

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Room 578, City Hall
27 September 2005**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Daniel McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz
Robert Thomas, AIA
Daniela Voith

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Officer
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Also

Allen Roth, Joseph Callaghan, Inc.
Mark Wiener, CB Richard Ellis
Jim Foster, Pomona-Cherokee Civic Council
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
George Calomiris, Nolen Properties
Jim Nolen, Nolen Properties
Bill Calomiris
Laura Siena, West Mount Airy Neighbors
Laura Kern, Klehr Harrison et al
Michael Moore, Councilwoman Donna Reed Miller's Office
Richard W. Thom, R.W. Thom Architect
Aileen Barnon, R.W. Thom Architect
Sean D. McDougall, Visionary Companies
Steven Anderson
David Plante, West Central Germantown Neighbors
Ed Robinson, The Property Connection, Ltd.
Clare Kahn
Bernice Hamel, Society Hill Civic Association
Bill Aumiller, Aumiller Youngquist
Boris Cubas, Aumiller Youngquist
Susan Chisholm, Converse Winkler Architecture
Dru Coulson, Lone Star Steakhouse
Jim Kellmer, Jack Kellmer Company
Diane Young, Jack Kellmer Company
Jon B. Hollander, 225 Race Street Investors
Fred Berg, 327 South 17th Street
Edward Bell, E Bell Architects
Carmella R. Bruno, 2528 South 19th Street
Arthur Jones, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects

Mary Price, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Valerie Ferguson, Loews Hotel
Stephen Verner, Cecil Baker & Associates
Helma Weeks, Powelton Village Civic Association
Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects
Carolyn Healy, Powelton Village Civic Association
Ursula Bucki, Powelton Village Civic Association
Jack Minnis, Powelton Village Civic Association
Sue Minnis, Powelton Village Civic Association
Robert Roomet, 3416 Baring Street
Marion Kreiter, 106 North 36th Street

Daniel McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 9:10.m.

1600 Callowhill Street

Owner: Rubicon-NGP Callowhill, LLC

Applicant: Allen Roth

History: 1908, for Louis J. Bergdoll Motor Co., later Middishade Clothing Factory

Project: Rebuild cornice or parapet

This application proposes to perform work at the cornice level of this industrial building. The applicant has been working with the staff on the masonry restoration and cleaning on the areas below the cornice, and although shown on the drawings submitted, that work is not part of this applicant. The building has lost its original cornice. The building is stuccoed where the cornice once stood; the stucco is in very poor condition. The applicant proposes two different intervention schemes for this area. Scheme One proposes rebuilding the stucco with new sound material. Scheme Two proposes restoring the cornice based on the original plans for this building. There are some discrepancies between the historic drawing and the built conditions; however, the cornice shown on the drawing is most likely a very close approximation of the original. Also, the applicant did not have all the pricing information for the cornice restoration at the time the application was submitted and has thus submitted the two different schemes for consideration.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of Scheme Two, the reconstruction of the cornice based on the historic drawing, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Danta acknowledged that only two Committee members were present and explained to the applicant that a quorum is three. Allen Roth and Mark Weiner, representing the developer, agreed to proceed without a quorum. Mr. Danta presented the application.

Mr. Roth explained that in researching the property he found the original drawings for the building. These show a galvanized-iron cornice with a brick parapet. However, as built, the edifice does not have the parapet shown on the drawings. A prior owner removed the cornice and parged the entire area. Now the entire façade is experiencing deterioration owing to water infiltration. The brick behind the parging appears to be in good shape except in several small areas. Mr. Weiner expressed concern for the requirement of sidewalk scaffolding over the winter in order to continue the façade repairs and the installation of the cornice. Mr. Danta reiterated that the proposed façade

repairs have been approved at staff level and Mr. Baron explained that these can include the stabilization of the parapet and cornice areas.

Ms. Pentz joined the meeting.

Mr. Roth noted that they were willing to install a fiberglass cornice that matched the original in profile; they simply were concerned about the timing of the project with winter approaching. The Committee discussed options for the timing of the project. Mr. Weiner asked if lead-coated copper flashing could be installed at the cornice area until the actual cornice is installed. The Committee members agreed that this was an acceptable solution.

Mr. Roth and Mr. Weiner agreed to delete the optional parging of the cornice area from the application.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend the reconstruction of the cornice based on the historic drawing, pursuant to Standard 6.

920 Clinton Street

Owner: Michael Greenzang

Applicant: Jonathan Broh

History: 1839; additions, c. 1910

Project: Construct additions, add rear gate, rehabilitate building

The large rowhouse at 920 Clinton Street is uniquely situated; the front façade faces Clinton Street; the rear façade faces Pine Street. Virtually all of the exterior facades are visible from the public right-of-way. The rowhouse was constructed in 1838. About 1910, the building was renovated in the Colonial Revival style. Several side and rear bays, a side addition, leaded glass windows, and other features were added at that time.

