

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

**VINCENT RIVERA, CHAIR  
ROOM 578, CITY HALL  
28 MARCH 2006**

**PRESENT**

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair  
Rudy D'Alessandro  
Herbert Levy, FAIA  
Robert Thomas, AIA  
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist  
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner  
Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director  
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

**ALSO PRESENT**

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance  
David G. Marshall, Parc Rittenhouse  
Stephen Marshall, Parc Rittenhouse  
James Garrison, Hillier  
Cooper Schilling, Hillier  
Thomas O'Donnell, RETTEW  
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance  
Jeffrey Laufer, JMLAIA  
Monica Malpass, Owner  
Michael Frebowitz, Tackett & Co  
Jay Tackett, Tackett & Co  
Joe Matisoff, Hyperion Bank  
Rebecca Stoloff, SHCA  
Robert Volpe, Lily Properties  
Edward Bell, EBA  
Lon Bartolotta, ODA  
Esme Bartolotta, ODA  
Sam Bradstreet, EFL  
Lisa Reeves, Owner  
Ray Bender, Owner  
Michael Mattioni, Esq.  
Christina Rovner, Partridge Architects  
Rod Herrera, RCH  
Frank Cascercer, Nextel  
Bryan Eicens, Nextel  
Alvin Holm  
John Devine, A. Holm Architects  
Allison Fritch, Tackett & Co  
David Orphanides, Nextel  
Jim Campbell, CTCC  
James Whitsell, CTCC

Joe Serratore, DSA

**CALL TO ORDER:** Committee members Robert Thomas and Suzanne Pentz called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. In the absence of Vincent Rivera, they selected Robert Thomas as the acting chair.

**219-229 S. 18<sup>TH</sup> STREET**

Owner: Rittenhouse Regency Affiliates

Applicant: Robert Cook, Sullivan Company

History: Built 1925, Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects, as Penn Athletic Club

Major alterations 1957, Cronheim & Weger, architects

Project: Alter facades, construct additions

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes the conversion of the former Penn Athletic Club building at the northeast corner of 18<sup>th</sup> and Locust Streets to residential use. The Commission approved a similar proposal in concept in December 2004; that approval was not renewed and therefore expired in December 2005 (§6.7.c.2 of the *Rules & Regulations*). The Architectural Committee reviewed a second in-concept application in January 2005, but the applicant withdrew it prior to the Commission's review.

The important Zantzinger, Borie & Medary architectural firm designed the building. The original design of 1924 called for an elegant 12-story building with subtle detailing. It was not erected. In 1927, a somewhat clumsy version of the original design was erected. It was taller than the original design and devoid of much of the gracious detailing. The clumsy building was substantially and unsympathetically altered in 1957, when it was converted to an Army Corps of Engineers office building. During the insensitive conversion, several important decorative features were removed and many new features were added.

The in-concept application approved by the Commission at its December 2004 meeting offered significant restoration in exchange for significant modifications and additions. This application initially proposed significant modifications and additions, but little restoration work. Since the initial submission, the proposal has been revised to include more restoration work.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff originally recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 9, but now withholds a recommendation pending a review of the revised proposal.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developers David and Stephen Marshall and architects James Garrison and Cooper Schilling represented the application. Mr. Farnham explained that the Committee lacked a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum.

Mr. Garrison presented an overview of the project. He stated that the realities of the real estate market had changed since the earlier reviews. He reported that some of the restoration proposed with the earlier applications had been deleted from the project as they endeavored to reduce costs. After learning that the staff had recommended denial of this proposal as first submitted for this round of reviews, the developer decided to reincorporate some of the restoration work that had been part of the earlier submissions. He explained that, since the earlier reviews, the developer had realistically evaluated the

project and determined how it would be accomplished. Some of the revisions to the earlier designs are the result of a better understanding the unusual structure and accommodations for it. For example, some additions and new window openings have been deleted because the masonry walls play a structural role even though it is a steel framed building. Also, the penthouse has been redesigned to account for the unusual structure. He stated that the penthouse is more “frame-like” than “wall-like” to correspond to the monumental window openings at the lower floors. It is not feasible to convert the stair towers in the corners to residential use because of structural idiosyncrasies. He discussed the balcony mock-ups and the questions about the detailing of the balconies, especially whether to include panels between them. He showed color samples of the proposed detailing. He also noted that the application did not include any proposals for the storefronts. Owing to complexities with the leasing of the commercial spaces, the developer is not yet ready to submit the storefront details. A subsequent application will be submitted for the storefronts.

Mr. Farnham explained that the staff had recommended denial of the application initially because it did not include the restoration proposed in the earlier applications. The restoration of missing historic fabric compensated for the non-historic addition. The developer had reinserted the restoration work into the application after learning of the staff’s recommendation of denial. Mr. Marshall pointed out the \$1 million in restoration work inserted back into the proposal.

Mr. Thomas stated that this was a troubling building from a preservation perspective because it had been greatly altered. He asserted that rehabilitated it as proposed was very sensible. He thanked Mr. Garrison for his compelling explanation of the project, especially the relationship of new to old. Mr. Thomas asserted that the addition meets the *Secretary’s Standards* even though it is relatively large. He remarked that the addition would be too large for many historic buildings, but that it is compatible here because of the unique circumstances of this building. He applauded the adaptive reuse and concluded that the proposal resolves the building architecturally; in its current, altered state, it is a “mish-mash.”

