

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
27 January 2004**

Present

Vincent Rivera, Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Herbert Levy, FAIA
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz

Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

Graham Wyatt, Robert A.M. Stern Architects
Hal Wheeler
Bill Wheeler
Neil Sklaroff, Esq.
Michael Skolnick, Polatnick Zacharjasz Architects
Stuart Feldman
Michael Del Rossi Jr., Graboyes Commercial Windows
Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance and Center City Residents' Association
Elise Vider, Center City District
Ben Frank, Center City Proprietors' Association
Gersil Kay, Building Conservation International
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
David Traub, architect
Marvin Halbert
Ryan Berley, 116 Market Street
Eric Berley, 116 Market Street
Paul Stewart, PARS Link LLC
Martin McNamara, 339 S. 21st Street
Dave McGrath, 339 S. 21st Street
Jonathan Myerow, 123 S. 18th Street
Robert Clemmer, 1521 Pine Street
Paul Badger Jr., 1518-1520 Green Street
Barry Brommer, Schwam Architects
Daryl Baker, Schwam Architects
Tina R. Makouljian, Ballard, Spahr, Andrews & Ingersoll
Clare Kahn, 1243 Lombard Street
Brian Barrabee, 106 and 108 S. 20th Street
Cathy Harris, Mural Arts Program
Amy Johnston, Mural Arts Program
Stanley Tang, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Craig Charlton, 434 Pine Street
Hyman Myers, Vitetta
Jim Hanson, Vitetta
Eric Lautzenheiser, Vitetta

Marvin Gerstein, Temple University
 Tony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing
 Allen W. Rubin, Spring Garden Civic Association
 Joseph A. Duffy, 2019-2023 Green Street
 William F. Murphy, 2019-2023 Green Street
 Jennifer Bretschneider, 2025 Green Street
 Martin Bretschneider, 2025 Green Street
 Maksym Szpilczak, 259 N. 3rd Street

Herbert Levy, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

1801-03, 1805-09, 1811-13 Walnut Street; 126-32 South 18th Street; 1812 Sansom Street

Philadelphia Rittenhouse Investors, Owner

Neil Sklaroff, Esquire, Applicant

DATE: 1801-03 Walnut Street, Van Rensselaer Mansion, built 1896-98, Peabody & Stearns, architects, significant
 1805-09 Walnut Street, Alison Building, built c.1910, Paul Davis, architect, contributing
 1811-13 Walnut Street, Rittenhouse Club, built 1900, Newman, Woodman & Harris, architects, significant
 1812 Sansom Street, built c. 1970, non-contributing
 126-32 S. 18th Street, built c.1840; 126 - refaced c. 1915; 132 - refaced c. 1926 by Ralph Goldberg, architect; all contributing

PROPOSAL: Demolish 126-32 South 18th St. and 1812 Sansom St.; demolish all but façade of 1811-13 Walnut St.; construct 27-story tower

This application proposes the demolition of 126-132 S. 18th Street in whole or significant part, the total demolition of 1812 Sansom Street, and the demolition of all but the front façade of 1811-13 Walnut Street. The applicant may rebuild or retain the façades of 126-132 S. 18th Street. The fence around the rear yard of 1801-03 Walnut Street would be rebuilt to move the entrance opening. The mechanical penthouse of 1805-09 Walnut Street would be removed. The new construction involves the erection of a 320-foot or 390-foot residential tower set behind and cantilevered over the Alison Building at 1805-9 Walnut Street. The tower would sit back 14 feet from the 18th Street building line and would not reproduce the dormers or roof line of the existing buildings. Although the plans propose retaining only the façade of the Rittenhouse Club on Walnut Street, the tower would be set back substantially from that historic façade. The plan stipulates a storefront, garage entrance ramp, and loading dock on Sansom Street. The applicant has presented a demolition argument based on economic hardship. The Commission voted on 8 November 2000 to approve a comparable project in concept for the site; however, that conceptual approval has expired.

Ms. Spina presented the project to the Architectural Committee. She reported that on 23 January 2004 the Committee on Financial Hardship recommended that the Commission make a finding of financial hardship in this case.

Following Ms. Spina's introduction, Mr. Wyatt, the architect, further described the proposal, stating that his most current design included the rebuilding of the penthouse on the Rittenhouse Club with the same massing and fenestration as the extant penthouse; the demolition of the mechanical penthouse on the Alison Building and the construction of a smaller mechanical penthouse; the shifting of the opening and reconstruction of the wall along 18th Street at the rear of the Van Rensselaer Mansion; and either the retention of the facades of the four buildings on 18th Street without roofs and dormers or the demolition of the four buildings and the construction of a three-story façade articulated to recall the four historic divisions. If the four façades on 18th Street are preserved, the floor levels of the new construction behind the façades would approximate the

historic floor levels and would correlate to the historic window openings.

Mr. Rivera arrived at 10:20 a.m. and assumed the chair.

Committee members as well as the public queried Mr. Wyatt on the height of the building, setbacks, parking, and other design details.

The Committee considered the 18th Street facades first. Mr. D'Alessandro of the Committee emphatically expressed his opinion that the facades of the historic buildings on 18th Street be preserved, especially in light of the fact that the architect had shown that he would be able to integrate them with the interior spaces. In response to a question, Mr. Wyatt clarified that, if a new façade were erected on 18th Street, the window openings at the upper floors would be raised approximately three feet above the locations of the historic openings. Mr. McCoubrey of the Committee contended that the historic facades should not be saved if the buildings themselves cannot be preserved. Ms. Pentz agreed, stating that, without the roofs and dormers, the façades were not worth saving. Mr. Levy asserted that the 18th Street façades themselves are not significant, but that their scale and relation to the surrounding historic buildings is significant and worth preserving. He added that the 18th Street buildings should be recorded to HABS standards before they are demolished.

