

**THE MINUTES OF THE 539TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**13 JULY 2007
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18029
MICHAEL SKLAROFF, ESQ., CHAIR**

PRESENT

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
James Brown IV
Eileen Evans, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Vincent Rivera, AIA
David Schaaf, RA
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner I
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Assistant City Solicitor, Law Department

ALSO PRESENT

Tom Lussenhop, Campus Inn Associates
Anthony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing
Bob Powers, Powers & Co.
Bob Hotes, Hillier Architects
Hope Zoss, Smith Memorial
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Deidre Deaganis, J.K. Roller
Kristin Erhard, J.K. Roller
Tony Forte, Saul Ewing
Christine Davis, Wesley Wei Architects
Wesley Wei, Wesley Wei Architects
Susan Erickson
Frank Rapisardi, Tackett & Co
Matthew Koenig, J.K. Roller Architects
James Garrison, Hillier Architects
Thomas Witt, Esq., Wolf Block
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
R. Sudall, Philadelphia Preservation Group
Laura Spina, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Margeux Pelegrin
John Andrews, Andrews Architects
Michael Hauptman, Brawer & Hauptman Architects

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sklaroff, the Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 539th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:05 a.m. Commissioners Brown, Evans, Leonard, Merriman, Rivera, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, Smyler, and Sugrue were in attendance.

MINUTES OF THE 538TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Upon a motion proffered by Ms. Merriman and seconded by Ms. Leonard, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 538th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 June 2007.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 10 JULY 2007

Thomas Sugrue, Chair

1 N. 30TH STREET, 30TH STREET STATION

Owner: Amtrak

Applicant: Philadelphia Historical Commission

Proposal: Amend boundary

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation unanimously recommended that the Philadelphia Historical Commission adopt the revised nomination for 1 N. 30th Street, a.k.a. 30th Street Station.

OVERVIEW: In April 2007, the Philadelphia Historical Commission directed its staff to propose a revision to the designation of 30th Street Station. The boundary of the historic resource is not clearly defined in the nomination the Commission adopted on 1 May 1980, when it designated the property. Amtrak, the property owner, is planning to demolish three buildings in the train yard at the 30th Street Station complex, the Steam Plant, Pullman Building and the Acid Storage Building. The Commission seeks to clarify the boundary of the resource to avoid any confusion regarding the extent of its jurisdiction.

The nomination adopted when 30th Street Station was designated is internally inconsistent. The Steam Plant is mentioned in the Statement of Significance section of the nomination, but is not mentioned in the description or explicitly included within the poorly defined boundary. The Philadelphia Register of Historic Places nomination for 30th Street Station was derived from the National Register nomination for the site. They are almost identical. The following section, which does not appear in the National Register nomination, was inserted into the Statement of Significance in the local nomination:

Support Facilities

Built in 1929, the steam heating and auxiliary power plant stands about a thousand feet north and west of the station. The system includes a boiler house, a turbine wing, and a smokestack; the facility also houses compressors and generators for the production of both the steam and the electricity required for the signal systems.

No other mention of the Steam Plant is made in the local nomination.

In the boundary section, the National Register nomination states that the historic site is 8.36 acres and defines the site boundary as:

The station is located west of Philadelphia Central Business District and across the Schuylkill River. The Station is bounded on the north by Arch Street, on the south by Market Street, on the east by West River Drive and on the west by 30th Street.

The 8.36-acre site defined in the National Register nomination includes the main station building, but none of the train yard.

The verbal boundary description section of the local nomination is blank. The local nomination does, however, state that the nominated site is 8.36 acres, the same as that in the National Register nomination. The actual site of the main station building bounded by Market, N. 30th, and Arch Streets and N. Schuylkill Avenue West is approximately 8.36 acres. Any site including both the main station building and the three buildings slated for demolition would be much larger than 8.36 acres.

An updated nomination is proposed. It defines a boundary for the historic resource that expressly includes the station building with the covered commuter rail platforms and immediate grounds, but does not include any of the surrounding yard. The Steam Plant, Pullman Building, Acid Storage Building, and all other outbuildings and structures are explicitly excluded from the revised nomination. The information about the power plant is retained within the revised nomination, but with a statement that it is not part of the designated resource.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the revised nomination to the Commission. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. Smyler asked why the Commission was proposing to amend the designation. Mr. Sklaroff explained that the boundary in the original nomination requires clarification. It specifies the size of the designated lot, but not a boundary line. He also noted that the Commission is seeking to avoid a jurisdictional dispute with the federal government.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and adopt the revised nomination for 1 N. 30th Street, a.k.a. 30th Street Station. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

5520-24 ARCH STREET, SAMUEL YELLIN IRON STUDIO

Owner: The Salvation Army, Eastern Pennsylvania and Delaware Division

Applicant: Fred Slifer, AIA

Proposal: Rescission of 5520-24 Arch Street from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation unanimously recommended that the Philadelphia Historical Commission rescind the designation of 5520-5524 Arch Street, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, provided the photographs and plans required as a condition of the approval of the demolition are submitted to the Commission.