Mr. Thomas asked the applicants to discuss the storefront area. Mr. Garrison explained that they are working with the tenants and prospective tenants to design the storefronts. He noted that a second-floor tenant has an iron-clad lease guaranteeing a private street entrance. He also noted that he plans to restore the corner area, where it was opened for the entrance to the hotel.

Ms. Pentz inquired about the restoration of the terra cotta balconies. Mr. Garrison explained that they have the original drawings for the balconies and can therefore remake them exactly. He added that they will remake other missing terra cotta ornament as well. He noted that they cannot restore the grand arched windows at the third floor because of irreversible floor-level changes. He presented a plan to reopen the windows without adding the arches, which the Committee accepted.

Mr. Levy stated that he disliked the design of the penthouse bays. Mr. Garrison explained that they were designed to mirror the openings at floors 2 to 4. Mr. Levy accepted his rationale, but suggested a redesign of the penthouse façade along Locust Street. Mr. Levy asserted that the penthouse does not correspond to the historic building below along Locust Street. Mr. Garrison agreed to restudy this penthouse façade; the penthouse in this area is open loft space and therefore very flexible.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the approach to the project is very thoughtful. He noted that the building has lost its architectural integrity and therefore allows for changes that would not be acceptable on other historic buildings. He applauded the restoration of historic elements to the façade, which will add a lost richness. He suggested a close study of the new, non-historic balconies to be added at the upper portion of the historic façade. Turning his attention to the addition, he remarked that it would be the largest ever approved by the Commission. He praised the color, framing, and massing, but suggested that it be reduced in height by one story.

Mr. Garrison explained that it is important for marketing reasons that the Commission provides the developer with a final decision. The developer needs to be able to define the project precisely for prospective buyers. He promised to work with the staff to refine the details.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised design with the reinstated restoration, provided the Locust Street façade of the penthouse is redesigned to better correspond to the historic building and the details of the non-historic balconies are refined, with the Architectural Committee to review the penthouse and balconies, and the staff to review other details.

#### **2004 DELANCEY STREET**

Owner/Applicant: Monica Malpass

History: constructed c.1860

Project: Add parking, deck, sun-room, and doorway

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to excavate the rear yard for subterranean parking. The yard is already used for parking; the Commission approved a rear wall with a parking entrance in 1983. A deck would be constructed above the parking space and a rear window reconfigured into a doorway to the deck. A small sun-room would be added at the rear of the rear ell, where a small deck now stands; the Commission approved the small deck in 1983. A brick and metal wall would replace a non-historic stucco wall that runs along the east property line at the rear.

The application does not provide information about the proposed parking doors. If a roll-down gate is proposed, the housing and motor should be located inside the wall, not outside. Also, the design of the doorway to replace the window should be revised; the transoms should correspond to the door and sidelights below.

Please note that an application is pending before the Commission to legalize the relocation and infilling of windows and the installation of non-historic windows and a vent at the rear ell. At its February 2006 meeting, the Architectural Committee recommended denial of the legalization of the relocation and infilling of windows and the installation of non-historic windows and vent at the rear ell; pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9. The illegal alterations are depicted on the drawings submitted with the current application.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the sun-room, deck, parking, wall, and entrance, provided the parking doors, which are not defined, are appropriate; and the transoms at the new entrance are redesigned to correspond to the doorway below; with the staff to review details; pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Homeowner Monica Malpass represented the application. Ms. Malpass presented an overview of the project. Mr. Levy asked her if the newly proposed project was linked in any way to the work proposed for legalization in the earlier application. Ms. Malpass stated that the legalization application and new application are entirely separate. Neither has a link to the other.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the sun-room, deck, parking, wall, and entrance, provided the parking doors, which are not defined, are appropriate; and the transoms at the new entrance are redesigned to correspond to the doorway below; with the staff to review details; pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.\*

**\* Note that the text for each Standard is now provided at the end of the minutes.**

**226-228 S. 4TH STREET**

Owner: Michael Forman

Applicant: Michael Frebowitz, Tackett & Co.

History: 226, built c. 1840, Contributing; 228, built c. 1805, Significant to the Society Hill District.

Project: Construct two garages with deck, one-story addition with pergola addition, and rear curtain wall.

**OVERVIEW:** The applicant proposes several renovations to this pair of rowhouses. Most of the work is proposed for the rears of the two buildings; the rears are visible from Leithgow Street and the Rose Garden, which is public.

For 226 S. 4th Street, the plans show the construction of a 13-foot-high wall at the rear of the property. The rear would have an open air parking space with a garage gate. The plans also show a new stuccoed dormer on the rear roof slope; the Commission previously approved an identical dormer. The applicants also propose to replace doors and door surrounds on the front and side doors.

For 228 S. 4th Street, the plans show the demolition of the rear ell and the entire original brick rear wall and its replacement with a glass curtain wall. The building would receive a garage addition with roof deck on top, a version of which the Commission also previously approved.