Gersil Kay of Building Conservation International claimed that demolishing the buildings on 18th Street would inhibit Philadelphia's ability to attract businesses and tourists.

Mr. Tyler argued for the importance of the small-scale, commercial, 18th Street experience. He also asserted that retention is not necessarily preservation. He maintained that the buildings on 18th Street should either be preserved to a substantial extent or demolished.

Committee members debated the merits of retaining the 18th Street facades. A majority of the members indicated that they preferred demolition to retention in the manner proposed.

Mr. Rivera added that the commercial space on 18th Street should be marketed to smaller stores, not one large store, in order to preserve the nature of these blocks of 18th Street.

The Committee shifted to a consideration of the Walnut Street properties. Mr. McCoubrey, Mr. Levy, and Ms. Pentz inquired into the deteriorated state of the Rittenhouse Club building. They noted that the lack of maintenance over the last decade is tantamount to demolition by neglect.

Mr. Wyatt explained his plan to demolish all but the façade, but maintain the massing of the original building. Mr. Tyler explained that his position on the 18th Street buildings does not apply to the Rittenhouse Club because of the proposed setback of approximately 100 feet.

Mr. Levy asked parenthetically if the developer would be willing to remove the basement entrance to the Van Rensselaer Mansion from Walnut Street.

David Traub, an architect and resident of the neighborhood, argued against the changes to the 18th Street buildings. He claimed that moviemakers film in Philadelphia because the city looks old. The old look of Philadelphia, he asserted, promotes art and culture. Preserving only the façades would undercut the old look and further Philadelphia's transition into a "cartoon city." The buildings on 18th Street should be preserved to a greater depth, he concluded.

Ms. Kay added that the demolitions would be a "financial hardship on the public."

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance addressed the Committee. He began by stating that he regarded the Rittenhouse Club-segment of the plan an excellent solution. Shifting to the 18th Street design, he stated that, in general, he regards the saving of façades to be an appropriate preservation solution. He added that the question of quality must factor into any decision. He contended that the 18th Street façades are not of a quality that merits retention. Turning to the proposed 18th Street facades, he stated that they are too uniform; they do not reflect the idiosyncrasies of the earlier buildings. He concluded that he would recommend conceptual approval of the new facades, but had not decided on a recommendation for final approval.

Responding to Mr. Gallery's concluding comment, Mr. Tyler stated that pieces of the proposal should be considered conceptual and should return to the Committee and Commission for final approval after lingering design questions are resolved. Mr. Tyler as well as Mr. Levy of the Committee asserted that the designs of the 18th and Sansom facades and the return behind the Van Rensselear Mansion should be reviewed again. Mr. Sklaroff reminded the audience that two Commission separate approvals would potentially run the risk of two separate appeals. He asked that the Committee craft a recommendation that would allow for a single Commission approval.

Marvin Halbert, a Center City resident, pleaded for the preservation of the 18th Street buildings and the shops they house. Ms. Kay asked that no demolition permits be granted until the project was finalized. Stuart Feldman presented a written statement. He asked that the Committee visit the site before making a recommendation and questioned the ownership of the Rittenhouse Club during the alleged demolition by neglect. Mr. Tyler stated that it was his understanding that none of the partners involved in the current proposal owned any part of the Rittenhouse Club during the period of neglect. Bill Wheeler concurred, explaining that the damage had occurred between the late 1980s and the late 1990s, when the club still owned the building.

Mr. Gallery cited the Commission's frequent practice of approval with staff to review details and suggested, in this instance, that the Commission could approve the new facades on South 18th Street as well as the returns on Sansom Street and at the rear of the Van Rensselear Mansion with the staff and Architectural Committee to review details.

Mr. Traub interjected that the application was deliberately submitted over the holidays to preclude discussion. He claimed that it was moving too quickly, that the democratic process was being restrained, and that more time for public input was needed.

Mr. Tyler urged the adoption of Mr. Gallery's suggestion.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal as submitted, including the option of complete demolition of the four buildings on 18th Street, provided all exteriors to be altered or demolished including the wall at the Van Rensselear Mansion are documented with HABS-quality photographs and deposited with the Historical Commission, with the staff and Architectural Committee to review the details of the revised design at a public meeting.

118 South 20th Street

Demetrious Paraskevopoulos, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Legalize vinyl windows, replace other windows, close window openings

This application proposed the legalization of the installation of six vinyl windows and the panning of the associated frames without a permit, the approval of the installation of six additional vinyl

windows and the panning of the associated frames and the approval of the infilling of two windows. All windows are highly visible owing to this building's prominent corner location. In response to numerous complaint calls during the window installation, a Historical Commission staff member visited the property and witnessed the illegal work. Subsequently, an inspector from the Department of Licenses and Inspections investigated and issued violations. This building contains numerous commercial and residential units and would, therefore, require a building permit regardless of whether it is listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The front windows, which have been replaced illegally, are segmentally arched. The Commission's designation photograph shows the segmentally arched 2/2 wood windows in place until this illegal work. The new vinyl windows are square-headed, disrupting the lines of this important building.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and the Window Guideline.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Mr. D'Alessandro of the Committee stated that a large window installation company like Window Wizards should have known that this project required a building permit regardless of the building's historic designation status. He and Ms. Pentz, Mr. McCoubrey, and Mr. Levy all concurred that this sort of unpermitted work was unacceptable. Mr. D'Alessandro and Mr. Levy added that every measure should be taken to strengthen enforcement and prevent illegal work. They concluded that they could neither sanction this work with a recommendation of legalization nor recommend approval of the infilling and installation yet to be completed.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to 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.]; and the Window Guideline [Recommended: Designing and installing new windows when the historic windows are completely missing. The replacement windows may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the window openings and the historic character of the building.].