The Commission reviewed an in-concept proposal for the project in June 2005. At that time, it decided to:

1. Approve in concept wood true-divided-light windows at the Clinton and Pine Street façades and wood simulated-divided-light windows at the side façade, provided all leaded glass windows are retained and restored.
2. Approve in concept the reconstruction of the second-story, Clinton Street, side porch based on the Commission's historic photographs, with a standing-seam metal roof, but denial of the proposed fenestration.
3. Approve in concept the demolition of the first-story side bay and construction of a one-story side addition with a roof deck, provided it is faced with an appropriate material. Deny all proposed Meteon plastic panels.
4. Deny the enlargement of the dormer on the Pine Street slope of the main roof. Approve in concept of the roof deck on the piazza, provided the dormer is not further altered (the window was converted to a fire escape door many years ago).
5. Approve in concept the reconstruction of a two-story addition atop the one-story side addition at the piazza, provided it is faced with an appropriate material.
6. Approve in concept the construction of a large three-story addition along the rear ell in the side yard.

7. Approve in concept the construction of a one-story infill addition beneath the second-story Pine Street bay, provided it is faced with an appropriate material.
8. Approve in concept the reconstruction of a second-story deck at the Pine Street façade.
9. Deny the construction of a third-story deck at the Pine Street façade, the cutting of a window into a door, and the new casement window.
10. Approve in concept the reconstruction of a brick and marble rear wall with wood gates in existing openings.

This design proposed in this application for final approval complies with the in-concept approval in every regard except one: it does not stipulate the retention and restoration of the leaded glass windows, a condition of Item #1 of the in-concept decision. The current proposal does correct the problematic fenestration at the front side porch (Item #2); replaces the unacceptable plastic panels with a smooth stucco (Items #3, #5, #7); deletes the unacceptable enlarging of the rear dormer (Item #4); deletes the unacceptable third-story rear deck (Item #9); and limits the parking entrance to the existing opening in the rear wall (Item #10).

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided all leaded glass is retained and restored, pursuant to the Historical Commission's in-concept approval of June 2005.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Jonathan Broh and Tiffany Strother of J.K. Roller Architects represented the application. Mr. Broh stated that the owner had agreed to retain and restore the leaded glass windows.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to adopt the staff recommendation and recommend approval, provided all leaded glass is retained and restored, pursuant to the Historical Commission's in-concept approval of June 2005.

101 and 221 West Johnson Street

Owner: Philadelphia Preservation Group

Applicant: James Nolen

History: Presser Building: 1914, Paul & Seymour Davis, architects

Carriage House: c. 1900, unknown architect

Nugent Building: 1896, J. Franklin Stuckert, architect

Project: Restore three buildings, construct three residential multi-unit buildings, alter site

This application proposes the addition of three rental apartment buildings and parking to the 5.5 acre site on West Johnson Street in Mt. Airy. It also indicates but provides no details for the conversion of the three historic buildings on the site to residential use.

The two adjacent properties, 101-121 and 221 W. Johnson Street, were individually designated as historic in 2004. The Theodore Presser Home for Retired Music Teachers occupied the large Renaissance Revival building at 101-121 W. Johnson, at the northwest corner of Johnson and Cherokee Streets. A Tudor Revival carriage house, a remnant from Presser's estate, stands beside the retirement home. The George Nugent Home for Baptists occupied the Chateausque building at 221 W. Johnson Street. The overgrown remnants of Presser's large garden occupy the large, center section of the consolidated parcel.

The application proposes the construction of three large, identical, five-story, contemporary apartment buildings on the site. One would be located behind the Nugent building; the other two would stand between the historic buildings, set back from Johnson Street. They would include ground-level parking and would be clad with stucco with brick accents. They would be roofed in metal and have aluminum windows and metal balconies.

In addition to the ground-level parking in the buildings, a large portion of the site would be paved for parking. Existing parking lots would be reconfigured and new lots added. The parking originally proposed for the lawn in front of the Presser building has been deleted from the revised plans. The remainder of the site would be landscaped. A large park or picnic area would be created along Johnson Street between the historic buildings.

Plans but no elevations were included for the historic buildings in the initial submission. Elevations were submitted the day before the Committee meeting. Most of the newly-proposed work to the historic buildings can be considered restoration and reviewed at the staff level. A few aspects of the proposal, mostly non-historic windows and doors, will require a subsequent round of reviews by the Committee and Commission. The plans initially submitted did propose a stair tower at Presser and an ADA ramp at Nugent; the Nugent ramp has been moved to the rear on the latest plans.

Staff Recommendation: Although the application requests final approval, the staff asserts that the level of detail is not sufficient for such a review. Therefore, the staff recommends the following:

1. approval in concept of the locations and massing of the new buildings;
 2. approval in concept of the site plan including parking, provided the parking lot between the Presser building and Johnson Street is deleted and the review of grading, retaining walls, plantings, drives and walks, walls and fences, and other site alterations and amenities is deferred until more details are provided;
 3. approval in concept of the location and massing of the stair tower at the rear of the Presser building;
 4. denial of the ADA ramp at the front of the Nugent building;
 5. denial without prejudice of any and all other proposals for the exteriors of the historic buildings owing to incompleteness at the time of submission;
- pursuant to Standard 9, the Building Site Guidelines, and the Accessibility Considerations.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect George Calamiris and developers Jim Nolen and Sean McDougal represented the project. Mr. Calamiris offered an overview of the project. He explained that the buildings would be developed as market-rate rental units. He explained that he was involved in a balancing exercise; he was attempting to balance the needs of the developers with the concerns of the neighbors and the requirements of the Historical Commission. He discussed the evolution of the project, especially how the parking and new buildings had migrated toward the rear of the site. He added information about retaining walls and storm water collection. He stated that he would replicate the historic fencing along the streets. Mr. Thomas asked about the parking. Mr. Calamiris noted that the developer may work with a neighbor to provide extra parking. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the unit mix be adjusted toward larger units to reduce the parking requirements. He also suggested

adding trees within the parking for shade. Mr. Calamiris and Mr. Thomas discussed ADA access. Mr. Thomas, who headed the City's ADA board for years, observed that the ADA requirements can be met with ramps and other access features placed at the sides and rears of the buildings.