OVERVIEW: The Commission designated the Samuel Yellin Iron Studio at 5520-24 Arch Street and placed it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in December 1985. In October 1998, the Commission approved the demolition of the building owing to financial hardship. The Commission's decision states: "approval of demolishing the building on the grounds of financial hardship, with photographic recordation of the current state of the building and copies of the architectural plans for the building, and copies of the historic photographs Ms. Yellin offered to reproduce for the Commission files." The building was subsequently demolished; however, the

required photographs and plans have yet to be provided to the Commission. The current owner now requests the rescission of 5520-24 Arch Street from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the rescission request to the Commission. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. Merriman asked about the possibility of ever receiving the documentation as required by the demolition approval. Mr. Farnham noted that one of the members on the Committee for Historic Designation stated at the Committee's meeting that he believes that the Yellin family retains the plans and photographs. Mr. Farnham also reported that the Yellin family donated the property to the Salvation Army, the current owner, and may still maintain a relationship with that organization. He concluded that it is likely that the current owner may be able to provide the requisite documentation to the Commission.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and rescind the designation of 5520-5524 Arch Street, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, provided the photographs and plans required as a condition of the approval of the demolition are submitted to the Commission. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

400 S. 40TH STREET

Owner: OAP, Inc. (real estate company owned by the University of Pennsylvania)

Applicant: Anthony Forte, Esq., for Tom Lussenhop

Site History: Built c. 1856; significantly altered and added to in 1962-1964, 1975

Designation: Individually designated 11/1/73

Proposal: Rescind individual designation

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation unanimously recommended that the Philadelphia Historical Commission deny the rescission request, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, and amend the designation to indicate that the c. 1856 Italianate building is historically significant, but the 1960s and 1970s additions and alterations are not historically significant.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the rescission of the individual designation of the property at 400 S. 40th Street, at the southwest corner of 40th and Pine Streets. The equitable owners seek the rescission to facilitate the construction of a small hotel.

The building at 400 S. 40th Street was constructed as a large Italianate residence in 1856. Deed research does not indicate that the original or subsequent owners were "persons significant in the past." The grand house was rehabilitated in the Colonial Revival style in the late nineteenth century by David P. Leas, the co-owner of a Leas & McVitty, a tannery. It was converted into a convalescent home in the middle of the twentieth century and then almost entirely encased in concrete block additions in 1964. A stair tower was added in 1975. The building covers most of the large lot, with asphalt paved drives at the front and rear. It served as a convalescent home for many years, but was eventually closed. The University of Pennsylvania purchased the derelict property in 2003. It is and has been vacant for several years.

The property was individually designated on 1 November 1973. The record provides scant information on the designation. The Commission's file on the 400 S. 40th Street contains two photographs of the building dating from 1963, a decade before the designation, but no

designation photographs documenting the condition of the site at the time of designation. The 1963 photographs depict the building in its historic configuration, prior to the encasing additions. The Commission's file also includes the notice letter, dated 2 January 1974, informing the property owner of the designation. The Commission holds in its records an official designation card for the property. The property is listed in the official pre-1985 Register. The Commission meeting minute documenting the designation on 1 November 1973 states that the staff recommended its certification along with the certifications of several other sites. The other sites designated at that time, including the Fidelity Trust Building, Irvine Auditorium and Houston Hall at the University of Pennsylvania, Rodeph Shalom Synagogue, Peirce Junior College and several others, appear to be unrelated to this site. Several similar grand mid nineteenth-century houses to the west of the property in question along the south side of the 4000-block of Pine Street are also individually designated; they were all individually designated in 1965 at the request of the West Philadelphia Corporation, which had surveyed the neighborhood for historic structures and presented the Commission with a request to certify 33 of the best examples. The property in question was not designated with its neighbors in 1965, but was designated alone nearly a decade later.

The property at 400 S. 40th Street is listed on the National Register of Historic Places as part of the Hamilton Family Estate District, which also includes properties on the south side of the 4000-block of Pine Street and the north side of the 4000-block of Baltimore Avenue. The National Register District was certified in 1978, five years after the local designation of 400 S. 40th Street. Even with the unsympathetic additions, 400 S. 40th Street is classified as a Contributing resource in the National Register District. The National Register nomination suggests that this building was designed by noted architect Samuel Sloan, but that suggestion may be incorrect. It appears that the nomination confused this building with one that stood to the south along 40th Street; that building, an 1854 "Italian Cottage" for James T. Allen, was lost about 1900 and part of its land incorporated into the 400 S. 40th parcel in 1907.

The Commission's involvement with the property since its designation has been limited. A three-story stair tower was erected along the north or Pine Street elevation with a building permit in 1975, but the Commission has no record of reviewing a building permit application for the project. A sprinkler system was also added in 1975; the building permit application for that work on file at the Department of Licenses & Inspections states that the building is not historical. The Commission has no record of reviewing that building permit application either. The only application ever reviewed by the Commission for the property was approved at the staff level in 2000; it proposed altering the sprinkler system.

Section 5.5.c.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations states:

The bases for the rescinding of an entry on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places are 1) the resource has ceased to meet the criteria for listing on the Register because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed, 2) additional information shows that the resource does not meet the criteria for the Register, or 3) error in professional judgment as to whether the resource meets the criteria for listing.

The applicant contends in his rescission request that the integrity of the Italianate building was compromised to such an extent by the encasing additions erected in the 1960s, 10 years before designation, that it cannot convey its historic character or value. The applicant concludes that either:

1. the Commission was unaware of its altered condition at the time of designation and the new information herein presented demonstrates that the resource does not meet the criteria for the Register;

2. or the Commission was aware of its altered condition at designation and committed an error in professional judgment.

The applicant presents a report that argues that the property does not satisfy any of the 10 current designation criteria in the City's historic preservation ordinance. However, the rescission application does not address the fact that this property was designated under the original ordinance, which did not elaborate designation criteria, but instead authorized the Commission to designate properties "which it deems historically significant to the City." Furthermore, the rescission application and attached report do not address the fact that the current historic preservation ordinance 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. [§14-2007(2)(j), emphasis added]

The property at 400 S. 40th Street was indisputably "listed" at the time of the adoption of the current historic preservation ordinance and, therefore, must be considered designated.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Sugrue recused because his employer, the University of Pennsylvania, owns the property. Mr. Farnham presented the rescission request to the Committee. Attorney Anthony Forte, preservation consultant Robert Powers, and developer Tom Lussenhop represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff asked if the 1987 photographs included in the material distributed by the staff represents the property's current condition. Mr. Farnham stated that its condition today is very similar to that depicted in the 1987 photographs. He also noted that the applicants submitted several recent photographs of the building, which are included in the materials distributed to the Commission.