116 Market Street

Letitia Place, LLC, Owner

Ryan Berley, Applicant

DATE: c. 1895

PROPOSAL: Illuminated and painted signs

This proposal calls for adding a wood single-light door and a projecting sign in the form of an ice cream cone to this storefront. Painted signage would also be added.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. The applicants, Ryan and Eric Berley, explained that the ice cream cone sign would be made of stained glass and would be three-dimensional like an emblematic nineteenth-century advertising sign. They also discussed the proposed painted signs, which would also replicate nineteenth-century signage. The Committee inquired into the attachment

of the large ice cream cone sign to the building. The applicants stated that they would use an existing mounting bracket.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to 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.]; and 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.].

18-22 Letitia Street and 33 South 2nd Street

EFL Partners V, LP, Owner

Paul Stewart, Applicant

DATE: 18-22 Letitia Street - built c. 1855; 33 S. 2nd Street - built c. 1905

PROPOSAL: Build 8-story stair tower connecting buildings, roof deck, balconies with new doors, infill and move window and door openings on Black Horse Alley, remove shutters, install new windows

The application proposes several renovations and additions to two adjacent buildings, one on Letitia Street and one on S. 2nd Street. It proposes the construction of a stair tower linking the two buildings; the construction of a roof deck as well as balconies with new doors cut from windows; and several alterations to windows and doors on Black Horse Alley, a narrow street that runs along the north sides of the properties. The additions will be visible from public rights of way. The window and door alterations are all visible and include moving one window opening, infilling two window openings, infilling two door openings, installing new windows, and removing shutters.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the roof decks and stair tower, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Denial of the window alterations pursuant to Standard 2.

Ms. Spina presented the application. The Committee first discussed the window and door alterations with the applicant, Paul Stewart, the project manager. He explained that the building is being converted to residential use and the alterations would allow for better interior arrangements. The Committee noted that it was opposed to the removal and alteration of historic fabric without sufficient reason. Members stated that it was difficult to evaluate the proposed changes without information about the interior plan. After a lengthy discussion, Committee members agreed that the infilling of the doors was acceptable to accommodate the new use if the infill were recessed to indicate the former openings and the staff reviewed the brick match. They also decided that the infilling of the 2nd-story and 4th-story windows was not acceptable, but that the blocking of the openings in the interior would be admissible, with the retention of the windows on the exterior. They further decided that the moving of the 5th-story window simply to make the façade more orderly was inappropriate; they asserted that historic anomalies should be preserved. They agreed that the shutters should be retained and restored rather than removed; missing shutters could be replicated to match the existing shutters. They also agreed that any historic windows on the façade should be retained and restored; at least one original 9/9 metal window has been identified. Where historic windows are missing and have been replaced with vinyl windows, the applicant may work with the staff to replicate the historically appropriate windows.

The Committee turned to a discussion of the stair tower linking the two buildings. Members determined that the stair tower was acceptable because it is well designed, would be minimally

visible, and is necessary for the viability of the project. After examining the plan for the roof deck, they agreed that it was acceptable because it is set back behind obstructions and would be minimally visible. They advised the applicant to provide site and roof plans to the Commission to aid in its review. Addressing the proposed balconies with new doors, they concluded that the enlargement of the openings for new doors was acceptable because the facades are not visible from any public right of way. They likewise agreed that the balconies were permissible because only small portions of the railings would be visible down a narrow gap between the buildings. They added that the staff should review all details because of the incomplete documentation.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the stair tower, roof deck, balconies, balcony doors, door infill plans as submitted, the interior blocking of windows, the replacement of vinyl windows, and the replication of missing shutters, with staff to review details, pursuant to 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.]; and pursuant to 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.]; but denial of the window infilling and window relocation on Black Horse Alley, the removal and replacement of historic windows, and the removal of historic shutters, pursuant to 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.]

123 South 18th Street

Michael Singer, Owner

Jonathan Myerow, Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: New storefront windows and door

This application calls for the alteration of the 18th Street storefront window at this commercial property, which is being converted into a restaurant. The extant single-light fixed glass pane would be replaced with a fixed glass pane of glass at the bottom and casement windows above. The staff has approved the alterations to the door and side windows as well as the addition of awnings and new paint, all of which are depicted on the plan, pursuant to section 6.3.c of the *Rules & Regulations*.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6. The staff recommends a fixed or bi-fold window with operable transoms.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. The Committee agreed that the proposal was not appropriate. Jonathan Myerow, the restaurateur converting the space, explained his needs to the Committee. After discussing alternatives, the Committee determined that either bi-fold windows filling the entire opening or a fixed storefront window with operable transoms would be appropriate.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of bi-fold windows or a fixed storefront window with operable transoms in the existing opening, with staff to review details.