The discussion turned to the design of the new buildings. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the windows be redesigned to be more horizontal, like the neighboring historic buildings and Philadelphia architecture in general. He also proposed that more brick be added to the facades. He commented that the large arched roofline should be redesigned. It should be lighter, simpler, and more like a penthouse. He also noted that the blank wall space above the top-floor windows under the arch should be articulated. Mr. Thomas also suggested making the windows more vertically oriented. He contended that the sill heights proposed are too high. Ms. Pentz stated that the designs were not detailed and complete enough to warrant final approval. She also dismissed the "whimsical" arched roofline. Mr. Calamiris stated that the arched roof was intended to complement, not compete, with the historic buildings.

Laura Siena, the executive director of West Mount Airy Neighbors, stated that her organization is concerned about three issues. First, the organization is concerned about the planning of the site; for example, are the historic garden features and the mature tree safeguarded? Second, it is concerned about the rehabilitation of the historic buildings, for which little information has been presented. Third, it is concerned that the new buildings might compete with, rather than complement, the new buildings. She stated that the new buildings should be dignified. She noted that her organization would have expert architectural consultants work with the applicants to improve the design. She also asked the applicants to provide her organization with adequate time to conduct its reviews. Finally, she noted that the Cherokee-Pomona Civic Council and the West Central Germantown Neighbors joined in her statement.

Stephen Anderson, an architect, near neighbor, and the person who nominated the Presser Building to the Register, remarked that the designs were in flux. He asked that the Committee and Commission not rush to judgment, but allow adequate time for a full review. He also suggested that the architect redesign the rooflines of the new buildings. David Plante of West Central Germantown Neighbors thanked the developers for working with the neighborhood and suggested that, owing to the complex topography of the site, the developers present topographical plans to the neighbors and the Commission for review. Jim Foster of the Cherokee-Pomona Civic Council recounted the sordid histories of these properties and asserted that his organization wanted the project to move forward, provided the solutions proposed are acceptable to the neighborhood.

Mr. McDougal, one of the developers, thanked the Committee and the neighbors for their comments. He stated that he has three goals: to preserve the historic buildings, to add complementary buildings, and to work with the community. He ensured everyone that he would continue to work closely with the community and would restudy the new buildings.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the following:

- 1. approval in concept of the locations and massing of the new buildings;*
- 2. approval in concept of the site plan including parking, provided the parking lot between the Presser building and Johnson Street is deleted and the review of*

- grading, retaining walls, plantings, drives and walks, walls and fences, and other site alterations and amenities is deferred until more details are provided;*
3. *approval in concept of the location and massing of the stair tower at the rear of the Presser building;*
 4. *denial of the ADA ramp at the front of the Nugent building;*
 5. *denial without prejudice of any and all other proposals for the exteriors of the historic buildings owing to incompleteness at the time of submission;*
- provided the applicants incorporate the Committee's comments offered during the meeting, 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 Building Site Guidelines [Recommended: Designing new onsite parking ... when required by the new use so that they are as unobtrusive as possible and assure the preservation of the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.] and [Recommended: Designing ... adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserves the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.]; and the Accessibility Considerations [Recommended: Designing new or additional means of access that are compatible with the historic building and its setting.].*

211- 213½ Vine Street

Owner: Hamam Enterprises, LP

Applicant: Richard Thom, architect

Proposal: Complete demolition

This application proposes the complete demolition of a complex of buildings at 211-213½ Vine Street in the Old City Historic District. The proposal poses numerous complex questions for the Commission.

First and foremost, the Commission must decide how to review this demolition application. Two of the buildings in the complex were individually designated many years ago, but were then classified as non-contributing when the district was created in 2003. Which designation predominates will determine how the review is conducted.

The buildings at 211 and 213 Vine Street were individually designated prior to the adoption of the new preservation ordinance in 1984. The staff has been unable to find any record of their designations in the minutes of the Commission or Committee on Historic Values, but the two addresses are listed in the original Register, a group of three loose-leaf notebooks that was maintained from the establishment of the Commission until the adoption of the new ordinance. The current ordinance [§14-2007(2)(j)] defines an *Historic Building* as:

A building or complex of buildings and site which is designated pursuant to this section or listed by the Commission under the prior historic buildings ordinance approved December 7, 1955, as amended.

Therefore, these buildings should be considered *Historic Buildings* subject to the Commission's plenary jurisdiction.

Complicating the matter, the complex is listed as non-contributing to the Old City Historic District despite the apparent individual listings of 211 and 213 Vine Street. The buildings were listed as non-contributing because they have lost integrity.

If the individual designations are maintained and/or the buildings are reclassified as contributing, then the applicant must demonstrate to the Commission that the demolition "is necessary in the public interest" or that the building "cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted" [§14-2007(7)(j)]. Neither claim is made in the current application.