Mr. Forte introduced himself and began his presentation with the assertion that this building does not possess the requisite integrity to be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. He asserted that having a building of such low integrity on the Register is "counterproductive" and compromises the integrity of the Register itself. He reported that additions have been attached to the building, which was originally an Italianate mansion. He stated that the historic building has been lost up to a line about 14 feet above grade. Historic porches and bay windows have been removed. Windows have been converted to doors. Steel girders have been punctured through the building. He claimed that the historic building no longer exists. He asserted that it should not have been designated. He claimed that no one has contended that this building is historically significant since it was designated. It was altered in the early 1960s. It was not included in a neighborhood survey of historic buildings undertaken in 1965. The Commission may not have even known that the building had been altered when it designated it in 1973; the only photographs in the file depict it in its historic state prior to the additions and alterations. He reported that it was mistakenly believed to be a Samuel Sloan-designed building when it was added to the National Register in the late 1970s. It was not considered significant in the National Register districts. Today, based on the current standards, preservation consultant Bob Powers, the Commission's staff, and the Preservation Alliance have all stated that it does not meet the criteria for designation. He concluded that it did not meet the single designation standard in 1973 and it does not meet any of the ten designation standards today. He explained the property's history since its purchase by the University. He noted that the University stabilized it, but has not found a use for it. Developers Tom Lussenhop and David Adelman would like to develop a hotel on the site. He stated that "their intention is not to demolish the entire thing. Their intention is to try to save the historic core or the Italianate

core building, demolish the 60s additions, and build a new construction in the open area to the rear of the site.” He stated that the developers believe that the Commission’s “restrictions, they believe, are just onerous and would be too difficult for them to try to meet all of these technically. The current designation of this property protects not only the 1870s building but also the 1960s addition. So, any sort of demolition would have to deal with...” Mr. Sklaroff disagreed with Mr. Forte’s final point and stated that he believed that the Commission would approve the demolition of the 1960s additions without hesitation. Mr. Forte countered that the value of the 1960s additions had been discussed at the meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. Mr. Sklaroff again stated that he believed that the Commission would be sympathetic to the restoration of the Italianate building. Mr. Forte contended that the Commission should designate and protect historic resources of high integrity, not designate and force the restoration of sites with low integrity. He asserted that, if the property remained designated, there would be “so much oversight, so much regulation” that it would create a high level of uncertainty for any potential developer. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the Commission’s role is oversight and regulation. Mr. Forte asserted that the redevelopment of this property will be risky and the designation of the 1960s additions pushes that risk to an unacceptable level. Mr. Forte stated that the developers object to the Commission’s regulation of the new construction on the site. Mr. Sklaroff stated that it is difficult to argue that the Commission’s process itself is a hardship. Mr. Forte alleged that the building has remained vacant and decaying because potential developers refuse to undergo the Commission’s process. Mr. Forte stated that whether the historic core can be saved is uncertain. He stated that it would cost \$50,000 to make that determination. The Commission may not allow the developer to do anything with the property once he has invested a great deal of money. Mr. Farnham stated that, in an attempt to reduce the risk for the developer, he had already offered to approve the demolition of the 1960s and 1970s alterations and additions at the staff level. He noted that the Rules & Regulations grants the staff the authority to approve restorations that include the demolition of later fabric that is not significant.

Ms. Merriman asked if the manner in which this property was designated was unusual. Mr. Farnham stated that it was typical of designations prior to the arrival of former director Richard Tyler in the mid 1970s. He noted that Mr. Tyler had formalized the designation process with the institution of the nomination and other measures. He stated that the Commission rarely, if ever, recorded the justifications for its designations in the official meeting minutes prior to the mid 1970s. He explained that the designations appear as lists of addresses in the minutes. Ms. Merriman asked about the number of properties designated in the manner that this property was designated. Mr. Farnham answered that several thousand properties were designated in this manner. He stated that information on the properties proposed for designation would have been provided to the Commission members when they considered a designation at a Commission meeting, but no formal documentation justifying the designation would have been prepared prior to the institution of the nomination form in the mid 1970s. Mr. Forte agreed that the designation was typical in that no documentation justifying the designation was entered into the record, but he also noted that the other properties designated at the November 1973 Commission meeting were important landmarks, not highly altered houses. Ms. Smyler pointed out that the Commission designated 907-909 Race Street, which is not a landmark, at that same meeting.

Mr. Baron stated that the early Commission was working with a very different city, one that had deteriorated significantly. He asserted that the Commission knowingly designated many buildings that were historically significant but in need of restoration, such as this one. He stated that the Commission was part of a larger effort to improve the city; it was not simply seeking to preserve pristine historic fabric. He also noted that a great amount of the historic fabric at 400 S. 40th Street survives. The scars left from the removal of the 1960s additions may, in fact, give the Commission more flexibility when reviewing new construction around it.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance reminded the Commission of the Committee's recommendation, which should assure the applicants that the Commission will not seek to protect the 1960s and 1970s alterations and additions. He stated that the Commission should clarify that the demolition of the newer additions will not be an impediment to the development of the property. He suggested that the demolition of the non-historic pieces should be undertaken immediately to allow the historic core of the building to be better assessed. If the Commission knew the true extent of the historic building that remains, it could make an educated decision about rescission. Mr. Gallery opined that the Commission should not rescind the designation until it has clear evidence that the historic building cannot feasibly be saved.