1521 Pine Street

Robert Clemmer, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1865-66 for Charles MacAlester, developer

PROPOSAL: Legalize glass block in basement window

This application proposes legalizing glass block and a dryer vent installed in the large front basement window without a building permit or Historical Commission approval.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Commission. Robert Clemmer, the owner, made a plea for legalization. He conceded that he had done the work without a permit, but claimed that before the work the window had been boarded with plywood for years; that PGW required he move the dryer vent from the chimney, an undertaking that cost \$3,000; that there is no way of determining the original window configuration and details; that the glass block is similar to several other basement windows on the block; that the glass block enhances his privacy and security; that he did not alter the opening or frame; and that he did not know that he needed the Commission's approval for the work.

Mr. Rivera stated that the illegal work is unacceptable. Committee members discussed the problem and possible solutions with the applicant. Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Rivera suggested moving the dryer vent to the boarded basement door under the front steps. Committee members suggested that a 2-light inward swinging casement window would be appropriate. They also suggested window grates for security. The applicant stated that he would consider withdrawing his application and installing an appropriate window.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to 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.].

339 South 21st Street aka 2041 Pine Street

Thomas Callan and Martin McNamara, Owners

Lisa Neely, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1870; storefront added, c. 1900

PROPOSAL: Remove and rebuild rear porch; new storefront, doors and windows

This application proposes several alterations. First, the storefront retains its original transoms, but the original storefront windows have been replaced with large plate glass windows. The owners wish to remove the entire storefront, including the historic transoms and install new transoms and storefront windows that match the original configurations. Second, the double-leaf storefront doors have deteriorated. The proposal calls for removing the doors, transom and frame and replacing them with new components to match. Third, all of the new 4-over-4 windows in the building will be replaced with aluminum clad windows with 7/8-inch simulated-divided-light muntins. The existing windows include the correct, wood, true-divided-light muntins with the wider vertical and thinner horizontal muntins. Fourth, the door on the Pine Street façade has six panels. The proposal calls for replacing it with a new six-panel door; the appropriate door would be a four-panel door. Fifth, the bay at the rear, which has wood clapboards and a small porch, has deteriorated. The application proposes demolishing and rebuilding the element; however, the new bay with porch

depicted in the drawings does not match the existing. The dimensions and location of the window should be verified and the railing should be wood only without any metal elements.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the rebuilding the rear bay with porch, provided the new exactly match the existing; the replacement of the large storefront windows and doors, pursuant to Standard 6. Denial of the replacement of the transoms, frames, and windows, pursuant to Standard 6.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. The Committee began with a discussion of the storefront. Martin McNamara, the applicant, and his contractor Dave McGrath distributed photos of the deteriorated storefront transoms. The Committee inquired into the condition of the storefront. The contractor replied that it had deteriorated to such a degree that nothing was salvageable. Based on their examination of the photos, some Committee members disagreed and suggested that as much historic material as possible be retained. They recommended that the transom sash be replaced if necessary and the remainder of the historic storefront be restored. Dissenting, Mr. Rivera and Ms. Pentz opined that they would recommend replacement of the entire storefront. The contractor added that the building had suffered termite damage.

Turning to the other windows in the building, the owner and contractor explained why they wanted to replace the existing windows with clad, simulated-divided-light windows. They claimed that the existing windows do not operate well and that the new windows would last longer, would be more energy efficient, and would be more authentic. Committee members questioned the applicant on his claim of authenticity for the proposed simulated-divided-light windows. He asserted that they would look “more real” than the historically appropriate windows with double-pane glass. He added that the windows he proposed were more expensive than the historic windows. Committee members did not accept this claim.

The owner agreed to substitute the appropriate four-panel door for the proposed six-panel door. He also agreed to revise the bay and porch design to match the existing.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the rebuilding the rear bay with porch, provided the new exactly match the existing; the replacement of the large storefront windows and the storefront doors, provided they match the historic windows and doors; and the replacement of the six-panel door with an appropriate four-panel door, with staff to review details. It did not reach a consensus on the storefront transoms. It voted to recommend denial of the clad, simulated-divided-light windows, pursuant to 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.].

1518-20 Green Street

Paul Badger Jr., Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1861-65, Stephen Button, architect

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation, new windows, doors, handicap ramp, lighting and canopy

The applicant proposes to rehabilitate this former church building as condominiums. The interior will be greatly altered. The sanctuary will be subdivided with another floor to house additional units.

The site will be improved. Enhancements will include a simple, metal picket fence along the side, a

new handicap-access ramp leading to the front door, modern pole light fixtures to illuminate the garden area, and a new stairwell in the rear of the building.

On the east façade, the windows in the lower level will be replaced in kind. A single, stained-glass window remains; the owner wishes to move it to the front façade. The remainder of the windows in the sanctuary are missing. The proposal calls for new windows that take design elements from the windows in the lower level and will have operable sash.

On the front façade, the plans call for installing a new oculus window. Two options are provided for the windows in the tower. One stained-glass window has survived on the front façade; the developer will retain it. Another stained-glass window has survived on the side façade; the developer will move it from the side façade to the central opening in the front facade. Windows like those proposed for the side façade will be installed in the front openings. Original doors survive in the two front flanking entrances; the plans call for replacing some of their wood panels with glazing to allow light into the residential units.