Even if the individual designations are deemed indefensible, the Commission may enjoy plenary jurisdiction over the proposed demolition owing to the non-contributing designation. The Commission is not required to apply the public interest and financial hardship tests when reviewing a demolition application for a non-contributing building. Nor is it required to promote the preservation of the non-contributing fabric for its own sake. Instead, it may, apparently, evaluate the proposal and determine if the demolition would negatively impact the surrounding historic district, which the Commission is charged to protect. One could effectively argue that the substitution of a vacant lot for the brick buildings that stand at the traditional building line and that correspond to the neighborhood in materials and scale would be detrimental to the historic streetscape.

Moreover, the application mentions that a new residential building will be erected on the site cleared by the demolition, but no plans or other information have been provided. The ordinance specifically requires the submission of plans for new construction with demolition applications [§14-2007(7)(e)]:

At the time that a permit application is filed with the Department for alteration, demolition or construction subject to the Commission's review, the applicant shall submit to the Commission the plans and specifications of the proposed work, including the plans and specifications for any construction proposed after demolition and such other information as the Commission may reasonably require to exercise its duties and responsibilities under this section.

Note also that the Commission can opt to maintain full jurisdiction even if it reviews the demolition and new construction applications separately. The ordinance [§14-2007(7)(i)] empowers the Commission to condition the demolition in any reasonable way. It could condition the demolition on a full review of the new construction:

The Commission may require that a permit for the alteration or demolition of any building, structure, site, or object subject to its review be issued subject to such conditions as may reasonably advance the purposes of this section.

Staff Recommendation: The staff recommends the denial of the demolition application owing to the incompatibility of the proposed work with the character of the historic district (a vacant lot or undefined new construction would negatively impact the district), pursuant to Section §14-2007(7)(k)(.4); and to incompleteness (the lack of a public interest or financial hardship claim as well as the lack of plans for the new construction), pursuant to Section §14-2007(7)(e) and (j) of the Philadelphia Code. The staff also recommends that the Commission refer the application to the Committee on Historic Designation to clarify the designations and classifications of these buildings.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Richard Thom and Eileen Banner and owner Dick Tucker represented the application.

Mr. Thom explained that the buildings have been heavily modified. The alterations and additions have been very poorly executed and inappropriate. He stated that the buildings fail to meet the current building code. He declared that recreating historic facades is not good historic preservation practice. He added that rebuilding the facades is not economically viable. He submitted a reuse plan for the properties. He also displayed a model of the existing properties. He then added a model of a proposed building at the rear, along N. American and Wood Streets. He claimed that this new building was inappropriate to the historic district and financially infeasible because of its small footprint. He proclaimed that he could not adaptively reuse the properties in an economically feasible manner. He concluded by stating that he would like to demolish the existing buildings and build a 7-story brick building on the site. He swept the representations of the historic buildings from the model and placed a model of his new building on the cleared site. The new building would have parking at the ground floor and residences above. The pedestrian entrance would be on N. American Street and parking garage openings would line Vine Street at the ground floor.

Mr. Tucker stated that he would like to improve the neighborhood. He noted the fence and gate he has installed across the street as an example of fine design. He asserted that the new building would be a “lovely” addition to the neighborhood.

The Committee concurred with the staff that it should not review the new design without a resolution to the demolition question. Mr. Baron stated that the applicant may have a hardship case. Mr. Thom opined that the non-contributing classification in the district should override the earlier individual designations. Mr. Farnham stated that the individual designations mandate that the buildings be considered “historic buildings” as defined in the ordinance; therefore, the hardship or public interest requirement must be applied. He suggested that Mr. Thom raise the question of the conflicting designations at the Commission meeting.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the denial of the demolition application owing to the incompatibility of the proposed work with the character of the historic district (a vacant lot or undefined new construction would negatively impact the district), pursuant to Section §14-2007(7)(k)(.4); and to incompleteness (the lack of a public interest or financial hardship claim as well as the lack of plans for the new construction), pursuant to Section §14-2007(7)(e) and (j) of the Philadelphia Code.

8-10 South Letitia Street

Owner: 8 Letitia Way Associates
Applicant: Richard Thom, architect
History: c. 1860
Proposal: Legalize roof deck

This application proposes the legalization of a roof deck that covers the main roof of this former-commercial building. The deck has a plastic railing that is visible from Front Street.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, the deck should be set back from the face of the building so that it is not visible from a public right of way, pursuant to Standard 9 and the

Roof Guidelines [Not recommended: Changing the configuration of a roof by adding new features.. so that the historic character is diminished].

Richard Thom presented the project. He explained that the deck was installed without a permit and now needs to be brought up to code with a taller railing. He explained that this will not have visibility from Letitia Street, but currently has visibility from Front Street. The approved construction at 22 S. Front Street will block much of that view from Front Street.

Ms. Pentz explained that the Committee and Commission have been consistent in asking that decks be located substantially back from front walls when they have been approved in the past.

Mr. Baron said that it was unclear whether this deck would still have visibility from Front Street through the lot on the south side of Black Horse Alley that is vacant and not being redeveloped.

The Committee discussed alternative locations for the deck. They also thought that the white plastic fence should be substituted with a black metal picket fence.

