks incongruous. Ms. Geary noted that the previous application set the addition back five feet as opposed to the current proposal of 11 feet. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the applicants had considered bringing the mansard to the front of the building and constructing the deck at the rear. Mr. Hallak responded that they thought that the Architectural Committee would prefer the addition to be set back further from the street. Ms. Geary commented that if they were to use some of the floor space towards the rear, it would force the addition further forward.

Ms. Stein questioned the reconstruction of the south wall, and whether the application is for rebuilding and stuccoing only the central portion of the home or also the one-story rear addition and three-story front section. Ms. Geary responded that the one-story addition is block construction and can remain, but that the entire three-story side wall of the main block needs to be reconstructed.

Ms. Pentz asked whether the new elevator will service five different levels. Ms. Geary responded that the elevator will run from the basement to the master bedroom on the fourth floor. Ms. Pentz asked whether the elevator would need to extend above the roof. Ms. Geary responded negatively, noting that it can be contained within the building envelope. Ms. Pentz asked whether the basement would need to be excavated. Ms. Geary responded affirmatively, noting that a four-inch pit is necessary, but that they are laying a new basement slab as part of the project anyways.

Ms. Stein expressed concern the patchwork of stucco that would be created by the installation of new stucco in some areas and the retention of existing stucco in other areas. Ms. Geary agreed that the stucco over the entire exterior should probably be redone.

Ms. Stein agreed with the staff's recommendation that the way the proposed addition is detailed, with the mansard set back from the main façade and overhanging the stucco wall, is inappropriate. She noted that mansards typically spring from the cornice itself, but acknowledged that that would not be possible here owing to the elevator. She opined that it would be preferable to have a setback addition with a straight wall rather than a mansard roof. Mr. McCoubrey agreed and suggested that the addition be differentiated from the main portion of the building through a band or change in materials.

Ms. Gutterman expressed her discomfort with the proposed front deck. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the deck would be disguised by the parapet at the front, but obliquely may be visible. Ms. Gutterman noted that the Architectural Committee has typically voted against decks on main roofs. Ms. Geary suggested constructing a mock-up of the deck railing to determine visibility, noting that the parapet wall is fairly high. Ms. Gutterman noted that the visibility issue will be more from the sides where the buildings are lower than from straight in front of the building. Mr. Baron noted that the whole roof is currently a deck. Mr. McCoubrey agreed that a mock-up showing that the deck is inconspicuous would be helpful.

Ms. Pentz questioned the placement of the mechanical equipment on the roof. Ms. Geary responded that the equipment is proposed for the roof because there is no yard space as the structure is currently built. Ms. Stein asked what kind of HVAC equipment they are proposing to use, noting that she sees a condensing unit located on the lower deck, which is acceptable. Ms. Stein noted, however, that the annotation for the equipment on the main roof says “package unit,” which usually means large commercial equipment, which the Architectural Committee does not typically support. Ms. Geary responded that the equipment would consist of a rooftop unit, with a condenser and compressor and ductwork. Ms. Stein responded that typically people put that type of equipment in basements. Ms. Geary argued that they need outdoor space and that it is difficult to serve four floors of space with a single condensing unit. Ms. Geary noted that she does not have the specifications for the equipment. Ms. Stein stated that the rooftop equipment will be highly visible, and that she does not think it is acceptable or that it meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Ms. Gutterman agreed, noting that HVAC equipment should not be visible at all. Ms. Geary argued that there has to be an outdoor component to the equipment. Ms. Gutterman suggested that equipment that is low and hidden by the parapet wall would be acceptable. Ms. Stein argued that the air-handling unit can be located in the basement. Ms. Geary reiterated that the equipment needs outdoor air. Ms. Stein suggested that window wells could provide ventilation to the equipment. Mr. Hallak noted that he can see mechanical equipment on other houses from his house. Ms. Stein explained that other equipment may not necessarily have been approved. Ms. Gutterman noted that this is a corner property with visibility on three sides. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the dimensions of the air-handling unit could be included in the mock-up. Mr. Hallak asked whether it would be acceptable to locate the air-handling unit in the basement and the smaller condensing unit on the exterior. Ms. Stein responded that it would depend on the unit’s visibility. Ms. Geary noted that the window wells are very small and agreed to consult with an HVAC specialist.

Ms. Gutterman noted that the application calls for wood windows on the historic portion of the building and aluminum-clad windows on the side and new addition, and asked whether Mr. Baron thought that that was acceptable. Mr. Baron responded that he believes aluminum-clad windows are acceptable on the addition. Ms. Geary explained that they hoped to use a high-quality wood window clad in aluminum on the side elevation. Ms. Gutterman responded that she does not find such a window acceptable for a street elevation, and Waverly Street is a public right-of-way.

Ms. Gutterman commented that the staff should also review the details of the proposed skylight. Mr. Hallak responded that the existing skylight is being removed. Ms. Gutterman replied that the drawings say “proposed skylight.”