Several alterations are proposed to the main entrance. The historic doors and transom no longer exist. The plans include two proposals, both with double transoms. A barrel-vaulted canopy that would sit below the brownstone door surround is proposed for the entrance.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the site alterations, windows on the side elevation, 1/1 windows in the tower, windows on the front elevation, side door alterations, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6, Standard 9, and Standard 10. Denial of the proposed front door alterations, pursuant to Standard 9. The front door should have a split transom and the appearance of larger doors, similar to the side door design. Staff did not reach a consensus on the canopy.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. The developer Paul Badger Jr., architects Barry Brommer and Daryl Baker, and lawyer Tina R. Makoulian represented the project. The architects presented revised drawings with updated designs for the front doors and canopy that responded to preliminary comments on the proposal. The revised drawings included updates to the outer doors on the front façade; in the updated design only the transoms, not the doors themselves are fenestrated. Also, the central door was revised to appear taller with the replacement of the second transom with panels. Finally, the canopy was redesigned to be lighter and less obtrusive.

The Committee approved of the proposal with the revisions. Members agreed with the staff that the tower windows should be arch-head 1/1 windows, not either of the proposed types. The applicants agreed to revise the tower window design.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal with the door and canopy revisions, provided the tower windows are redesigned as arch-head 1/1 windows, with staff to review details, pursuant to 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.]; and 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.].

1243 Lombard Street

G. Clare Kahn, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1830 by George Harmstead, carpenter

PROPOSAL: Legalize skylight in dormer, install storm/security doors on front and basement doors

This application calls for two items: legalizing a skylight installed in the roof of a dormer, and installing storm doors on the front 1st-story and basement doors. The skylight has been in place several years. The owner recently replaced the skylight's glass, which brought it to the attention of the Historical Commission. The house presently has a simple security door on the front door, installed without Commission approval. The owner wishes to replace the door with one of a highly decorative design and install a similar storm door on the basement door, which does not presently have a storm door.

Staff recommendation: Legalization of the skylight, which was installed by a previous owner many years ago. Denial of the proposed storm doors, pursuant to Standard 9. Many houses of this era had louvered storm doors. The staff recommends approval of louvered wood storm doors or simple fully-glazed wood storm doors, pursuant to Standard 9.

Ms. Spina presented the application. The Committee decided that legalization of the skylight was appropriate given that a previous owner installed it many years ago. The Committee also concluded that the proposed storm doors are inappropriate for this early nineteenth-century building. It agreed with the staff and offered the applicant the option of either louvered wood storm doors or simple fully-glazed wood storm doors.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the legalization of the skylight and approval of either louvered wood storm doors or simple fully-glazed wood storm doors, with staff to review details, pursuant to 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.].

106 and 108 South 20th Street

Brian Barrabee, Owner

Harold Murray, Applicant

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Roof decks on rear ells.

The application proposes installing roof decks on the rear ells of these twins. Both will be visible from Ionic Street, a service alley. One may be minimally visible from 20th Street.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and Standard 10.

Ms. Spina presented the application. Brian Barrabee, the owner, discussed the application with the Committee. Committee members agreed that the rear ells were the appropriate locations for these decks. They also agreed that the decks would have little or no visual impact on 20th Street.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposals as submitted pursuant to 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.]; and 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.]

1800-18 Park Avenue aka Liacouras Walk

Temple University, Owner

Hyman Myers, Architect/Applicant

History: 1872, David A. Woelpper, builder

Project: In concept – Rehabilitation of 1800 Park Avenue; substantial demolition at 1802-1818 Park Avenue; retention of historic facades and mansards of 1802-1818 Park Avenue; construction of 5-story building set back behind front facades of 1802-1818 Park Avenue

This application for approval in concept proposes the rehabilitation of 1800 Park Avenue; substantial demolition at 1802-1818 Park Avenue; the retention of the historic facades and mansards of 1802-1818 Park Avenue; and the construction of a 5-story building set back behind front facades of 1802-1818 Park Avenue. The rowhouses at 1800 to 1946 Park Mall on the campus of Temple University were designated as the Park Avenue Historic District in 1990. The buildings at 1800 and 1804-1818 Park Mall are listed as “contributing” to the district; the building at 1802, the home of David A. Woelpper, the builder of the row, is listed as “significant.” In 1998 the Commission approved the demolition of 1820-1830 Park Mall.

On 23 January 2004, the Committee on Financial Hardship reviewed a petition asserting that the adaptive reuse of these buildings would constitute a financial hardship and, therefore, is not reasonable. At that meeting, the Committee concurred with the petition and recommended that the Commission find that preserving and reusing these building would constitute a hardship.

Staff Recommendation: In light of the Committee on Financial Hardship’s recommendation, the staff recommends approval in concept. The staff urges that the design be restudied before it returns for a final review. For example, the design of the north façade should be refined.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. He reported that on 23 January 2004 the Committee on Financial Hardship recommended that the Commission make a finding of financial hardship in this case. Tony Forte, Esquire, introduced Marvin Gerstein, Director of Planning and Design at Temple University; Hyman Myers of Vitetta and lead architect for the project, and Jim Hanson and Eric Lautzenheiser, also of Vitetta. Mr. Hanson explained to the Committee the changes in the design since the Committee last saw the project, specifically that the façades of the historic buildings will now function as the wall of the new building. Using a section drawing to illustrate his point, he showed how the floors of the new building will relate to the historic façades. Mr. Rivera noted that the plans call for 12-foot ceilings and asked if these could be made smaller. Mr. Hanson said that the floor to floor measurement calls for 12 feet, but the actual height of the ceilings on each floor is only 8 feet. The rest of the space encompasses the structure of the floors themselves and mechanical equipment; therefore, the 12-foot measurement cannot be reduced. Mr. Myers emphasized that the intent of the design was to keep the new construction as low as possible to minimize its visibility above the historic buildings.