The Committee unanimously recommended the denial of the legalization of the deck in its current location, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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 the Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

1911 Green Street

Owner: The Property Connection

Applicant: Ed Robinson

History: c. 1859 by Edward T. Randolph, builder. Alterations: refaced with pressed bricks and limestone details for George W. Fiss, worsted yarn merchant, 1875; mansard roof added and Queen Anne remodeling for George W. Fiss, 1885

Proposal: Add six decks on top and rear of building

This application proposes to construct a total of six decks at various locations on this property, all of which would not be visible from the public way. The applicant proposes to construct a deck on the main roof of the house, which would measure 9' by 16' and have a set back of 22' from the cornice. A second deck would be located on the roof of the rear ell. This deck would measure 16' by 10'. The remaining four decks would be porch types on the second and third floors attached to the building, which can be seen on the photograph provided of the same design on the next door property. In order to access the decks the applicant proposes to cut down one window per floor to access each deck. This would require the alteration of a total of 4 windows, all of which are located on the rear of the property. The applicant proposes a 9-light wood door, which would be set within the width of the former window.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the main roof deck, but approval of the other five decks, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ed Robinson, the owner, appeared to present the proposal. He distributed a drawing demonstrating the view of the back of the building with the proposed porches and decks. He said that the building, which he has restored, will be divided into condominiums. He is trying to give each some outdoor space. He said that the roof top deck has been designed to sit back as far as possible from both the front and the sides of the roof to make it invisible from the street. This is aided by the fact that the roof slopes backward for drainage resulting in the deck being set lower. The deck will sit back 22 feet from the front wall.

It was noted that a two-level deck is proposed for the top unit.

The Architectural committee unanimously recommended approval of the proposal 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 a property. The new work 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

Owner/Applicant: Claire Kahn

History: c. 1830

Proposal: Replace rooftop HVAC equipment

This application proposes to reinstall a cooling/heating unit on the roof of this property. The house is part of a row, which was rehabilitated sometime in the mid 1950s. The documentation in the file does not specify whether the rehabilitation took place prior or after designation. However, the location of the cooling/heating unit is not unique to this property and most of the other houses on this row have their units on the same location. The house has a landscaped rear yard with flower beds around the perimeter. In addition, the dining room window overlooks the only area of the rear yard that could hold the HVAC unit. If located there, it would block light into the dining room. The applicant has submitted a cover letter in which she explains the inconvenience moving the unit to such a location. She would also incur an additional expense.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the unit in the same location, but approval at a less conspicuous location, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Danta presented the application. The owner, Ms. Kahn, explained that she had spent \$6,000 repairing the concrete slab at the roof where the former heating and air conditioning unit sat. To move it, the slab would have to be reconstructed and the internal ductwork would have to be moved, requiring internal modifications. She said that the new unit was a lower and wider type.

The Committee unanimously recommended approval if the HVAC unit is painted a light grey color, making it less conspicuous.

248 South 3rd Street

Owner: Michael and Christine Mahoney

Applicant: Susan Chisholm

History: c. 1825 for Robert Kid, merchant. Alterations: November 1986, new roof, renovate old bricks, interior alterations

Proposal: add shutters, add door and window under steps

This application proposes to install paneled shutters at the ground floor and louvered shutters at the second and third floors. Owing to the installation of the shutters at the ground floor, the applicant wishes to move the existing light, currently on the left of the doorway, to the area above the arched entryway. The historical file for this property contains a fire insurance survey from 1834 that clearly mentions that this property had interior paneled shutters, and not exterior shutters. The same survey has a revision from c. 1860, which mentions that Venetian (louvered) shutters had been added at the upper floors by that time. This is further proved by the fact that the ground floor of this house does not have any shutter hardware, but hardware remains at the upper floors.

The application also includes a proposal for changes to the open area beneath the front steps. Currently, this area has a south facing metal access grill and a north facing metal window grill. The applicant proposes to change these to a four-panel wood door, which would mimic the front door in place of the access grill, and a six-pane, true-divided-light, wood window in place of the window grill.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the shutters on the ground floor and denial of the light above the door, based on the historical surveys and pursuant to Standard 3, but approval of the changes to the open space beneath the stairs pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Dante presented the proposal. Susan Chisholm represented the homeowners. She explained that the homeowners wished to install the shutters for aesthetic reasons and because other houses have them.

Bernice Hamel representing Society Hill Civic said that they do not object to the shutters but rather the metal grates at the lower door.

Mr. Thomas said that the Commission does not typically favor the creation of false history, particularly when the historic condition is well documented. He said that the shutters at the first floor could not lay flat because they would have to overlap since the space between windows is narrow.

The Committee members did not object to the installation of a door or window under the stair.

The Committee unanimously recommended denial of the shutters on the ground floor and denial of the light above the door, based on the historical surveys, and pursuant to Standard 3 [Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding

conjectural features or elements from other historic properties will be avoided.]; but approval of the new door and window under the stair, with the 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 a property. The new work 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.].

717 Chestnut Street

Owner: Del Frisco's of Philadelphia

Applicant: Bill Aumiller, architect

History: 1923, Paul Cret, architect, for Integrity Trust Bank

Proposal: Restore masonry base; cut new door; add ramp and awning – in concept

This in-concept application proposes to rehabilitate and alter the front façade of this former bank building on Chestnut Street. The building was designed by renowned Philadelphia architect Paul Philip Cret in 1923. The ground floor of the building underwent alterations sometime after WWII with the addition of a new storefront that protrudes from the historic façade. The applicant proposes to remove this post-war alteration and re-establish the original plane of the façade. In addition the applicant proposes to open a secondary entrance with an ADA accessible ramp on the eastern bay of the front façade. This door would be a two-leaf design with transom to match the existing western door. The middle bay would be opened with a fixed insulated glass window. The existing door in the western bay would be replaced with new doors that would match the current ones. The applicant proposes a new internally illuminated canopy over this western main entrance.