Mechanized cellar bulkhead doors would be installed at the fronts of both buildings. No details have been provided for the bulkhead or other doors.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the parking area, garage with deck, and doors, with the staff to review details; and denial of the demolition of the rear ell and the replacement of the rear wall with a curtain wall, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jay Tackett represented the application. Mr. Baron noted that the Commission approved the rear dormer last year during the review of a similar project; the current roof is not historic fabric. He displayed a photograph showing the building with a flat roof; the gable

was later restored. Mr. Baron pointed to the wall that would be demolished and replaced with a glass curtain wall. He noted that the rear ell would also be demolished. Mr. Baron cited his concern about the lack of the details for the new front doors and cellar bulkheads. He asked if the new cellar doors would attach to the marble cheeks of the existing bulkheads.

Mr. Tackett introduced the project. He said that a portion of the rear wall at the first floor of 228 was demolished long ago. He stated that the tall stair tower and glass sliding door were added many years ago. Mr. Thomas asked if the second and third-floor rear windows on 228 are part of the original façade; Mr. Tackett responded that they probably are original. Mr. Tackett stated that almost everything on the rear of 226 will remain, with the exception of glass sliding doors, which will be replaced with a window and flower boxes. The Brandywine Conservancy holds a façade easement on the property. The Conservancy has approved this proposal, including the dormer addition.

Mr. Tackett stated that the cellar bulkheads that open onto S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street are intended as an alternative means of egress. They will be fitted with mechanical assist operators on the inside as a safety measure. Mr. Baron asked that the details be submitted for review. He asked about the crack in the marble lintel over the front door. Mr. Tackett responded that their intention is to install a steel angle, which would be covered by the brick. They will then cinch the marble back into place and point the crack.

Mr. Levy asked about the size and location of the curtain wall. Mr. Tackett stated it was 70 feet back from the street. Mr. Tackett said the properties were being combined as a single house with limited outdoor space. He proposed the courtyard as a more modern portion of the house. He said the kitchen would face the courtyard. Mr. Baron referred to a previous submission for the demolition of a rear wall on Delancey Street; the Committee asserted that the applicant should retain the original rear wall. Ms. Pentz agreed with Mr. Baron and said that this was the most troubling aspect of the application. Mr. Thomas said that taking down the façade would not meet the *Standards*.

Mr. Thomas then questioned the garage elevation. He said the doors could be more appropriate for the area; the proposed blank doors are a “street-killing” façade. Mr. Thomas noted that the garage was acceptable, but requested that the applicant add windows or panels to the doors to enliven the facade. Mr. Tackett disagreed with Mr. Thomas and claimed that the doors are charmingly simple. Mr. Thomas said he was not suggesting false historicism, but felt the garage looked threatening without any openings. Mr. Tackett rejected the comment and added that there other doors on the facade. Mr. Thomas asked for any available photos of the streetscape; Mr. Tackett could not provide any. Mr. Thomas asked for a design befitting the residential scale. Messrs. Thomas and Levy both agreed that the present design is not residential in scale or appearance.

Becky Stoloff of the Society Hill Civic Association reported that the organization had met with the property owner several times, but asserted that the project would benefit from additional review. She suggested that it be revised and presented again to the Committee.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance noted the Committee’s recent recommendation to deny the demolition of the rear of an historic building on the 500-block of Delancey Street. He asserted that this application should be denied as well because of the

significant demolition proposed for the rear.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the parking area, garage with deck, and doors, with the staff to review details; and denial of the demolition of the rear ell and the replacement of the rear wall with a curtain wall, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

**1201-1209 N. 2ND STREET**

Owner: Sedo Sanchez

Applicant: Jeffrey Laufer, architect

History: built 1871, altered 1907, architect Thomas Levy

Project: Add ADA ramp, exterior stairs, canopy, and ingress and egress doors, alter ground-floor windows

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes renovating this long-vacant bank building to house a new bank. The building has suffered from the removal of historic fabric including its stoop and doors on 2nd Street and the enlargement of window openings. The application proposes adding a ramp and reopening the main doors on 2nd Street and Girard Avenue. A new ramp and door will allow wheelchair access. The masonry window jambs, windows, and doors will be restored on 2nd Street and Girard Avenue except that the applicant proposes to retain non-historic single-pane windows on the west façade and taller windows on the south façade to allow greater visibility into the bank. The plans show metal signage over the doors, with individual letters pinned to the stone. On the east façade, which is stuccoed, the applicant proposes to partially remove a metal canopy structure and install a covered stair. On a back building, largely hidden from public view, he proposes new windows and the closing of two openings with brick set in a reveal. Skylights structures on the roof would be covered with a new roof. The plan show a parking area on the western portion of the lot.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval subject to the installation of the correct sash in the restored openings on 2nd Street and adhering rather than pinning the signage, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Banker Joseph Matisoff and architect Jeff Laufer represented the application.

Mr. Laufer began his discussion with the ADA ramp, noting it was 30 inches from the sidewalk to the entry on the first floor. He also noted that the ramp would be set away from the building except at the landing. Mr. Thomas approved of the location of the ramp, but questioned the use of stucco as a cladding. He suggested replacing it with granite to match the building. Mr. Laufer explained that he had selected a stucco cladding for the ramp, but a granite cladding for the landing to differentiate between the historic step area and the non-historic ramp. Mr. Levy concurred with Mr. Thomas and suggested granite for the entire ramp. Mr. Laufer agreed to change the cladding to all granite. Mr. Thomas asked if the railing at the ramp would need pickets. Mr. Laufer explained that it would not; ramps 30' tall or less do not need pickets. He added that the railing would be metal, but that a finish had not been chosen.

