

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
29 April 2003**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Herbert Levy, FAIA
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jeffrey R. Barr, Historic Research Technician
Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

Patricia Dowden, 524 Delancey Street
Philip Scott, Kise Straw & Kolodner
Stephen Wu, Kise Straw & Kolodner
Cam Lacy
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents Association and Preservation Alliance
Vito Chimenti, Peirce College
Heather Ascher, 2137 St. James Place
Michael Ascher, 2137 St. James Place
Nikki Marx, 2134 St. James Place
Elsie Faulconer, 2141 St. James Place
Andrew J. Know, 1420 Locust Street
David Urffer, J.K. Roller Architects
David Schmidt, J.K. Roller Architects
Jules Zacher
Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects
Charles King, The Offices of Charles King
Nicole Pellegrini, The Offices of Charles King
Mark Gallini, 311 S. Chadwick Street
Andrea Hemmann, 311 S. Chadwick Street
Robin Kohles
Francis Gallagher, 1801 Porter Street
Joe Serratorre, DSA Architects
Ivano D'Angella, DSA Architects
Penelope Benth, 1601 Locust Street
Edward Robinson, 516 Queen Street
Timothy J. Woolford, 516 Queen Street
Sandra Horrocks, Free Library of Philadelphia
William J. Fleming, Free Library of Philadelphia
Jeffrey G. Carson, City Sign
Charles Datner
Doug Seiler
Roberto Pupo
Leonard J. Ciccotello
Penelope H. Batcheler, 314 S. American Street

Anthony Bracali, AB ARCH
Aris K.
William Alesker, A&D Architects
Joe Campbell, Royal Bank
Robert Tabaj, Royal Bank
Jeff Bossert, BVI Architectural Group
J. Fink
Angela Vendetti
William Jelen
Dianne Chambless, 929 Clinton Street
Alan Goldstein, 929 Clinton Street
Alex Rice, Gardiner Fox

Vincent Rivera, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

524 Delancey Street

Patricia Dowden, Owner
Stephen Wu, Architect/Applicant
DATE: c. 1805
PROPOSAL: Reconstruct 3rd floor

The applicant seeks to reconstruct the third floor of this row house, which was lost at some point in the past. The continuity of brickwork makes it clear that this house was built with 526 Delancey Street, its neighbor to the west, which retains its upper floors.

Staff recommendation: Approval with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. In particular the cornice and dormer details are inaccurate and need revision.

The owner, Patricia Dowden, and the architects, Stephen Wu and Phillip Scott, attended the meeting. Mr. Wu explained that he would work with the staff on the cornice and dormer details. Committee members also spoke to the architects regarding details for the downspout.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and where possible materials.]

128 South 18th Street

William Munz, Owner
Perri Milou, Applicant
DATE: c.1835; storefront, early to mid-20th century
PROPOSAL: Storefront alterations

The application proposes removing the extant Colonial Revival storefront and adding a new aluminum storefront. In addition, the applicant wishes to install a back-lit box sign.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 4.

Perri Milou, the tenant for the space, explained that he is an artist and intends to run a gallery from this space. He would like a larger window for display. He could not understand any desire to save the storefront as he understood the Commission had approved a proposal for the

demolition of the buildings. His architect, Cameron Lacy III, said that there was evidence that parts of the storefront had been altered and that the marble surround and transom appeared to be of a different vintage than the wood storefront. They also showed photographs of other modern storefronts on the street.

Mr. Baron explained that those storefronts predated designation and that the demolition of these buildings was part of a package that included the preservation of much of the Rittenhouse Club. Lenore Millhollen pointed out that even in that development, the facades of these buildings were to be preserved.

The Committee members were mixed in their response to the proposal although none of them thought the new design appropriate. Several stressed that further research should be done on the existing storefront regarding its date. All thought that if a new storefront were built, that it should relate better to the existing marble framework and transom. A design was discussed that removed panels above the existing central bay but retained most of the fabric. There were questions regarding the sign and all agreed that more detailed drawings were needed to even assess the sign. The applicant was encouraged to withdraw the current application and reapply with historical information and a more appropriate and detailed design.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant 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.]; and Standard 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.].

1420 Pine Street

Peirce College, Owner

Vito Cimenti, Applicant

DATE: 1897, George C. Mason, Jr., architect

PROPOSAL: Security camera

The proposal involves installing a security camera in a plastic dome to police the area in front of the home of the college president, which stands directly across Waverly Street.