The three beautifully crafted bronze windows between each pilaster would be cleaned and restored, but a new insulated glass and muntin system would be placed behind the decorative grills. The rest of the application proposes restoration and cleaning of the stone façade, bronze elements, and new fixtures for façade illumination

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the removal of the non-historic addition, new openings, new glass and muntin system and cleaning/restoration of stone and bronze elements, pursuant to Standards 7, 9, and 10. Denial of the canopy, which should be located within the two pilasters and not exceed that space, pursuant to Standard 2.

Boris Cubas and Bill Aumiller attended the meeting as well as Drew Coulson representing the restaurant. Mr. Cubas expressed a concern about narrowing the canopy, saying that it would be easier to attach to the face rather than the jambs of the piers. In regard to the possibility of constructing the ramp internal to the restaurant, he said that they did not want to lose the internal space for seating and it would be more of a trip hazard inside.

Mr. Coulson expressed a concern that they had reduced the canopy from the full width of the building to thirteen feet eight inches. If the canopy were reduced to fit between the piers, it would be seven feet wide with an eight-foot projection. He thought this would not be large enough to suit its purpose. The applicants said that they would be retaining the ornamental gates at the door.

Committee members thought that the canopy should be held within the piers. Ms. Pentz said that in terms of engineering, it was just as easy to attach to the jambs as to the face of the stone.

Regarding the railing on the ramp, Mr. Thomas explained that if the rise of the ramp does not exceed 18 inches then the rail could be open, lessening its visibility.

The Committee unanimously recommended approval in concept of the removal of the non-historic addition, new openings, ramp with open rail, and glass and muntin system

at the first floor and cleaning/restoration of stone and bronze elements, with the staff to review details, but denial of the canopy at the proposed width, pursuant to Standard 7 [Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.]; Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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.].

Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Thomas departed the meeting. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Voith joined the meeting.

327 South 17th Street

Owner: 327 Condominium Associates

Applicant: Fred Berg

History: c. 1860

Proposal: Construct rear addition and deck

This application proposes a rear addition with mansard and deck on an earlier addition to the rear ell of the building at 327 S. 17th Street. The rear of the building, a carriage house of sorts, faces Chadwick Street. There are many mansards in the area on Chadwick Street including a mansard-roofed addition approved by the Commission for the house next door. The deck would sit at the front edge of the wall on this carriage house. The Commission has consistently asked for setbacks from front facades. In addition, the applicant proposes to reconstruct the original railing on the front stoop and to reopen and open several windows at the rear side elevation.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the front railing, addition, and rear windows, but denial of the deck, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Don Ventresca and Fred Berg represented the application. Mr. Baron asked the applicants about the material they proposed to use to replicate the historic cast-iron railing on the front steps. Mr. Berg said that they had not fully investigated the materials yet, but suggested fiberglass. Ms. Voith noted that fiberglass may not withstand that use and said that further investigation should be done.

For the addition on the rear, Mr. Baron explained that the building has a four-story main section, a three-story rear ell and a two-story addition that faces Chadwick Street. He noted that the two-story addition reads as a separate building. Houses face Chadwick Street; it is not an alley. The configuration of the addition and its relationship with neighboring buildings precludes an addition that would not be visible.

The Committee discussed the proposed addition. None of the Committee members opposed the addition itself, but several found the deck problematic. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested reducing the deck in size to only four feet deep and ten feet wide to read as a

balcony to the addition rather than a roof deck. Other Committee members believed the deck should be incorporated into the addition's lines, to read as part of the mansard roof like a day porch. The Committee suggested that the east or back wall of the addition, which is a mansard in the proposal and therefore pitched, be revised to be a true vertical wall.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the application, provided the east wall of the addition is revised to be vertical, not pitched, and the proposed deck is deleted.

225 Race Street

Owner: 225 Race Street Investors

Applicant: Jon Hollander

History: c. 1865

Proposal: Rehabilitate exterior, add roof deck

This application calls for the conversion of a commercial building to residential use. The structure has facades on Race and Florist Streets. The plans show the addition of a stair-house and deck on the roof, set very far back from Race Street. The Race Street façade is missing its second and third floor cornices, which it had at the time of designation. The new owner has agreed to rebuild these cornices, although in a substitute material.

Staff recommendation: Approval, subject to the rebuilding of the missing cornices, pursuant to Standard 9.

Jon Hollander represented the project. Mr. Baron explained the application. This building stretches from Race Street to Florist Street and has storefronts on both elevations. The Race Street façade is cast-iron; the Florist Street is cast-iron at the storefront and brick on the upper floors. A previous owner removed the cornices on the Race Street façade without a permit or Historical Commission approval. This application includes reinstalling those cornices, but using fiberglass to replicate them. The windows on Race Street will also be restored. Mr. Baron noted that the building does not have a rear ell and the proposed roof deck is set back from the Race Street cornice-line.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal with the restoration of the front cornices, 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.].

112 Queen Street

Owner: Van Hee Properties LLC

Applicant: Edward Bell

Proposal: Legalize windows and rehabilitate façade

This application seeks to legalize the removal of sash, frames, and shutter hardware

and the installation of new wood windows with applied muntins and wider frames. As mitigation for this unpermitted work, the applicant proposes to reset these new windows several inches deeper in the opening to allow for the installation of appropriate clamshell brick-molding. He would install shutter hardware and shutters, and a new door based on an historic photograph.