Mr. Sklaroff asked if the hotel project would take advantage of the federal preservation tax credit program. Mr. Forte responded that that decision would depend on the amount of historic building that survives. Mr. Lussenhop stated that he would use the zoning process to forge an agreement on the development with neighborhood representatives. Mr. Farnham noted that the University City Historical Society, one of the neighborhood representatives, issued a letter adamantly opposing the rescission of the designation. Mr. Forte countered that the letter highlights the complexity of this project; it restates the false attribution to Samuel Sloan and it insists on a rigorous review of any changes to the property.

Mr. Sklaroff summarized the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Forte asked that the Commission not only declare the 1960s and 1970s alterations non-historic, but that it also limit its review of any new construction to review and comment, "in order to allow something good to happen here." Mr. Sklaroff stated that Mr. Forte's request was out of order.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and deny the rescission request, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, and amend the designation to indicate that the c. 1856 Italianate building is historically significant, but the 1960s and 1970s additions and alterations are not historically significant. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JUNE 2007

Vincent Rivera, Chair

7048 GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Owner: Hedgebank Partners, LP

Applicant: John Capoferri

History: 1836, Thomas U. Walter, architect, Greek Revival country villa

c. 1850 Italianate addition
designated 1/3/06

Project: Alterations and additions to villa and barn.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission reviewed an application for the construction of townhouses on this large site on June 2006. The Commission approved the new construction at that time and granted an approval for the restoration of the villa and barn, with the staff to review the restoration details.

The applicant returns with a revised proposal for the villa and the barn. This current application proposes a restoration with minor alterations and an addition at the villa and a rehabilitation of the barn. The applicant proposes to introduce three new openings at the northern façade of the villa. This portion of the building is the oldest and most significant owing to its association with Thomas U. Walter; however, it is not in an original condition but rather presents several layers of modifications. The proposal would retain the historic window and create three new openings to match it. At the ground floor, the applicant proposes to swap a door with a window, neither of which appear to date from the original time of construction, but might date from the Italianate remodel. The applicant also proposes to construct a new addition at the rear. This addition would take place of a derelict non-historic rear addition. The new addition would occupy the same foot-print as the rear ell and its design is respectful of the historic villa building. The south elevation would have a garden wall that has not been drawn in elevation, but it is shown in plan.

The barn building would be rehabilitated rather than restored. This structure presents extensive damage to its roof structural members and has been punctured with unsympathetic additions on two facades. The applicant proposes to demolish and reconstruct the roof with the addition of dormers. The front façade would be slightly altered with the enlargement of windows over the doors and the relocation of a doorway. The other two facades would receive new openings for windows. The application proposes to construct a townhouse addition on the west elevation of the barn. This townhouse would not be internally connected to the historic barn, but would share a wall with it.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Sklaroff amended the agenda and moved 7048 Germantown Avenue to the head of the Architectural Committee report owing to an emergency that had arisen with the applicant.

Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Developer John Capoferri and architect Larry McEwen represented the application.

Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission had approved a proposal to rehabilitate the historic house and barn and construct several townhouses on this property, with the staff to review details, in June 2006. When the developer submitted the construction drawings for approval, the staff determined that the revisions to proposals for the historic buildings exceeded its authority to approve under the rubric of details. Therefore, the staff referred the revised proposal to the Commission for its review. He noted that the overall site plan and the plans for the townhouses were already approved. This review relates to the rehabilitation details for the house and barn only.

Mr. Capoferri explained that the structural engineer and architect had made refinements to their original plans. He provided an overview of the revisions to the plans since they were last reviewed by the Commission. He commented on the addition of and relocation of windows and doors on the north facade. He discussed the addition to the rear of the building. Mr. Schaaf asked about the windows in the pediment. Mr. Capoferri explained that two are extant; the third will be added, but none are visible from the ground owing to the projecting pediment.

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1550 N. 33RD STREET, SMITH PLAYGROUND

Owner: Smith Memorial Playground

Applicant: Robert J. Hotes, AIA

History: 1899

Project: Renovate playground

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of an infant and toddler playground at Smith Memorial Playground, a non-profit children's recreation center located in Fairmount Park. This application proposes the third phase of a complete rehabilitation of the Smith facilities. The Commission reviewed and approved Phase I and II in 2004 and 2006 respectively. A similar Phase III application was submitted but then withdrawn in April 2007.

This application proposes the construction of an infant and toddler playground on the lawn at the rear of the historic playhouse in an area know as the "velodrome." The name refers to the Figure-8 tricycle path that traverses the lawn. Owing to safety restrictions, it is no longer possible to allow children to race around the Figure-8 on wheeled vehicles. Therefore, Smith would like to redevelop it as a play area for younger children in a way that would echo the Figure-8. The redevelopment would include playground safety surfaces, play equipment, seating walls, accessible pathways, site furniture, fences, gates, and landscaping. The construction of the play area would require the removal of a dilapidated picnic shelter. The shelter dates to the 1920s, would be expensive to rehabilitate, no longer fits programmatically, and poses safety hazards.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Robert Hotes represented the application.

Mr. Hotes stated that his client is in agreement with the Committee's recommendation. He explained that the plan had been revised to reflect the Committee's concerns with the view and the paving. He also noted that his client would document the 1920s pavilion prior to its removal.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approval of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

101-221 W. JOHNSON STREET

Owner: Philadelphia Preservation Group

Applicant: Mathew Koenig

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

Carriage House: c. 1900, unknown architect

Nugent Building: 1896, J. Franklin Stuckert, architect.

Project: In Concept, construct six-story apartment building

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept.

OVERVIEW: This application in-concept proposes to construct a six-story building. The Commission granted a conceptual approval in January 2006 of a proposal for this site that included the construction of three identical residential buildings. The Architectural Committee

discussed at great length that proposal, specifically the massing, design and placement of the three new buildings and the ratio of open green space versus new paved space for parking.