Discussion then turned to the north elevation. Mr. Lautzenheiser explained that the architects wanted the historic façades to have prominence and they thought the setback of the modern façade

paid deference to the historic buildings. However, he acknowledged that the proposed design needs refinement. Mr. Tyler suggested that the design of the new construction should be more provocative and that the new construction be brought out to the same plane as the historic buildings to eliminate the awkward transition between the new and historic construction.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance said that this collection of historic buildings is of exceptional value and their façades are worth preserving. However, he also shares the concern for the design of the north façade.

Committee members discussed the design of the north façade at length. Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro said that, although the current design needs some tweaking, they thought the slight setback of the new construction appropriate. Mr. McCoubrey did not see a relationship between the old and new construction and thought the design should be reconsidered.

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval of the proposal in concept, with the north façade to be redesigned.

1317 Market Street and 1319-25 Market Street aka 1 East Penn Square

1317 Market Street – Wil Rappaport, SR Developers, Owner

1319-25 Market Street – Granite Penn Square Holding Corp, Owner

Cathy Harris, Mural Arts Program, Applicant

History: Showell, Fryer & Co. Building, Edgar Seeler, architect, 1902 (1st building at site of 1319-25 Market Street)

Showell, Fryer & Co. Building reclad in terra cotta, c. 1915

Showell, Fryer & Co. Building demolished except east wall and south corner, c. 1930

Market Street National Bank constructed by Ritter & Shay, 1930 (present building at 1319-25 Market Street)

Project: Legalize mural

This application proposes the legalization of a mural painted without Historical Commission approval or a building permit. The mural was commissioned by the Mural Arts Program, painted by Michael Webb, is titled “Tree of Knowledge,” and was completed in November 2003.

Questions have arisen regarding the location and ownership of the wall on which the mural was painted. Research has revealed that the mural was painted on a relic of a former building that once stood at 1319-1325 Market Street, also known as 1-21 N. Juniper Street. That address has been listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places since 18 December 1985. The relic, an unusual wall, stands at the east property line near Market Street between a parking lot to the east and the former Market Street National Bank to the west. When the bank was designed and built about 1930, the architects set the facade of the tower back several feet from the east property line in order to include windows on the façade. For reasons unknown, they left standing a piece of the building that was demolished for the bank. The demolished building was built in 1902 and clad in white terra cotta about 1915. The relic is a remnant of the 1902 building with its 1915 cladding. It is not simply the west wall of the Centennial Bank Building, which once stood at 1317 Market Street and was two stories taller than the relic.

Staff recommendation: Owing to the fact that the mural is on a former party wall and does not obscure any architectural detail, the staff recommends approval of the legalization, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal and described the development of the site at 1317 and 1319-

25 Market Street. Cathy Harris and Amy Johnston of the Mural Arts Program attended the meeting. Ms. Harris explained that the owner of 1317 Market Street, Mr. Rappaport, approached the Mural Arts Program and requested that a mural be painted at the site. The colors of the mural are taken from the brick and terra colors of the historic building. Ms. Pentz, a structural engineer, commented on the nature of the painted arch, which extends above the frame. Ms. Johnston said that the artist, Michael Webb, tends to have a sense of humor and the fact that the arch did not quite fit in the space is typical of the quirks of his murals.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend legalizing the mural.

1216 Arch Street

Young Smyth Field Condominium Association, Owner

Stanley Tang, Architect/Applicant

History: 1902, Field & Medary, architects

Project: Modify balconies

The Young Smyth Field Building is one of the few surviving examples of an important type of industrial loft building that once dotted the landscape north of Market Street. Small balconies on the front façade at the second to eighth stories link the interior spaces to the fire stair. The existing metal balcony railings do not meet code. This application, the second for these balconies to come before the Historical Commission, proposes to bring them up to code. At its August 2001 meeting, the Commission approved an application that included alterations to make the existing balcony railings code-compliant. Since that time, the architect has determined that the approved design, which was based on horizontal stainless steel cables, is not feasible. The architect now proposes a new design based on welded wire mesh with a pipe frame. The mesh would be attached to the existing railings.

Staff recommendation: The staff recommends approval, provided the mesh and frame are painted a color that allows them to recede and to be differentiated from the historic railings, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to modify the balconies to meet code. Stanley Tang, architect for the project, noted that the historic balcony railings will be painted a dark green and the mesh will be painted a matte black to differentiate the two. Committee members noted that black may not be the best background color to recede from the historic railing.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the mesh as proposed, with staff to review details, including a mock-up of the proposed paint scheme.

2019-23 Green Street

Miguel Leon, Owner

Joseph Duffy and William Murphy, Contractors/Applicants

History: c. 1860 with major alterations c. 1922 and 1959

Project: In concept – Demolition of 1-story building, construction of 3 or 4-story 9-unit building with parking

This application in concept originally proposed the demolition of all but the 1st-story front façade and side party walls of a 2-story building and the construction of a 3 or 4-story, 9-unit, residential building with parking at 2019-2023 Green Street. A few hours prior to the review of their proposal by the Architectural Committee, the applicants amended their application via fax. After meeting

with the Spring Garden Civic Association, interviewing a builder, and commissioning an inspection by engineer Robert Rosen, the applicants decided that it would not be financially feasible to retain the front façade. They therefore amended their application in concept to stipulate the demolition of all but the side party walls.