Staff recommendation: Approval, subject to the mitigation, with the staff to review details.

Edward Bell, the architect, and Timothy Jones, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Baron explained the proposal. A contractor, without a permit or Historical Commission approval, removed the original windows, frames, and shutter hardware and installed new windows that have applied muntins and do not have the proper brickmold. The contractor is no longer working on the project.

Mr. Jones wishes to have the windows legalized, but as a form of mitigation is willing to reinstall them so that the proper clamshell brickmold can be installed. The proposal also includes the installation of new shutters and shutter hardware and the restoration of the front door. Mr. Bell explained that the house its original door frame and transom.

Ms. Voith questioned the metal lintel over the windows. Mr. Baron explained that houses from this era had one of two types of windows. Some had plank framed windows which formed the necessary support for the brick above the window openings. Others, like this building, had metal straps as the lintels behind the brick and clamshell brickmolding.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the legalization of the windows, on the condition that the other work is performed as mitigation, with the staff to review details.

12 South 12th Street aka 1200 Market Street, PSFS Building

Owners: Loews Hotels

Applicant: Arthur Jones, architect

History: 1930-32, Howe and Lescage, architects; rehabilitated with rear addition, 1998, Bower Lewis Thrower, architects

Proposal: Cut door on Market Street, extend canopy

This application proposes to cut an additional entrance in the façade of the world-renowned International Style PSFS Building. From an architectural perspective, the building is, without exaggeration, one of the world's most important twentieth-century structures. In his groundbreaking essay on the building, the late William Jordy emphatically stated that:

any list of the most significant American buildings embodying what has come to be popularly termed the 'functional' phase of modern architecture, which began to appear at the very end of the 1920's in the United States, would surely include—and probably at the top—PSFS. ... In the development of the bare-bones esthetic of modern skyscraper design, PSFS is the most important tall building erected between the Chicago School of the eighteen eighties and nineties and the metal-and-glass revival beginning around 1950.

In his 77-page essay, Jordy analyzed in great depth the complex, integrated,

sophisticated design of the exterior of the building, especially the base. In his concluding sentence, he declared that:

For the analytical precision with which it meets a complex architectural program, for elegance and comprehensiveness of design without sacrifice of this analysis, and for creative expression of what was relevant at a moment of momentous esthetic and philosophical change in modern architecture, PSFS has ... much to teach.

A new entrance for a revolving door into the hotel lobby would be cut in the Market Street façade of the PSFS Building. The cut would entail the removal of three large granite panels that would be stored for possible reinstallation. The canopy over the main hotel entrance would be extended significantly to cover this new entrance. This would create a stronger horizontal line in an otherwise vertically oriented section of the façade.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9.

Ms. Spina presented the project. Architect Arthur Jones, Valerie Ferguson, and Mary Price represented the project. Mr. Jones explained that the hotel is seeking a better and more clear circulation pattern. He mentioned that guests who entered the hotel from Market Street tended to go up the grand stairs, which originally led to the banking room, but that now lead to a ballroom. Ms. Ferguson reiterated Mr. Jones's comments and added that 60% to 70% of their guests entered the premises from Market Street and that the 12th Street entrance was primarily used for departures.

Ms. Voith commented that this area of the façade had a strong sense of verticality and that the existing canopy clearly signaled the hotel's entrance. Ms. Voith asked the applicants if there was anyone at the entrance to greet guests. Ms. Ferguson answered that there was always a doorman present as well as signs in the interior. However, she mentioned these were not sufficient.

Ms. Voith pointed out that the PSFS building was by far the most famous building in Philadelphia and one of most important buildings in the country. Ms. Ferguson mentioned that they were aware of the building's importance and fame and that they had tremendous respect for the building and had shown their commitment to the property through the amount of money spent on the restoration. She then stated that the use of the building had changed; it is now a hotel with different needs and circulation patterns.

Mr. Jones added that the rehabilitation had been a significant project for him. It had received wide acceptance. The canopy on Market Street had been the only addition proposed by the hotel at the time of the rehabilitation.

Mr. Rivera mentioned that this area of the facade was the only location on the Market Street elevation where the verticality of the building clearly came through owing to the uninterrupted line of granite panels. Ms. Voith concurred with Mr. Rivera's statement and added that it would be a radical alteration to the elevation, which would destroy a key aspect of this important façade. All other Committee members agreed.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the proposal, 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.]; and 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.].

2528 South 19th Street

Owner/Applicant: Carmella Bruno

History: 1909, James and John Windrim, architects

Proposal: Replace storm door with security door

This application proposes to replace an ornate storm door with a simplified security door. The security door is fully glazed with plain bars.

Staff Recommendation: Approval

Ms. Spina presented the project. Julie and Carmela Bruno attended the meeting. Ms. Carmela mentioned that there had been several home invasions in the neighborhood and that they wished to replace the security door with a new one for the reasons of security.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal.

227-31 South 6th Street

Owner: MCW Enterprises

Applicant: Stephen Verner, architect

History: 1900, William Pritchett, architect; rehabilitated and penthouse addition, 2003, Cecil Baker & Associates, architects

Proposal: Alter rooftop addition

The second floor of this penthouse addition has a small balcony with a double-leaf door. The potential buyer for this condominium would like to remove the balcony and doors and enclose the balcony following the slope of the penthouse roof to create a skylight. The change would be visible from Washington Square, but occur in non-historic fabric.