Mr. Baron inquired if the Committee was in agreement with the tall windows on the Girard Avenue facade. The Committee replied that they were acceptable because the

openings are already enlarged. Discussion turned to the proposed large, undivided windows at N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. Mr. Laufer stated they sought to maximize the light and visibility into the entry area of the bank. Mr. Thomas asserted that the historic paired one-over-one windows with the center mullions should be restored along 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. He stated that the proposed windows do not meet the *Standards*. He added that restoring the historic windows would not compromise the light and visibility into the bank.

The Committee agreed with Mr. Baron's suggestion that the sign be attached with an adhesive rather than pinned to the masonry.

The Committee considered the alterations to the rear and deemed them acceptable.

Mr. Matisoff then spoke to the Committee on the bank's intention to restore the building. He noted the expense of rehabilitating and stated that both the Girard Avenue and N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street facades would be restored as much as possible. Mr. Matisoff indicated they may return with a new application for the rear to reduce their costs. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee would welcome their return. Mr. Thomas then suggested that the applicant use the federal tax credits to offset the cost. Mr. Matisoff replied that time constraints precluded the tax credits. Mr. Thomas reminded him that he could apply for the tax credits up to 30 months after the completion of the work.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, provided the historic windows are restored on N. 2nd Street, the ramp is clad with granite, and the signage is adhered, not pinned, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

**2100 DELANCEY STREET AKA 328-30 S. 21ST STREET**

Owner: Lily Properties, Robert Volpe

Applicant: Edward Bell, architect

History: built 1905, architects, Okie, Duhring & Ziegler

Project: Construct penthouse addition with roof deck

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes the construction of a rooftop addition and roof decks on this apartment building, which is being converted to condominiums. The building currently has an original elevator penthouse and a small apartment unit on the roof, which the owners wish to expand on three sides. The new penthouse would feature a metal roof and cream-colored stucco and tile walls. A staff member met with the architect and owner on site to review a mock-up of the addition. The addition would be highly visible from directly across 21st and Delancey Streets, looking south from 21<sup>st</sup> Street, looking up from 21<sup>st</sup> Street toward the south façade and somewhat visible from points east and west on Delancey Street. The balustrade is also very open; the new penthouse would be highly visible through it. The existing historic penthouse is currently visible from the public right-of-way in every direction; any addition to it would be highly visible.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect Edward Bell and developer Robert Volpe represented the application.

Mr. Bell stated that the newly proposed addition is a response to the Committee's previous comments about visibility. Mr. Bell agreed with Mr. Baron's assertion that the addition would be visible. However, he noted that the new addition would not be more visible than the existing historic penthouse. Mr. Volpe added that he had talked to the neighbors and that they supported the project.

Mr. Thomas asked for a clarification on the proposed materials. Mr. Bell explained that they were proposing an asphalt roofing shingle of an inconspicuous color such as charcoal. He also added that the walls would be clad in stucco or tile, or a combination of the two.

Mr. Thomas requested an explanation of the set-backs from the balustrade. Mr. Bell explained that he proposed a 6' set-back from the 21<sup>st</sup> Street balustrade and a 3'-6" set-back from the balustrade on the other two elevations.

Mr. Baron said that the *Roof Guidelines* require that rooftop additions be inconspicuous. Mr. Thomas noted that there was a difference between inconspicuous and invisible. Mr. Thomas remarked that the addition would have a low profile that would complement the massing and scale of the historic building.

Ms. Pentz asked the applicant about changes since the last application. Mr. Bell answered that the set-back had increased by 2' along the 21<sup>st</sup> Street elevation. Ms. Pentz noted that this proposal flirted with the border of acceptability because it would not be inconspicuous. Messrs. Levy and Thomas thought that with the setback and balustrade that the addition was sufficiently inconspicuous.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the Committee to review the details.

### **313-15 N. 3RD STREET**

Owner/Applicant: Esme Bartoletta

History: built c. 1865

Project: Construct rooftop addition

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes adding an additional story onto this corner building. The building is a narrow Italianate commercial building with a cast iron façade. The addition would have no setback from Wood Street and would be highly visible. A park occupies the north side of Wood Street, allowing for open views of the building.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owners Esme and Lew Bartolotta and architect Jeff Davidson attended the meeting.

Mr. Davidson explained that the proposed addition would be placed on the back of the building and it would not be visible from 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, owing to the 35' set-back from the front façade. He noted that it would be visible from Wood Street and Route 676. He also mentioned that there is an existing 12'-tall elevator penthouse; the proposed addition would not be taller than this penthouse.

Mr. Thomas stated that the proposed addition would be different than the historic building in massing and color. He also stated that he understood the need to have the addition sit on the load-bearing wall along Wood Street; situated on the bearing wall, it would rise directly up from the historic façade. However, he believed that the engineering requirements of the proposal did not correspond with the historic preservation requirements. The addition should be set back from the historic façade. Ms. Bartolotta reported that they have the approval of the condominium association to construct the addition. They are restricted by both the condominium documents and the existing rooftop conditions. Mr. Thomas noted, once again, that he understands the restrictions and stated that, in his view, the historic preservations and engineering requirements cannot be reconciled.