The property has a long history. About 1860, three 3 or 3½-story rowhouses like those to the east were constructed on three separate parcels. About 1922, the rowhouses were consolidated into a single 4-story apartment building. At that time, a Classical Revival-style facing was applied to the 1st-story front façade to tie the three buildings into one. In 1959, the apartment building was converted into a social club. For the conversion, the entirety of the building excepting the lower two stories of the front façade was demolished and a 1-story building was erected behind the façade. The front façade openings were infilled and a new central entranceway was added. The existing building is classified as Contributing to the Spring Garden Historical District. The historic limestone façade at the 1st story warranted this classification.

In place of the existing building, the applicants seek to erect a 3 or 4-story, 9-unit residential building with parking. Nine or more parking spaces would occupy the 1st story, which would be depressed below grade. The garage would be entered from Green Street, the property's only street frontage.

Pat Freeland of the Spring Garden Civic Association has submitted a letter stating that the "jerry-rigged," "ugly," "bastardized" limestone façade of "questionable historic significance" should be demolished to allow for the construction of an entirely new building with plenty of parking.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the amended application, which is incomplete. The applicants submitted neither plans documenting the revised proposal nor a statement of public interest or financial hardship to justify the demolition of the surviving Contributing fabric. The staff had recommended approval in concept of the original application, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. He explained the revision to the application and presented a letter from Ms. Freeland of the Spring Garden Civic Association. He noted that the staff had recommended approval in concept of the original design, which it considered to be sensitive and sympathetic to the historic district. He stated that the staff was compelled to recommend denial of the revised application, which is incomplete. The applicants did not submit plans documenting their new proposal, which calls for the demolition of the front façade. Also, they did not submit any statement claiming public interest or financial hardship to justify the demolition of the front façade. The front façade is the only surviving historic fabric and the reason this property was listed as Contributing in the Spring Garden Historic District inventory.

Joe Duffy and Bill Murphy, the applicants and developers, explained the late change in their application. Mr. Murphy is also the architect for the development. They noted that after submitting their application to the Commission they had interviewed a builder, J.J. DeLuca Company. DeLuca stated that the retention of the front façade would greatly complicate the construction process. The builder asserted that the retention of the front façade would not only prevent the use of large construction equipment on the project, but it would also require expensive shoring owing to the façade's fragility. DeLuca thought that it would be difficult if not impossible to save. Note the cost breakdown by DeLuca for four options: \$70,000 to demolish and rebuild with brick; \$120,000 to demolish and rebuild with limestone; \$145,000 to shore, retain, and repair limestone; \$155,000 to remove limestone, rebuild, and reinstall limestone. They also commissioned an inspection by engineer Robert Rosen. In a written assessment, Mr. Rosen states that the facade needs maintenance and concludes that it would preferable to demolish the façade and replicate it on the

new building. The applicants also met with the Spring Garden Civic Association. Ms. Freeland of the Association strongly urged that they demolish the façade. With all of this information, which was collected after they submitted their original application, they decided to revise their application via fax on 27 January 2004, the day of the Architectural Committee, to stipulate the complete demolition of the front façade.

The applicants discussed the project with the Committee. Mr. Murphy stated that, if they preserved the limestone façade, he would like to remove the step in the façade between 2019 and 2021 and change the floor levels. This would facilitate the construction of the parking level. The Committee responded ardently that the idiosyncrasies of the façade such as the step should be preserved because they are historic. Mr. Murphy explained how his design would work with the historic façade. Committee members suggested that the applicants find a way to work with the existing façade. They suggested that they either retain and repair the limestone cladding or remove the cladding, erect a new front wall, and then reinstall the cladding on the new wall.

Mr. Tyler clarified the Ordinance and *Rules & Regulations* regarding demolition. He stated that any plan that stipulated the demolition of the front façade, even if the facade was later recreated in new materials, would require a showing of either public interest or financial hardship. He said that the applicants needed to make a decision. They need to decide to demolish and present a hardship application or decide to retain and find some way of preserving the façade.

Allen Rubin of the Spring Garden Civic Association addressed the Committee. He stated that the developers should make a financial hardship application to the Commission. He added that the civic association would impose an “additional hardship” on the applicants if they decide to retain the historic façade. He stated: “I give them an additional hardship. The addition hardship is: ‘We [the civic association] will not approve the use of that stone with that façade because it won’t work.’” Mr. Rivera asserted that Mr. Rubin was free to express his opinion, but that the Commission and its committees would determine whether the façade was historically significant and whether a hardship would result if the applicants retained it.

Mr. Tyler outlined the requirements for a complete financial hardship application. The Committee, applicants, and Mr. Tyler discussed the components of a financial hardship application.

Jennifer and Martin Bretschneider, neighbors who own 2025 Green Street, asked that the Committee and Commission require the applicants to include a light well along the west property line at the rear to allow light and air into their rear yard. They asserted that the typical historic rowhouse consisted of a main block with narrower rear ell. The rear ell configuration, they claimed, set a precedent in the neighborhood for light and air at the rears of properties. Mr. Rivera stated that their issue was a zoning matter and would best be discussed at the zoning hearing for this property. They also testified to the poor condition of the limestone façade.