Staff recommendation: Approval if it is painted brick red, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Cimenti from Peirce College explained the need for the camera. Committee members asked if it could be shifted slightly so that the electrical conduit could fit into the joint of the brick rustication and thereby have less visibility. He agreed that this placement and painting the conduit and housing brick red could be accomplished.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval subject to the new placement and painting the installation brick red, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

2201 Spruce Street

Andrew Krouk, Owner

David Schmidt, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1835, storefront c. 1900

PROPOSAL: Façade renovations, HVAC, vents

The applicant seeks to restore the storefront and stucco walls, block up a door in a brick and stucco portion of the building, and add roof vents, a skylight and HVAC equipment.

Staff recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

The applicant, Mr. Krouk appeared accompanied by his architects David Schmidt and David Urfer. Committee members viewed evidence of the former storefront. The architect explained that a door would be added on the north elevation of the building as well. Committee members addressed the brick panels below the storefront windows and the pier between windows on the west wall and thought they should have wood panels.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval with the addition of wood panels below and between the storefront windows, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and where possible materials].

2127 St. James Street

Marion Rogel, Owner

Bernard Nearey, Applicant

DATE: 1923, Spencer Roberts, architect

PROPOSAL: Legalize lattice, pergola and planter

The proposal involves the legalization of several garden structures including a pergola, lattice, and planter that encroach onto the walkway in the front of this house in the English Village.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Marion Rogel and her counsel, Bernard Nearey, attended the meeting. Mr. Nearey explained that the courtyard of English Village is private and owned in common by all of the homeowners including Ms. Rogel. He stated that the development does not have any mechanism of deed restrictions or enforcement of rules for the common area and that the neighbors were trying to use the historic designation inappropriately to resolve intramural disputes. He contended that the area is posted as private property and has minimal visibility for the public from 22nd and Van Pelt Streets. He thought that the Commission would not scrutinize alterations in a private area such as this. He showed photographs of the view from the public streets showing extensive plantings as well as photographs of Ms. Rogel's plantings in bloom. Mr. Nearey thought that the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* did not restrict this type of construction and planting. He also asserted that the wood planter should not be of concern because it does not attach to the historic building. He offered for the wood to be stained and cut back a foot and a half.

Mr. Tyler explained that although the street is privately owned, it is commonly used as a thoroughfare by the public as it is not closed at either end. In addition, he pointed out that the Commission has reviewed work on this block for many residents before and has similarly reviewed work in the University of Pennsylvania Quadrangle and other similar settings. He said that the Commission also considers homeowners facing an area such as this to be a part of the

public with rights to design review protections. He explained that the Commission staff requested that Licenses and Inspections write a violation for the work.

Jules Zacker acted as counsel for Heather Asher, another resident of English Village, and unofficial spokesperson for the block. In response to his questions, she explained that the street, though posted as private, is commonly used by the public. When Ms. Rogel constructed the planter box encroaching into the bluestone street of the Village, many residents voiced concerns and she sent Ms. Rogel a letter. The letter asked her to pull the planter back to its original dimension. Ms. Asher showed how other people have kept their plantings within certain bounds. She showed an original plan showing how the bluestone paving extended right to the edge of the houses. She also asked Mr. Tyler to speak to owners in the Village to explain the nature of the Commission's concerns and review. Other residents of the Village including Michael Shaffer, Elsi Faulkner, and Nicki Marks, came to express their desire to see the Commission exercise its review and have the additions removed and the house and street returned to its condition prior to the alterations

A petition to this effect signed by Village residents was also submitted at this time. Concerns were also raised regarding the protection of the walkway as an historic street and part of the Commission's thematic street paving district.

Herb Levy raised the issue of the planting box restricting access to fire trucks and safety vehicles. All the Committee members thought the amount of lattice work covered too much of the historic building and found the pergola at odds with the design of the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the lattice by a vote of 3 to 1 and unanimously voted to recommend denial of the pergola and planting box. They recommended approval of a planting area with a bluestone curb built out to the extent shown in the designation photograph of 3 May 1995, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

4700 States Drive, Ohio House

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Arlene Matzkin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: built to represent State of Ohio at 1876 Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition

PROPOSAL: Fence, lighting

The proposal involves adding parking, fencing, and gates around the building as well as lighting for the parking and for the house itself.