Mr. Bartolotta stated that this property was located at the edge of the district and that the visibility of the addition would be completely blocked by a billboard along Route 676. Mr. Thomas answered that the billboard predated the designation of the district, but noted the visibility from several areas including the park on Wood Street.

Ms. Bartolotta asked the Committee members what would be permissible at this location. Noting that the applicants have access to space on the building at 313 N. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, to the south where they have a deck, Mr. Thomas answered that an addition might be acceptable if it was located where the deck now sits, substantially set back from the north façade of the building at 315 N. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. It was noted that this application differs from the other rooftop additions under consideration; the building lacks a parapet or balustrade and the addition would not be set back from the façade. Also, the building is highly visible because of the open areas around it.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance agreed with the staff recommendation. He remarked that this is an individually designated building and a significant building to the district and is highly visible in the district. He also stated that these types of additions detract from the character of the district.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

### **31-35 S. 2ND STREET AND 18-22 LETITIA STREET**

Owner: EFL Partners V.

Applicant: Brett Harmon

History: 18-22 Letitia, built c. 1855; individually designated and contributing

31 S. 2nd Street, built c. 1840; individually designated and contributing

33 S. 2nd Street, built c. 1905; individually designated and contributing

35 S. 2nd Street, built c. 1885; individually designated and significant

Project: Add additions and roof decks on main roofs of buildings

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes alterations to a number of buildings that face both S. 2nd and Letitia Streets. They have been combined into a single residential development. The Commission has reviewed aspects of this development a number of times, approving a stair-tower set between the buildings in the middle of the block as well as a deck set back from the front façade on the Letitia Street properties. The Commission has also approved some window alterations on the Blackhorse Alley

façade. The stair-tower has been constructed; it is taller and in a different configuration than approved, making it highly visible.

The latest application seeks to modify and legalize this stair-tower, and demolish the roof and add an additional floor and multiple roof decks on 35 S. 2nd Street. These additions and decks would have a high degree of visibility from Front, Letitia, and 2nd Streets and Trotter's Alley because the adjacent buildings are shorter, the lot to the east of these buildings is open from Front Street, and Trotter's Alley is perpendicular to the west façade of 31-35 S. 2nd Street.

For the facades of 31 and 33 S. 2nd Street, the plans call for new four-over-four windows. The windows are not appropriate for 31 S. 2nd Street. The roof of 31 S. 2nd will be raised and a highly visible roof deck.

On the north and west façades of 18 Letitia Street, the applicant proposes to cut new window openings and install one-over-one windows. Few window details have been provided.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. He explained that staff is reviewing a proposal to rebuild and restore a portion of the Letitia Street façade that is bowing, under a separate permit application. The application was represented by architect Brett Harmon and developer Sam Bradstreet. Mr. Harmon said that they were withdrawing the application to replace the historic windows at this time with the understanding that that aspect of the design can be approved at the staff level after it has been revised.

The Committee members did not object to the cutting of several new windows on the less visible Blackhorse alley façade, the west façade of 18 Letitia Street, and the north façade of 33 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. The Committee suggested that the windows include muntins to match the others in the north façade. After looking at photographs and hearing Mr. Bradstreet's explanation of the construction of the elevator tower, the Committee also agreed to the modifications to legalize the tower. They also thought that the redesign of the roof deck and raised roof on 31 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> was acceptable and an improvement over the design reviewed last month. They thought that a metal railing would be less visible than a solid stucco railing on that deck. The most controversial piece involved the roof top decks and additions at 35 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. Although they agreed that these would be visible, they thought that the visibility would be acceptable after the decks are lowered and several nearby construction projects are completed. Mr. Harmon explained that the stair enclosures had been deleted and replaced with open stairs. He said that the nineteenth-century elevator tower and roof structure would be removed from 35 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> and 22 Letitia Street to allow for the building of the additional floor. Some Committee members thought that the height of the structure could be reduced by several feet by combining the roof of the addition with floor of the deck above. Mr. Baron opined that the decks and additions would be highly visible from all sides.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance noted that the applicants had not made any hardship claim to justify the proposal. He said the project could be much less visible by placing only one unit on the roof rather than two. He said that, if a hardship proved that a

second unit was needed to make the project feasible, there are alternate, less visible locations for it at the rear of 22 S. Letitia Street. He supported the staff's recommendation of denial.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architecture Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the height of the addition is reduced at 35 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and a metal railing is substituted at 31 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, with the option of true-divided-light windows in the new openings on Blackhorse Alley, with the staff to review details.

### **224 FITZWATER STREET**

Owner: Ray Bender

Applicant: Arlene Vega, RCH Architect & Engineer

History: 1805

Project: Add roof deck on one-story rear ell

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a roof deck on a one-story section of the rear ell. The rear of the property is visible from Fulton Street across a parking lot and from an alley in front of four designated buildings.

The proposed deck would be accessed from an existing door in a two-story section of the rear ell. Owing to the change in elevation between the two-story and one-story sections of the rear ell, the deck would include a small L-shaped bridge connecting the deck to the access door. The deck would have an elaborate railing of wood turned posts and wood spindles.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the deck, provided that the deck is set back to the plane of the front façades of the row of designated houses adjacent to the one-story section of the rear ell and provided that the railing is simplified, deleting the ornate posts shown in some of the drawings, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Owner Lisa Reeves and Ray Bender, attorney Michael Mattioni, and architect Rod Herrera represented the application.