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the mansard-style roof of the addition is replaced with vertical walls; all windows in the historic structure are wood; mockups demonstrate that the deck will be inconspicuous and mechanical equipment invisible from the public right-of-way; and any stucco is real stucco, not dryvit or EFIS, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ADDRESS: 3500 BARING ST**

Proposal: Remove and replace five stained glass windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Metropolitan Baptist Church

Applicant: Gregory Johnson, Metropolitan Baptist Church

History: 1875; Northminster Presbyterian Church; Thomas Webb Richards; Wilson, Harris and Richards; Tiffany Studios; 1904 (parsonage)

Individual Designation: 3/10/2017

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to remove five stained glass windows from the nave of this church. Four of the five windows were produced by renowned Tiffany Studios, lead by Louis Comfort Tiffany, in New York City and date to 1895, 1898, and c. 1920. A cover letter explains that the congregation would use the funds derived from the sale of the windows to pay off debt as well as to undertake work such as the rewiring of the building and construction of an accessible bathroom. The application proposes to replace the windows with new stained glass windows. The application provides no documentation that would allow this application to be considered a financial hardship application.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Pastor Gregory Johnson and stained glass consultant Joseph Milano represented the application.

Mr. Milano said that he has been involved with this church for many years. He pointed out that in the 1875 photographs of the original church, the windows looked quite different. Ms. Gutterman said that, although the windows are not original, they were in place prior to the designation of the property as historic. Mr. Milano said that, if the five windows could be removed, they would like to use some of the money to restore the windows to their earliest condition with c. 1870 style painted glass. He said that the church has many needs; for example, it has old knob and post wiring that should be replaced. Ms. Gutterman said that she understands that the building has many needs and may have a hardship; however, they have not provided any financial numbers either of the cost of repairing the church or the proceeds from the sale of the windows. She asked Mr. Baron if he had described the hardship option. Mr. Baron explained that he had asked the applicants to develop the financial information regarding their hardship claim to provide to the Historical Commission.

Mr. Baron said that, if they had provided information for a hardship application, it could have been referred to the Committee on Financial Hardship for evaluation. Since they have not provided any financial information, the Architectural Committee should evaluate the application purely on whether or not it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Ms. Gutterman opined that the application is incomplete because they have not provided information about what they intend to put in place of the existing windows. Mr. Baron pointed out the information in the application showing the proposed windows for replacement. There are images of different windows from two different vendors along with costs to replace the glass with the preferred options. Ms. Gutterman acknowledged that information. Mr. Baron noted that the existing windows have significance, not because they were there at the time of designation, but because

they are more than 50 years old and because they are associated with Louis Tiffany. They have acquired significance. If they were vinyl windows existing at the time of designation, they would not be protected from change. Mr. McCoubrey said that they also have significance because of the families that gave them as memorials. Mr. Milano pointed out that this is a consolidated church. The original church moved to Drexel Hill. They took the commemorative plaques but expressed no interest in having the windows. Mr. McCoubrey said that the Commission had very little precedent for this type of removal, but had approved the removal of windows from St. Peter's Church in Germantown, which was reused as a Waldorf school. Mr. Baron pointed out that, in that circumstance, the windows were preserved within Philadelphia and placed on public display. Mr. Milano said that these windows would be put on display, but outside the city. Mr. Baron said that once they had left the city, they would no longer be effectively under the Commission's jurisdiction.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment.

Patrick Grossi spoke against the removal of the windows, saying that the sale of the windows would only result in a one-time infusion of cash. He suggested that the congregation work with Partners for Sacred Places to find a more sustainable funding source. Amy Lambert of the University City Historical Society recommended applying for Keystone grants. She also suggested working with the families associated with the glass for funding. Pastor Johnson said that he had been talking to Partners for Sacred Places for years and they had not come up with a solution. He said that the descendants often come to visit and they are very grateful to them for their donations usually in the range of \$25. He said that they had restored one window at a cost of \$34,000. He said that the other windows are in very poor condition. He described how they recently had a disabled woman come to a concert but they could not provide her with an accessible bathroom. He said that the carpet is held together with tape and he is afraid of a lawsuit. He expressed a willingness to work with Partners and anyone else to find a solution so that the church does not become an eyesore to the community.

A congregant, Bernice Mason, spoke against the removal of the windows. She said that they are amazing windows and very much a part of the experience of the church. She said that they are being undervalued. She said that the members of the church want to be notified and will work to raise money.

Shirley Baxter, another member of the church, said that the congregation has not received enough bids and that they need to understand the worth. She said that she has a great attachment to those windows and that they are a big part of her attachment to that church.

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

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 10:45 a.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.

Accessibility Guideline: Recommended:

- Complying with barrier-free access requirements in such a manner that the historic building's character-defining exterior features, interior spaces, features, and finishes, and features of the site and setting are preserved or impacted as little as possible.
- Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the user while preserving significant historic features.
- Finding solutions to meet accessibility requirements that minimize the impact of any necessary alteration for accessibility on the historic building, its site, or setting, such as compatible ramps, paths, and lifts.