The applicant now proposes a modified scheme. The new proposal has eliminated the three individual buildings and proposes a single six-story building instead. The previous design paid homage to the two historic buildings by utilizing certain architectural details in their design. The current proposal presents a contemporary design that also picks up on the architecture of the historic buildings, although in much more subtle ways. However, the relationship between the new building and the site can not be assessed based on the documentation provided. The proposed site plan differs from the one previously approved in concept. The most noticeable change occurs at the central open green space. The previous proposal maintained this space undeveloped. However, the current proposal shows a defined paved entrance to the new building and parking spaces on part of this previously undeveloped green space.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Developer James Nolen and Architect Matt Koenig represented the application.

Mr. Koenig displayed his architectural plans and renderings and described his proposed building. He noted that it would stand in the approximate footprint of the three previously approved buildings. He explained that the project became more feasible economically with the consolidation of the three buildings into one. He pointed to economies of scale with the elevators and other utilities, which are no longer spread across three buildings. He stated that the new building would be contemporary in style and would not compete with the historic buildings on the site. It is set back behind the historic buildings and also recedes architecturally. He noted that it is taller than the historic buildings, but, owing to the steep drop-off in grade toward the rear of the site, it does not stand above the historic buildings. He is proposing to retain most of the large trees on the site and is seeking to maximize the green space along Johnson Street. Mr. Koenig stated that the parking ratio will be 1.2 spaces for each unit. Some of the parking will be located under the new building; surface lots will be located around the site.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization supports the proposal in general. He agreed with the architect that the new construction should be a backdrop for the historic buildings. He objected to the location of parking between Johnson Street and the new building and suggested that this area should be reserved for green space. If this parking is necessary, it should be shielded from the street with landscaping.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal in concept. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

316 S. 21ST STREET

Owner: William Hozack

Applicant: Alvin Holm, AIA

History: c. 1860, main block refaced in 1949

Project: Construct two-story rear addition, alter side façade.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Scheme D.

OVERVIEW: This is the fourth permit application submitted for this project. The applicant submitted the first in March 2006. The Historical Commission reviewed that application in April

2006 and tabled it for a period not to exceed six months to allow for a review of the inventory regarding the classification of this property. In June 2006, the Commission reviewed the inventory classification and classified the property as Contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. The applicant withdrew the permit application tabled by the Commission in April 2006 and submitted an application in July 2006, which was also subsequently withdrawn and not reviewed by the Historical Commission. The applicant returned to the Commission in November 2006 and received an approval for a two-story rear addition with garage and the addition of two new openings in the side façade with small balconies.

The applicant now proposes a revised elevation. The two-story addition and garage have not changed from the scheme previously approved by the Commission. The new application proposes changes to the side elevation of the rear ell. This is the only portion of the building that maintains its original appearance. The previous approval allowed two new openings between existing windows. The current proposal moves the new openings further east on the façade altering two of the original openings. The applicant proposes three schemes. Scheme B proposes a pedimented three-sided balcony that extends two floors. Scheme C proposes the same pedimented balcony as a small rectangular balcony, rather than three-sided. Scheme D proposes French doors that open on to the deck over the loggia and a separate balcony at the second set of French doors with balcony at the second floor. The application also proposes to construct a new brick parapet and to paint the rear ell white. The rear ell is currently painted.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Attorney Thomas Witt and architect Alvin Holm represented the application.

Mr. Witt expressed his client's support for the Plan D, which the Architectural Committee recommended for approval.

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve Scheme D. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1919 WALNUT STREET

Owner: Imaging Properties of Philadelphia, LP

Applicant: Jeffrey C. Heaton

History: c. 1870

contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Legalize front steps, sidewalk and planters

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the demolition of brownstone steps and non-historic pavement and the subsequent construction of brick steps, brick pavement and planters. The applicant received a violation, which was appealed directly to the Board of License & Inspection Review. The Board scheduled a hearing for the appeal twice. The appeal was continued both times. At its last hearing the Board advised the applicant to submit an application to the Historical Commission. On the appeal form, the applicant states that the demolished steps were brick and cement rather than brownstone and that the work was carried out as an "emergency basis" and that the owner was not aware of any historical requirements. The applicant stated at the Board of Licenses & Inspections Review hearing that the new steps were constructed within the existing foot-print and at the same height. However, the Historical Commission files contain photographs that show that the new steps are taller and extend

beyond the footprint of the previous steps. In addition, the applicant also stated that the planters on the sidewalk were an existing condition. These planters however, do not appear in any of the designation photos and furthermore the City of Philadelphia's official aerial photography records show that as of 2003 the sidewalk did not have planters. Lastly the herringbone brick paving was also installed at the same time as the steps. This paving material is not historic nor is it appropriate for a building of this style.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Attorney Christopher Stouffer represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion.

Mr. Stouffer stated that he was assigned to the case this morning, minutes before the Commission meeting. He stated that his firm had just received a letter from the property owner directing it to seek a continuance. He added that Mr. Beller, the attorney who had handled this case, was not available on such short notice.

Mr. Sklaroff reported that the owner had had several opportunities to present his case to the Commission as well as the Board of License & Inspection Review. Ms. Merriman objected to a continuance. Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the Commission act prudently and give the property owner another opportunity to present his case, even if he has not availed himself of earlier opportunities. Mr. Rivera remarked that the photographs of the illegal work speak for themselves. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Stouffer to guarantee that his client would appear at the next meeting. Mr. Stouffer responded that he had never met the client and could not guarantee his appearance.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Mr. Sugrue and Ms. Leonard withdrew their motion to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to continue the application for one month to the August 2007 Commission meeting. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 1. Mr. Brown dissented.