Mr. Bender showed photographs of a mock up he erected. Ms. Reeves noted that the only visibility is from the St. Stanislaus Church parking lot. The deck would not be visible from Fitzwater Street. Also, it would not be visible from Fulton Street owing to the wall that surrounds the church parking lot.

Mr. Bender displayed a catalog showing a pre-fabricated, dark-colored, PVC pipe railing with 1.5" baluster. Mr. Thomas suggested metal railing painted black to reduce visibility. Both Mr. Bender and Ms. Reeves agreed with the suggestion.

Mr. Rivera questioned the size of the deck. Mr. Bender replied it was originally designed to be 18' x 18', but had been reduced due to zoning requirements and two skylights to about 11' x 11'.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the deck, provided a less intrusive metal railing is substituted for the proposed railing, with the staff to review details.

**1617 JOHN F. KENNEDY BOULEVARD**

Owner: The Realex Capital Corporation

Applicant: Christina Rovner, Partridge Architects

History: 1930, Graham Anderson Probst & White, architects

Project: Install black-out film to four ground-floor windows.

**OVERVIEW:** In January 2005, the current tenant submitted an application to the Historical Commission proposing to apply blackout film on the four windows that face John F. Kennedy Boulevard. That application proposed covering the entirety of one window and three-quarters of the other three windows. At that time the Commission, voted to deny the blackout film, but allowed the tenant to apply a frosted film on up to one-half of the windows.

The same tenant now returns with an application similar to the one denied 14 months ago. It proposes to install blackout film to the same four windows in the ground-floor of Suburban Station. The film would be applied to three windows up to a height of approximately 8 feet from the ground. The existing signage on the glass would remain. The fourth window would be blocked in its entirety.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to the Commission's decision of January 2005 and Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Christina Rovner of Partridge Architects represented the application.

Ms. Rovner stated she did not know that the Commission had reviewed and denied a similar application in January 2005. She displayed several photographs in which the backs of kitchen equipment could be seen through the windows. Mr. Danta explained that the Commission had denied the dark window film, but had approved an etched frosted film on the lower half of the windows. Ms. Pentz asked if the earlier submission requested an approval to blacken the entirety of the windows. Mr. Danta stated that it requested an approval to blacken one entire window and half of three other windows. Architect Jay Tackett, speaking as a member of the public, asked if the Commission had jurisdiction over film placed on the interiors of windows. Ms. Pentz responded that it did. Mr. Danta noted that, even though it would be placed on the interior of the window, it would alter the exterior appearance of the building. Mr. Rivera opined that it would alter the building architecturally. Ms. Rovner questioned the previous approval. Mr. Danta explained that the Commission had approved film on the lower halves of the windows.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to the Commission's decision of January 2005 and Standard 9.

### **2200-2202 PINE STREET**

Owner: Romi Trading Corporation

Applicant: Allison Fritch

History: 2200 Pine: Built c. 1895; designed by Cope & Stewardson

2202 Pine: Built c. 1860

Project: Construct two new roof decks, refurbish a third existing roof deck

**OVERVIEW:** This application involves two properties, 2200 and 2202 Pine Street. The applicant listed them as one on the building permit application. However, they are separately listed in the inventory for the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District and are considered two separate properties by the Board of Revision of Taxes.

2200 Pine: The application proposes to construct a new roof deck on a one-story section of the rear ell. The deck would measure 22' by 13' and extend to the edge of the roof, which is highly visible along 22<sup>nd</sup> Street. A window would be converted into a wood and glass door for access to the deck. In addition, an existing roof deck located on a two-story section of the rear ell would be refurbished, retaining its existing dimensions. A new wood and glass door is also proposed for this location. The application also proposes cleaning and spot repointing the brick façade and replacing some windows in-kind.

2202 Pine: The application proposes to install a new roof deck on the main roof of this property. The building has a rear ell. The deck would be set back five feet from the front façade. The deck would measure 22' by 16' and would have simple wood posts and spindles. The deck would be accessed through an existing door on the gable end of 2200 Pine.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of both decks at 2200 Pine Street, provided the railings are simple, black, metal pickets; but denial of the deck on the main roof of 2202 Pine Street; pursuant to the Commission's deck policy, Standards 2 and 9, and the Roofs Guideline.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Jay Tackett and Allison Fritch represented the application.

Mr. Danta displayed aerial photographs for the Committee to clarify the locations for the decks. Ms. Fritch elaborated on the proposed locations for the decks. Mr. Danta asked if the deck for 2202 Pine could be relocated to the rear ell. Mr. Tackett stated that it could, but that it would not be worth constructing in that location. The Committee noted the Commission's policy of decks on main blocks of rowhouses.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of both decks at 2200 Pine Street, provided the railings are simple, black, metal pickets; but denial of the deck on the main roof of 2202 Pine Street; pursuant to the Commission's deck policy, Standards 2 and 9, and the Roofs Guideline.