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

Ms. Matzkin explained that, for reasons of cost, the fence will most likely be built without the stone piers.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy

historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the property and its environment would be unimpaired.]

1223 Pine Street

Katie Recker, Owner

Arlene Matzkin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: Reinstall historic door and steps

This application proposes restoring an historic door, doorway, and steps that were removed and infilled without a permit at some point in the 1990s. A violation for the unapproved infill was issued in February 1997. In April 1997, the Commission denied an application by a previous owner to legalize the infill. In December 1997, the Commission denied an application by the current owner to legalize the infill. At that time, the Commission did approve the installation of a false door at the infill. This work was never undertaken. At different times during the discussions of this infill, the original door has been reported to be behind the brick and in the basement.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of reopening the doorway, restoring the door with transom, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. Denial of the installation of the brick steps, pursuant to Standard 6. Marble steps matching those on the front façade should be installed. If marble is not practicable, cast stone steps simulating marble may be installed.

Mr. Farnham described the history of the property and presented the proposal. Arlene Matzkin, architect for the project, explained that she is searching for slabs of marble to restore the steps. Committee members offered possible sources. The Committee agreed that if a marble replacement cannot be found, a cast stone substitute would be acceptable.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with either marble or cast stone steps, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated 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.]

1719-21 Walnut Street

Two Nuts, L.P., Owner

Charles King, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1719: 2003; 1721: c. 1900

PROPOSAL: New door on 1719, new awnings on 1719 and 1721

This application proposes a new double-leaf door at 1719 Walnut and signage and awnings at 1719 and 1721. In February 2002, the Commission approved substantial demolition and new construction at these two properties. The building at 1721 dates to c. 1900; the building at 1719 is entirely new construction, but echoes the historic façade that once stood in its place.

At 1719, a glazed double-leaf Neo-Colonial door would be installed in place of the fully glazed double leaf door approved by the Commission when it reviewed the new facade. Awnings would be installed over the 1st-story door at 1719 and over all 2nd and 3rd-story windows on the front facades of 1719 and 1721. The awnings would be steeply pitched and would include neither

cheeks nor aprons. They would be mounted directly into the historic limestone façade at 1719. Signage would consist of a plaque beside the door at 1719, a vinyl transom sign above the door at 1719, a decal on the 1721 storefront window, and etched film on the 1721 storefront transom. Additionally, the Talbots logo would appear on the two window awnings and the doorway awning as well as hanging signs on the doorway awning frame.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the signage, pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of the awnings, pursuant to Standards 6 and 10. The awnings should approximate historic awnings. They should be less steeply pitched and include cheeks and aprons. They should not be mounted onto the historic stone façade at 1721, but should connect to the wood window frames. Mounting the awnings into the façade would ultimately lead to the deterioration of the stone. Denial of the door, pursuant to Restoration Standard 7. The door already approved by the Commission is compatible with the remainder of the storefront; the pseudo-historic Neo-Colonial door is not.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Chick King and Nicole Pellegrini, architects for the proposal, explained that the Art Commission prefers awnings without sides or cheeks. Mr. King said that almost all of the 900 Talbots stores around the country have the trademark red, neo-Colonial doors. He stated that he was hesitant to attach the awnings to the window frames because the frames may not be structurally sound. Also, if they mount the awnings in the windows in the new construction, the window manufacturer may not guarantee the windows. Committee members noted that since the building has not been constructed yet, the owner can easily install tabs or hooks to support the awnings. They also noted that repairing the historic wood windows would be easier than repairing the historic stone, should the awnings be removed in the future.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the door; signage, provided that the plaque is anchor-mounted; and the awnings with open sides, provided that they are not mounted to the stone façades, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property].

311 South Chadwick Street

Mark Gallini and Andrea Hemmann, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1845; addition by architect Frank Weise, 1991

PROPOSAL: Expand rooftop addition and deck – in concept

This application for approval in concept proposes extending an addition on the roof of a carriage house at 311 S. Chadwick Street. The Commission approved the original addition in April 1991. Owing to a parking lot running along Pine Street from Chadwick to S. 17th Streets, the carriage house and any rooftop additions are highly visible from the south and west. During the review of the application for the original addition, the Committee and Commission discussed the visibility of the addition, which they sought to reduce, and compromised with the applicant. The addition currently proposed would be much more visible than the original addition.