225 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: Rittenhouse Regency Affiliates

Applicant: James B. Garrison, AIA

History: Built in 1925, designed by Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects; major alterations in 1957, Cronheim & Weger, architects. Designated 2/8/1995, listed as contributing.

Project: Alter parapet, install glass railing

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided all of the terra cotta is retained and reused and a simple metal picket railing painted a color that recedes, not a glass railing, is installed to the inside of the brick parapet, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter an original parapet on the 18th Street façade of the former Penn Athletic Club. The parapet has ten courses of brick, a terracotta cap, and a non-historic metal railing. The applicant proposes to lower the parapet by removing five courses of

brick and to reinstall the original terracotta cap at the new height. The non-historic metal railing would be replaced by a glass railing assembly.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect James Garrison represented the application.

Mr. Garrison stated that the units facing Rittenhouse Square on this floor have the quality of a basement space owing to the relationship between the floor plane and the terrace parapet height. He noted that the floor levels had been altered during the unsympathetic renovations in 1950s. He explained that he is proposing to carefully remove the historic terra cotta coping from the parapet, remove five courses of brick, and reinstall the historic coping. He has amended his design to comply with the Committee's recommendation and is now proposing a metal picket railing instead of the glass railing previously proposed.

Mr. Sklaroff asked why the staff had recommended denial. Mr. Farnham stated the staff faced a dilemma. It contends that, by the letter of the law, this proposal does not comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards because it requires the removal of historic fabric. However, the staff also contends that the alteration will be inconspicuous. He and Mr. Danta visited the site and concluded that the slight lowering of the parapet will not be apparent from Rittenhouse Square. He also stated the Commission has already approved myriad changes to this façade because it was so radically altered in the 1950s and because the current developer is spending a great deal of money to restore its lost grandeur.

Mr. Schaaf asked if the applicant was confident that the terra cotta could be moved without damage. Mr. Garrison responded he has great confidence in the contractor, the Joseph Duggan Company, which already undertaken a large amount of masonry work at the building with efficacy and aplomb.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, provided all of the terra cotta is retained and reused and a simple metal picket railing painted a color that recedes, not a glass railing, is installed to the inside of the brick parapet, with the staff to review details. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

307-309 CHERRY STREET

Owner: Rachael Hoffman Wei

Applicant: Christina David

History: c. 1930

individually designated 12/31/84

non-contributing within Old City Historic District

Project: Add third story with roof deck

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a third-story addition to two early twentieth-century, two-story industrial buildings. The addition would extend the length of the existing structure and would be set back about four feet. In the setback would be a terrace covered by a cantilevered solar shading device that would extend flush with the façade and would be supported by a metal column. The façade of the new addition would be constructed of glass and metal frame and the

sides would be stuccoed. A green roof, deck, solar panels, and HVAC units are proposed for the roof level.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owner and architect Wesley Wei represented the application.

Mr. Wei described the proposal, stating that it involves constructing a third-floor residential addition on two two-story buildings.

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

100-102 MARKET STREET

Owner: ESK Ventures

Applicant: Jason Brinker

History: 1882 by owners George and Albert Ulrich as a cigar manufactory and store designated individually, 10/7/1976

contributing to the Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Install mechanical rooftop equipment.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the equipment is painted to recede, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of equipment on the roof of this five-story corner building. The equipment would include ductwork, an exhaust fan, and air-handling units connected to a kitchen on the first story through a mechanical shaft in the southwest corner of the building.

The staff has requested additional photographs and the installation of a mock-up to provide more information pertaining to public visibility.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Sklaroff recused owing to his firm's representation of the developer in other matters. Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Frank Rapisardo represented the application.

Mr. Schaaf asked the applicant to explain how paint would allow mechanical equipment to "recede." The applicant stated that he would paint the equipment a flat non-reflective color that would not stand out against the sky.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the equipment is painted to recede, with the staff to review details. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

226 AND 228 S. 4TH STREET

Owner: Michael Farman

Applicant: Allison Fritch

History: 226: c. 1804 by Edward Bonsall and William Shoemaker
designated individually, 04/30/1957

contributing Society Hill Historic District, 03/10/1999

228: c. 1805 by Isaac and William Paxson
designated individually in 04/30/1957

significant to the Society Hill Historic District, 03/10/1999

Project: Repair and replace doors, cornices, roof framing, and downspouts.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the specific cornice proposed for 226, but approval of a revised cornice and all other aspects of the proposal, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to repair and replace doors, cornices, roof framing, and downspouts on both buildings. The cornice and roof framing of 228 S. 4th is deteriorated and requires repair. Great care must be exercised in this repair because the cornice is an extremely rare and valuable example of hand-carved wood ornament. Owing to its great historic value, the cornice should be repaired rather than replaced wherever possible. No portion of the cornice should be removed to accommodate the downspout; the downspout should accommodate the cornice.

The front and side doors of 226 will be replaced. He proposed side door appears to replicate the extant side door. Further research should be undertaken to verify that he proposed front door, which would match the extant but non-historic door, is historically accurate.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Sklaroff recused owing to his firm's representation of the owner in other matters. Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Frank Rapisardo represented the application.

Mr. Rapisardo explained that he had attempted to design a cornice for the building at 226 that would be grand in scale like the building itself. He stated that the door to be replaced at 226 is only 20 years old; it is not historic. The staff will aid him in identifying an appropriate door and cornice for the building. Mr. Sugrue asked the applicant why he is proposing to replace the existing cornice. Mr. Rapisardo explained that it is not historic and is not appropriately scaled for the building; it is very small. Mr. Sugrue asked the architect to explain the sources for the proposed cornice. Mr. Rapisardo explained that it was based on "language" used for cornices on nearby buildings, but is not a replica of any particular historic cornice. Mr. Sugrue noted that the building in question was built about 1804 and then modified in the Italianate style in the 1840s or 1850s. He noted that the Commission has no photographic evidence of the appropriate cornice. Mr. Baron stated that he would research the matter and identify an appropriate cornice. Mr. Schaaf posited that the building has been refaced. It used to match those to the south, but was altered significantly several times.