**316 S. 21<sup>ST</sup> STREET**

Time: 12:45, 28 March 2006

Owner: William Hozack

Applicant: Alvin Holm

History: Designated on 8 February 1995

Project: Demolish wall of rear ell, construct new addition with mansard

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to significantly alter and add to the Cypress Street façade of a property that stands on the corner of Cypress and S. 21<sup>st</sup> Streets. The application proposes demolishing the Cypress Street facade of the rear ell, the rear ell chimney, a bay window on the main block, and a non-historic sun-room addition. The Cypress Street facade of the rear ell would be completely rebuilt in a different location. A Tuscan-Doric colonnade would be created at the ground level. New second- and third-floor facades would be built at the sidewalk line, several feet out from the plane of the historic façade. A fourth-floor mansard with two dormers would be added to the reconstructed rear ell. A grand, pedimented entrance would be added on Cypress Street at the intersection of the main block and ell.

The inventory for the local Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District was created from the National Register Historic District Inventory. The local district inventory lists this property as an "Intrusion." However, this term is not used by the Philadelphia Historical Commission when classifying properties. Section 2 of the Rules & Regulations defines "Significant," "Contributing," and "Non-contributing," but not "Intrusion." The classification of this building as an "Intrusion" in the local inventory is a mistake. According to the standards used to classify buildings in the local district, this building should be listed as "Contributing"; it is an historic building which was modified, but which retains its historic scale and materials.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 9, and 10.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Alvin Holm and John Devine represented the application. Mr. Holm explained that a new façade was installed on the building in the 1940s after structural problems with the building to the south resulted in a condemnation. The main entrance was moved from 21<sup>st</sup> Street to Cypress Street at that time. In the 1980s, the building was rehabilitated and the pergola over the entrance on Cypress was constructed. Mr. Holm asserted that the rear ell is too narrow to accommodate the current resident's lifestyle. He would like to demolish the street wall of the ell and extend the upper floors out several feet. He would also like to add a grand pedimented entranceway, a colonnade at the ground level, demolish a bay at the second floor, and add a mansard on the new, widened ell. All new materials and moldings would match the historic materials and moldings.

Messrs. Rivera and D'Alessandro stated that the Committee could not recommend approval of the application, which proposed significant demolition and pseudo-historic construction. Mr. Holm countered that the building had originally looked like the other buildings on the street, but had been altered and was now a "dog." The Committee suggested restoring the front façade to its original appearance with the main entrance.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that this proposal was the most historically imitative design ever presented to the Commission. He read from the

architectural drawings, which proposed new cornices and other features “to match existing.” He reminded the Committee that the *Standards* require that the new be differentiated from the old. He asserted that the Committee should recommend denial on two grounds, the demolition of significant, original historic fabric and the construction of a falsely historic building.

Mr. Rivera acknowledged that his Committee had recommended approval of additions to rear ells, but nothing of this magnitude. He stated that it would set a regrettable precedent if approved.

Mr. Holm remarked that the owner had paid a significant amount of money for the property and should therefore be allowed to make alterations to it. He asked the Committee how to improve the entrance. Ms. Pentz replied that he should relocate to its original position on 21<sup>st</sup> Street. Mr. Holm countered that a grand entrance on Cypress Street with a pediment and colonnade would enhance the building. Mr. D'Alessandro informed Mr. Holm that the proposal does not meet the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*. He stated that the Committee could not condone the demolition of the highly visible, original rear ell. Ms. Pentz agreed.

The Committee members agreed to recommend denial. Mr. Holm continued to press the Committee to consider his design. He stated that it was not imitative of historic architecture, but was instead the latest installment in a long tradition. He stated that he was carrying on a 2,500-year tradition that began with the Greeks. He rejected contemporary styles and stated that he was designing in an appropriate style. He insisted that the pediment, colonnade, mansard, and other details were appropriate and would enhance the building and the neighborhood. Mr. Farnham suggested that he speak with a staff member after the review to discuss the project. He explained to Mr. Holm that the Committee's recommendation was based not only on a rejection of the historicist architecture, but also a rejection of the significant demolition.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 9, and 10.

### **100 S. BROAD STREET**

Owner: LTB LP c/o ASI Management

Applicant: David G. Orphanides, Esq., Nextel Communications of the Mid-Atlantic, Inc

History: Finest example of Chicago School skyscraper in Philadelphia; built in 1897; designed by D.H. Burnham & Co of Chicago, IL

Project: Install fifteen panel antennas and a rooftop equipment shelter

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to install twelve panel antennas; some would be installed immediately and others in the future. Each antenna measures 4'-6" by 1'-5". The application also proposes to erect a rooftop equipment shelter.

A set of four antennas would be installed on the west facing wall of an existing penthouse, well above the cornice line of the building. The antennas would expand to a total width of 12' and be spaced at intervals of approximately 3' on center. They would be painted to match the masonry wall. These four antennas would be visible from 15<sup>th</sup> Street and Chestnut Street owing to the open view across the Ritz parking lot. In addition, two sets of four antennas each are proposed for the east side of the roof.

These antennas would be mounted on sleds that would be 12' tall and 8' wide. They would be painted blue-grey.

The application also proposes to install a new equipment shelter. The shelter would measure 22' by 12' and sit on an existing steel platform that holds the HVAC equipment. The shelter would be finished with aggregate stucco. The shelter would support three additional GPS antennas. The shelter would not be visible from the street since it is smaller than the HVAC unit on the roof and that unit is not visible from any location on the ground.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends tabling the application to allow for the construction of a mock-up to evaluate visibility and optimize placement.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Frank Cascercei and Brian Eicens of Nextel, engineer Mark Damiano, and attorney David Orphanides represented the application. Mr. Orphanides presented an overview of the project. He explained that they cannot move the east antennas to the penthouse wall and are therefore withdrawing that option. He displayed samples of the screening materials.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if any antennas would be installed above the height of the penthouse. Mr. Orphanides stated that none would. Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the sled-mounted antennas would be 12' above the roof. Mr. Orphanides explained that they have to be able to clear the roof and parapet.