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

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Stephen Verner attended the meeting. Ms. Spina specified that a non-reflective film would be used on the glass to avoid glare from the sun. She also added that the Society Hill Historic District had supported this project. Ms. Pentz asked if the alterations were only confined to the addition. Mr. Verner answered that they were.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal, 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.].

3428 Sansom Street

Owner: Judy Wicks

Applicant: Arlene Matzkin, architect

History: 1896-71, attributed to James Cochran, architect

Proposal: Excavate at front and add stair and storefront – in concept

This proposal in concept calls for excavating in front of the building to accommodate a new store in the basement of this former residence. The two basement windows would be cut down; one for a door and one for a storefront with a plate-glass window. This house is part of a rare, intact row of Second Empire houses that has been converted to commercial use.

Staff recommendation: Denial, Standards 1, 2, 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the project. Ms. Arlene Matzkin attended the meeting. Ms. Spina read and explained standards 1, 2, 9 and 10 upon the applicant's request.

Ms. Pentz asked if the property had a full-height basement. Ms. Matzkin stated that it did. Ms. Voith asked if they could maintain the width of the existing openings. Ms. Matzkin answered that she did not believe one of the openings would be wide enough for a door; however, she did not fully investigate this option. She also stated that, given the proposed use of the space, they would prefer more glazing.

Mr. Rivera mentioned that this change would create a loss of social space and change the experience of the side walk. He also added that it would be a great precedent on the entire block. Mr. D'Alessandro concurred with Mr. Rivera's comments and added that this proposal would dramatically change the spatial relationship between the building, the side walk, and the street.

The Architectural Committee was split in its decision. Two members recommended denial and two members recommended approval in concept, provided that the new openings retain the width of the existing openings.

3416 Baring Street

Owner/Applicant: Robert Roomet

History: c. 1862, attributed to Samuel Sloan; porch and rear addition, 1897, A.W. Dilks, architect

Proposal: Cut driveway through fence and yard, build retaining walls

The owner wishes to install a driveway and parking pad. He attained a zoning permit and a curb cut approval and began excavation. To build the driveway, the historic wrought-iron fence must be removed and the yard excavated to allow the driveway to be at grade with the sidewalk. The driveway will extend twenty-six feet through the front yard and lead to a parking pad in the side yard. The parking pad will be nineteen feet, six inches wide. The driveway and parking pad will be concrete.

The owner will then construct two retaining walls flanking the driveway. The retaining walls will stretch for twenty-six feet, stand two-feet high, and be made of cast-stone block.

The proposal also calls for removing the brick sidewalk, installing a concrete base and reinstalling the brick at the driveway.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and the Setting Guideline.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Owner Robert Roomet attended the meeting. Mr. Roomet clarified that the sidewalk would be reinforced and the brick replaced. He distributed a letter to the Committee members and the staff in which he explained the reasons for doing this work. He also distributed photographs of other driveways in the area with designs similar to the one proposed.

Mr. Roomet expressed his desire to move into the property and retire and mentioned that his car had been broken into and stolen several times and that creating this driveway would keep the car secured. He explained that the Department of Licenses & Inspections had issued a permit and that his contractor had received the necessary curb-cut permits but that he was not aware of the historic designation. Mr. Roomet explained that since there was enough space for the proposed drive way, no variance was necessary. Mr. Roomet also mentioned that he had recently worked on the property to remedy a rat infestation problem for which he had received a violation. He asserted that the proposed driveway would destroy this rat habitat.

Ms. Pentz asked if the historic iron fence extended around the perimeter of the yard. Mr. Roomet answered that there was a section missing. Mr. Roomet stated that he had never been informed of the historic designation of the property. He passed letters from neighbors who were not opposed to cutting a driveway into the side yard of his property.

Ms. Voith asked if there would be a gate to secure the driveway. Mr. Roomet answered that he was not proposing one at the moment, but that it would be an element he would certainly consider. Mr. D'Alessandro asked Mr. Roomet if he would be opposed to maintaining more greenery than concrete on the driveway. Mr. Roomet mentioned that it would create a difficult situation for him in winter with the removal of snow. Mr. Rivera inquired on the location of the historic fence. Mr. Roomet mentioned that it was at the sidewalk level.

Helma Weeks, chair of the Historic Preservation Committee of Powelton Civic Association, read a statement on behalf of the organization and objected to the construction of the proposed driveway. She explained that the next door property which has a similar driveway is occupied by students who park their cars without care for the neighborhood and usually park them on the sidewalk. Arlene Matzkin, resident, mentioned that it was not difficult to park on this block. Caroline Healy, resident, expressed her opposition to the driveway and removal of historic fabric including the stone retaining walls. She mentioned that this alteration would damage the historic context of the building and surrounding block and would create a bad precedent for the rest of the houses that have similar side yards. Mr. Roomet clarified that his property did not have a stone retaining wall and he did not believe his driveway would set a bad precedent. Ms. Healy answered that given the number of Drexel students renting in the area it would be a terrible precedent.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the application, 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 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 the Setting Guideline [Not Recommended: Placing parking facilities directly adjacent to historic buildings which result in damage to historic landscape features, such as the removal of plant material, relocation of paths and walkways, or blocking of alleys.].

The Architectural Committee meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron, Jorge Danta, Jonathan Farnham,
Laura Spina