ACTION: Mr. Brown moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the specific cornice proposed for 226, but approve a revised cornice and all other aspects of the proposal, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2030 PINE STREET

Owner: Patrick Rommel

Applicant: Patrick Rommel

History: c. 1860, designated as contributing in the Rittenhouse/Fitler District, 1995

Project: Legalize first-story shutters and third-story windows and install shutters on second and third-story windows

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the legalization of the third-floor windows; denial of the legalization of the first-floor shutters; and approval of either no shutters on the building or three-panel shutters at the first floor, three-panel louvered shutters at the second floor, and two-panel louvered shutters at the third floor, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize windows and shutters. The staff requested that the Department of Licenses & inspections issue a violation earlier this year after witnessing some work to the façade.

The non-historic windows are located at the third floor of the front façade. The applicant claims that they were likely installed in 1988, seven years prior to the designation of this building. The Commission has no information to refute this claim.

This application also proposes to legalize the two-panel shutters installed without the Commission's approval at the first-story, front windows. The two-panel shutters were installed at some point between the fall of 2003 and the spring of 2005. The building had no shutters at the time of designation, but had three-panel shutters in 1986, a decade prior to designation. The three-panel shutters are probably appropriate for the first floor of this building.

The applicant proposes to install two-panel, louvered shutters at the second and third-story windows. Again, there were no shutters on the front façade of the building at the time of designation. A pre-designation photograph shows three-panel, louvered shutters at the second story and no shutters at the third story. The three-panel louvered shutters at the second and two-panel louvered shutters at the third are probably appropriate of this building.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Commission. No one represented the application.

In response to Mr. Sklaroff's questions, Mr. Farnham clarified the terms of the recommendation for the Commission.

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the legalization of the third-floor windows; deny the legalization of the first-floor shutters; and approve either no shutters on the building or three-panel shutters at the first floor, three-panel louvered shutters at the second floor, and two-panel louvered shutters at the third floor, with the staff to review details. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

100 NEWTON STREET

Owner: Reed Shuldiner and Cynthia Frank

Applicant: John S. Andrews

History: c. 1855; designated 9/28/1971

Project: Construct two one-story additions

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the windows in the historic openings in the side wing are wood, six-over-six, true-divided-light and the windows in the proposed front addition are either six-over-six or one-over-one, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct two one-story additions on the side wing, demolish a one-story porch with a balcony, and construct an upper and lower terrace and wood deck by the pool. The pool is labeled as existing; however there is no record of it on file and it does not appear in 2004 aerial photographs. One addition is proposed for the front elevation of the wing to serve as an entrance. This addition would be sided in stucco to match the existing building and roofed with standing seam copper. The other addition is proposed for the rear elevation of the wing to serve as access for the proposed upper terrace. This addition would be a bay of fixed and operable glazed and wood paneled doors, columns, and a standing seam copper roof. Two-over-two simulated-divided-light windows are proposed throughout the side wing and the proposed front addition.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect John Andrew represented the application.

Mr. Schaaf stated that this building was constructed as a large summer cottage near the terminus of the Chestnut Hill East rail line, which was completed in 1854.

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the windows in the historic openings in the side wing are wood, six-over-six, true-divided-light and the windows in the proposed front addition are either six-over-six or one-over-one, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

240-242 CHERRY STREET

Owner: Maritime Exchange

Applicant: Jack Glass

History: c. 1875

individually designated, 12/31/1984

contributing, Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Legalize installation of one-over-one vinyl windows

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of vinyl one-over-one wood windows, which were installed without the Commission's approval. The designation photograph, taken in 2004, shows wood, true-divided-light, two-over-two windows in the openings. The staff received a complaint call regarding the illegal work and, upon visiting the site, discovered that the windows had just been installed. The contractor later conceded that he had installed the windows without the Commission's approval or a permit.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. No one represented the application.

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the legalization, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2423 PINE STREET

Owner: Kevin & Margaux Pelegrin

Applicant: Dennis Torres

History: c. 1835, designated contributing in Rittenhouse/Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Add two-story rear addition, partial demolition of rear ell and rear gable with dormer.

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to partially demolish the rear ell and rear slope of the roof with dormer. In its place the applicant proposes to construct an enlarged second-story master bedroom and an enlarged third-floor bedroom. The side yard has a small non-historic addition at the ground floor. The application proposes to rebuild that addition and extend it up to the second floor. The rear slope of the roof would be altered with an enlarged dormer with French doors that would access a deck over the new two-story rear ell.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Designer Dennis Torres and owner Margaux Pelegrin represented the application.

Mr. Baron noted that the Architectural Committee had expressed concern about the poor quality of the architectural documentation. Not only is it printed very lightly and therefore difficult to read, but it is also inaccurate. He also noted that the Committee objected to the amount of historic fabric proposed for demolition. At the Architectural Committee meeting, the applicant reported that the Commission had approved a very similar project for the adjacent building. The staff subsequently researched the earlier approval for the neighboring building. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Baron if this information about the precedent-setting approval next door changed his opinion of the project. Mr. Baron stated that it did. Mr. Sugrue asked if the rear ell or proposed addition would be visible from a public right-of-way. Mr. Baron stated that it is not and would not be visible.