Mr. Orphanides displayed photographs of the existing rooftop conditions and samples of the equipment shelter. He explained that it would be difficult to create the mock-up suggested by the staff because the elevator does not go to the roof. He noted that the sled-mounted antennas would be painted blue-gray. Ms. Pentz asked him if the equipment shelter would be visible from the ground. He stated that it would be difficult to see. Mr. Damiano clarified that they have not yet designed the equipment shelter. They plan to design it after they receive their zoning approval. He stated that the shelter will not be visible from the ground, except perhaps from S. Penn Square and City Hall.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if more antennas would be installed at a later date. Mr. Orphanides stated that they had no plans to install additional antennas. Mr. Baron noted that co-location is very common. He also reminded the Committee of the significance of the building, which is the city's only Chicago-style skyscraper and was designed by Daniel Burnham. Mr. Baron also stated that he believed that the equipment would be quite visible from the street. Mr. Orphanides replied that one sees equipment on the roof of every tall building. He then methodically read a list of buildings on which they had attempted to place their equipment. After Mr. Orphanides completed the long list, Mr. Farnham asked him if he had considered the preservation easement that the Preservation Alliance holds on the building. He stated that he knew nothing about it. Mr. Gallery confirmed that the Alliance holds an easement on the building including the roof. He stated that the Alliance would never approve the installation of telecommunications equipment on the building.

Mr. Baron suggested a mock-up to evaluate the impact of the equipment on the building. Mr. Orphanides reiterated his claim that it would be difficult to install a mock-up, but agreed to work with the staff and the Preservation Alliance.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend tabling the application to allow for the construction of a mock-up to evaluate visibility and optimize placement.

**1736 ADDISON STREET**

Owner: Dan Barton

Applicant: Joseph Serratore

History: two story Italianate rowhouse; designated on 2/8/1995, contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District.

Project: Roof deck on front block and rear ell

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a roof deck that would be located on the main block and the rear ell of the house. The deck would be set back 5'-10" from the front façade. This set back would be equivalent to that of deck on an adjacent building, which is not visible from Addison Street. The deck would measure 15'-4" by 30'-10". In addition, a stair enclosure would be built over an existing roof hatch. The enclosure would measure 3'-8" by 9'-1". The deck would have a simple wood post and spindle railing.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial of the deck as proposed, but approval of a deck and stair house that is located on the rear ell only, pursuant to the Commission's policy on decks on main roofs, Standards 2 and 9, and the Roofs Guideline.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Joe Serratore represented the application. Mr. Serratore stated that a deck on the rear ell only, as the staff had recommended, would be too small. He contended that the deck would not be visible from the street. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Rivera informed the applicant that the rear ell, not the main block, is the appropriate location for the deck.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the deck as proposed, but approval of a deck and stair house that is located on the rear ell only, pursuant to the Commission's policy on decks on main roofs, Standards 2 and 9, and the Roofs Guideline.

**2126 CYPRESS STREET**

Owner: James Whitesell

Applicant: James Campbell

History: c. 1960, garage and apartment building

Project: New fourth floor addition with deck, new rear deck at second floor

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes alterations and additions to a non-contributing building in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. It proposes to construct a second-story deck and stair at the rear of the property. An existing second-floor door and window would be altered to allow access from the second floor. The rear yard would be enclosed with a six-foot fence. It also proposes a fourth-floor addition with a deck on the existing three-story building. The addition would be shaped like a mansard and it would be set-back 6'-8" from the front façade; a roof deck with a glass railing would occupy this 6'-8" space at the front. The mansard addition would be clad in a standing-seam metal roof.

An HVAC condenser would be located at the eastern edge of the roof.

Section 6.5 of the *Rules & Regulations* governs the review of applications for non-contributing buildings. The Committee may elect to approve the proposal without referral to the Commission.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the HVAC condenser is moved to the west end of the roof, making it invisible from Cypress Street.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner James Whitesell and architects James Campbell and Dan Kline represented the application. Mr. Farnham reminded the Committee that the building was listed as non-contributing and advised it to consider the impact of the proposal on the district, not the building itself, which is non-historic. Mr. Campbell explained that the building was erected as garage and apartment building. It has large garage doors at the front and back allowing automobiles to enter it from Cypress Street and continue out into the yard on the other side. It was erected about 1960. Mr. Campbell showed several mock-ups of the addition as well as color studies. He agreed to move the HVAC condenser to the west end of the roof, making it invisible from Cypress Street. The Committee members agreed that the addition was appropriate and compatible with the historic district.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE DECISION:** The Architectural Committee approved the proposal, provided the HVAC condenser is moved to the west end of the roof, making it invisible from Cypress Street.

#### **STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES**

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

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 not be undertaken."

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

Standard 9: "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment."

Standard 10: "New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."

Roofs Guideline: "Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential,

office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.”

**ADJOURNMENT:** The Architectural Committee adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron  
Jorge Danta  
Jonathan E. Farnham  
Karen Gonski