Mr. Tyler suggested that, if the front façade is demolished, the developers erect a contemporary building, not a pseudo-historic building.

Mr. Duffy asked why this building was classified as Contributing in the district’s inventory. Ms. Spina explained that the district’s period of significance extends from 1850 to 1930 and that this façade, which dates to 1922, is an important remnant and reminder of the apartment building that once stood on the site. She added that the limestone façade tied the three older rowhouses into one apartment building.

Mr. Farnham suggested that, if the façade is as seriously decayed as several people have claimed, the applicants might consider petitioning the Commission to reclassifying this property as Non-

contributing, thereby clearing the way for demolition. He offered to provide information to the applicants on a similar case on the 300-block of Delancey Street.

The Committee discussed the possibility of recommending tabling the application, allowing the developers time to prepare a complete application.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend tabling the project for a period not to exceed six months.

259 North 3rd Street

259 Third Street Development, Owner

Maksym Szpilczak, Applicant

History: c. 1785 with major alterations c. 1910 and c. 1950

Project: Demolition of front and rear façades, installation of new façades

This application proposes demolishing and rebuilding the front and rear facades of the building at 259 N. 3rd Street. A 2½-story building dating to about 1785 and known from an illustration in the 1860 Baxter's Panoramic Directory once stood on this site. It is unclear whether any of that 1785 building survives within the extant building. The 2-story brick facades date to about 1910; the storefront dates to about 1950.

This rehabilitation project began before the Commission acquired jurisdiction over the property. The Commission's jurisdiction began with the posting of the Old City Historic District notice letters in July 2003. Prior to July 2003, the applicant received a building permit to construct two new stories on the building. The framing for the new stories can be seen in the photos of the property. This building permit covered the construction of front and rear facades, but, because of the demolition moratorium in place in Old City at the time, it did not cover the demolition of the existing facades. The current permit requires that the applicant retain the existing facades and incorporate them into new facades. The applicant proposes demolishing the existing facades and constructing entirely new facades.

The applicant proposes constructing a 3-bay front façade with a storefront at the ground floor and one-over-one windows above. The façade will be topped with a cornice. At the rear, on Bodine Street, the applicant proposes constructing a 3-bay façade with small metal balconies at the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th floors.

It has been posited that the "Transition Regulation for Building Permits," which allows flexibility in the review of applications for properties in proposed historic districts, is relevant in this case. This property is within the recently created Old City Historic District and was not designated individually prior to the creation of the district. The Transition Regulation appears at Section 6.3.b of the Commission's *Rules & Regulations*. It states that the Commission "shall consider ... executed contracts, substantial design development or other evidence of a material commitment to development [made prior to designation] in the review of applications." Although this clause appears germane in this case, the *Rules & Regulations* limits review flexibility to "the interval between the mailing of notices to owners [in the proposed district] and the holding of a public hearing on the proposed designation." This application, which is dated 12 January 2004, was submitted to the Commission four months after the first public hearing on the proposed Old City Historic District, which was held on 10 September 2003.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided the storefront is redesigned with a less historic appearance, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Mr. Szpilczak explained that he could not get a demolition permit because of the moratorium on demolitions, but received a building permit for the additional floors prior to the district designation. He could add a façade to the upper floors as he proposed when he received the building permit, but he wants a more uniform look for the building. Mr. Szpilczak noted that he was rebuilding the rear façade because the present rear wall sits on the rear property line and, because of the height of the floors, he is required to have stairs that lead to the street level that cannot be on the sidewalk.

The Committee discussed the proposed design. Mr. Rivera thought the design was too reminiscent of the historic buildings in the district and that the new façade should be more contemporary in nature. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz believed that the brick at the second-floor front should be kept and incorporated into the new design. Mr. Szpilczak noted that the glazed brick would be difficult to match.

When Committee members asked for floor plans and a section of the front wall, Mr. Szpilczak said that he did not have them with him. They also asked for other details, such as brick color and window types. Mr. Szpilczak answered that he was willing to work with the staff to make those decisions. Committee members said that they could not make a recommendation without more information.

The Architectural Committee recommended tabling the proposal for one month for the applicant to return with additional information.

434 Pine Street

Craig Charlton, Owner/Applicant

History: 1960

Project: New garage door and lattice on garden wall

This application proposes the addition of a wood garage door at the rear of the property at 434 Pine Street, along Addison Street, opposite the Presbyterian Historical Society. A 2'-tall wood lattice would be added to the 6'-6"-tall brick walls flanking the parking area to support and hide the garage door tracks. Owing to the property's location the southeast corner of 5th and Pine Streets, the door and lattice would be highly visible. Although outside the purview of the Historical Commission, it is worth noting that the addition to the wall may require the approval of the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided a door with squared lights and panels, which would be compatible with the Colonial Revival building, is substituted for the door with arched lights and panels, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Craig Charlton, the owner, attended the meeting and showed other door designs from the same company. Committee members and Mr. Charlton agreed on a door design that had rectangular lights and panels, which was more in keeping with the Colonial Revival architecture of the house. Committee members also noted that a more substantial support structure may be needed to hold the tracking of the garage door and offered Mr. Charlton a sketch of what may be required. Mr. Rivera said that solid panels, rather than a lattice would provide a better transition from the heavy beam to the solid brick wall.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the application, provided a door with rectangular lights and panels is substituted for the proposed door, with

staff to review details, pursuant to 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.].

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Farnham and Laura M. Spina
Historic Preservation Planners