Mr. Torres distributed better reproductions of his architectural drawings. He stated that he is not proposing any work to the front façade. He and Ms. Pelegrin explained that they are proposing alterations at the rear to add living space and to enlarge the dormer for access to a deck. Ms. Smyler inquired about the amount of historic fabric that would be lost. Mr. Baron stated it would include the rear wall of the main block, the rear ell, rear roof, and the rear dormer. Ms. Pelegrin corrected him, stating that rear wall of the main block and the rear roof would not be demolished. Ms. Smyler asked that the record be clear and state that there would be minimal loss of historic fabric; this application would not to set a negative precedent regarding demolition.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

418-430 SPRUCE STREET, SOCIETY HILL SYNAGOGUE

Owner: Society Hill Synagogue

Applicant: Michael Hauptman, AIA

History: Synagogue

1829-1830, First Baptist Church of Philadelphia, T.U. Walter, architect

1851, enlarged, new front façade, T.U. Walter, architect

1910, Congregation Beth Hamedrash Hagadol Nusach Ashkenaz

c. 1911, steeples demolished with conversion to synagogue

1978, exterior restored, Herbert Levy, architect

1985, south addition, James Oleg Kruhly & Associates, architects

Significant in the Society Hill Historic District

Rowhouse

c. 1775

Significant in the Society Hill Historic District

Project: In concept – Demolish rear of rowhouse, construct addition and link

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept.

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes the conversion of an eighteenth-century rowhouse at 430 Spruce Street to an administration and classroom building and its connection to the Society Hill Synagogue building to the east. The rowhouse is currently a rental residential building. A narrow alley separates the rowhouse and synagogue.

The project would require the demolition of the rear ell, piazza, and the rear wall of the main block of the rowhouse. A three-story addition would be constructed to the south and east of the remaining section of the rowhouse, infilling the alley and linking to the west façade of the synagogue.

The linking of the converted rowhouse to the synagogue would require alterations to the west façade the synagogue. The northernmost bay of the west façade, nearest Spruce Street, continues the decorative treatment of the front façade. It is granite at the tall base and scored stucco above and includes a very large window with a highly ornate window surround. The remainder of the façade is brick with large windows. The application provides only floor plans, but not elevations or sections, regarding the proposed alterations to this important façade to achieve the link. For example, will the decorative window surround be preserved within the interior of the link? At the front façade, the addition would be clad with frameless glazing.

The rear of the synagogue and rowhouse are visible from S. 5th Street, across a supermarket parking lot.

Additional information about the current conditions of and proposed alterations to the west façade of the synagogue as well as a demolition plan and a section through the link are required to fully evaluate this in-concept proposal.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. No one represented the application.

Mr. Baron distributed a letter of broad support from the Society Hill Civic Association to the members.

Mr. Baron stated that the Architectural Committee's primary concern was with the glass link that would connect the synagogue to the rowhouse. He noted that the treatment of the front façade of the synagogue returns onto the sides of the synagogue building for one bay. The northernmost bay on each side façade has the same ornate masonry and window treatments as the front facade. As designed, the passageway from the synagogue to the link would require the alteration of the ornate window on the west side. It had been suggested at the Committee meeting that one could shift the front façade of the link and the connecting opening back several feet to avoid the ornate window, leaving it outside the link. The Committee was split on this question and agreed that the design of the link in this area could be determined during the final review. Mr. Sklaroff asked that the record reflect that an approval in concept would leave open the question of the window. Mr. Schaaf noted that the position of the connection from the synagogue to the link was related to the new layout of the second floor of the rowhouse. He observed that, if the connection was moved toward the back of the building, then spaces in the rowhouse might be harder to access. Mr. Baron stated that this situation had been discussed at the Committee meeting and the Committee and architect had determined that the plans for the rowhouse could be revised to accommodate the movement of the connection.

Mr. Baron stated that the rear ell of the rowhouse has been altered several times. It was last altered to allow for the construction of a parking lot for the supermarket on 5th Street. Maps show that it was lengthened and shortened during the twentieth century.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application in concept. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

227 MONTROSE STREET

Owner: Susan Erickson

Applicant: Joseph Serratore

History: c. 1825, designated 5/31/1966

Project: Construct third-floor roof deck and dormer door access

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a third-floor roof deck at the rear, supported by columns extending from the first-floor rear ell. To access the deck, a dormer with a door is proposed. It would require cutting into the existing gable roof.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owner Susan Erickson represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10. Ms. Evans seconded the motion.

Ms. Erickson explained that her newly-renovated, second-floor bathroom would prevent access to the second-floor deck that the Architectural Committee had suggested. Ms. Erickson's architect designed a deck that would be accessed from the third floor, but would rest on columns standing on the roof of the first-floor, rear addition. This design would also allow for more privacy for both the property owner and her neighbor, whose decks would be adjacent if the applicant's was erected at the second floor. Ms. Erickson noted that the rear of her house is

not visible from the street. At most, some of the side railing may be visible from the street. The proposed dormer would not be visible from the street. When asked about the size of her rear yard, Ms. Erickson stated that it was smaller than the Commission's conference table. She then explained that, at the request of the Architectural Committee, her architect had lowered the proposed deck by two feet. The applicant stated that she had maintained the front façade of her house in its historic condition; the rear is already altered. She noted that she appreciates the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Schaaf suggested a shed dormer rather than the proposed pedimented dormer. He also opined that the columns looked too spindly. He felt that more robust columns would be more appropriate. Ms. Erickson was agreeable to his suggestions. Mr. Rivera cautioned the applicant on the design of the deck and suggested that she employ a structural engineer.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Mr. Sugrue and Ms. Evans withdrew their motion to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to approve the revised design with the deck lowered two feet, provided the dormer to the deck is a shed, not pedimented, dormer and the columns supporting the deck are more robust in appearance, with the staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 10:44 a.m., Ms. Leonard moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 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.