The current proposal is based upon the Committee's review of a similar proposal at its February 2003 meeting. At that meeting, the Committee recommended approval in concept of the proposed addition provided that its west façade was redesigned to be less conspicuous and that the deck and a more transparent railing were set back to the plane of the west façade of the proposed addition. Satisfying the Committee's first request, the new design of the west façade is less conspicuous. The applicant has not met the Committee's second request. The railing has not been set back to the line of the west façade of the addition. In the new design, the railing stands between the addition's west façade and the main façade of the carriage house. The applicant

withdrew the application prior to the Commission's March 2003 meeting.

Staff Recommendation: The Architectural Committee recommended approval of this project at its February 2003 meeting provided that (1) the new addition's west façade was redesigned to be less conspicuous and (2) that the deck and railing were set back to the plane of the west façade of the addition. The new application satisfies provision 1, but not provision 2. Despite the Architectural Committee's first recommendation, the staff again recommends denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs guideline. The staff contends that any addition to the existing rooftop would be highly visible and therefore detrimental to the structure and the district. The Commission already compromised on visibility when it approved the original rooftop addition; approval of this application would annul the Commission's original compromise.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal and noted that the proposed railing does not meet the Committee's previous recommendation. Mark Gallini and Andrea Hemmann, owners of the property, opined that the new railing would not be visible from across the street, as shown in a sight-line study. Mr. Farnham noted that the parking lot at the northwest corner of Chadwick and Pine Streets would allow visibility of the addition and deck from Pine Street. Ms. Hemmann countered that visibility from the lot is not a natural sight line because a building may be erected in that location in the future. Mr. Gallini said the proposed metal railing appears more transparent than the existing and, with the proposed setback, would fall into the shadow-line of the addition's roof. Committee members noted that the railing design should be adjusted to meet the Building Code.

The Architectural Committee recommended final approval as proposed.

2433 Pine Street

Robin Kohles and Sam Garst, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Demolish 2-story rear addition, add new 2nd floor bay with deck

This application proposes demolishing a rear 2-story stucco projection and adding a patio, 2nd-story bay window, and 3rd-story deck. It is very likely that the existing rear projection to be demolished consists of an original 2nd-story bay with a 1st-story infill addition.

The application proposes several additions and alterations. At the 1st-story level where the projection would be removed, a tripartite aluminum-clad window and an aluminum-clad single-leaf door with transom and concrete steps would be installed. The new bay at the 2nd story would be clad with painted wood or metal and fenestrated with aluminum-clad windows. The deck atop the new bay would include a painted steel railing. The portions of the rear façade revealed by the demolition would be covered in stucco. At the rear, a wood and CMU wall would be demolished and a new wood fence with a gate along with brick patio paving would be added.

At its March 1998 meeting, the Commission approved a similar proposal to demolish the 1st-story of the rear addition, leaving only the 2nd-story portion as a projecting bay. At that time, the Commission also approved the demolition of the wall and the construction of the wood fence. Although approved, the work was not undertaken.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and Restoration Standard 7.

Mr. Farnham described the application. Robin Kohles, owner of the property, said that she based the bay's design on others found in the neighborhood. Existing beams, located 2'-0" on center, would support the new bay; however, although the original bay extended 4'-6", the proposed bay

would only project 3'-0". The bay will have metal sheathing. Committee members discussed the proposed aluminum-clad windows and questioned whether they should be wood instead. They ultimately recommended approval of the aluminum-clad windows because the bay and first floor windows are new construction.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval as proposed, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and Restoration Standard 7 [Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence].

1801 Porter Street

Francis Gallagher, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1907, James and John Windrim, architects

PROPOSAL: Demolish fence for parking pad

The owner wishes to remove the metal hairpin fence on the side elevation and install a parking pad.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the site guideline. The front and side gardens represent a significant aspect of the Girard Estate development and should be preserved.

Francis Gallagher, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Farnham described the proposal. Mr. Gallagher said that the property previously had a garage, but it was demolished years ago. He said that the sidewalk has no curb cut, but the Streets Department has approved one for the location. Two older maps show a building at the location of the parking pad, but Committee members thought the building could have been a shed rather than a garage. Ms. Spina noted that a major aspect of Girard Estate's significance is the front and side gardens. Committee members discussed the precedent of having parking in a side garden

The Architectural Committee voted three to one to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and the site guideline [Not recommended: placing parking facilities directly adjacent to historic buildings which result in damage to historic landscape features.]. Mr. Rivera dissented.

1516 Pine Street

Joseph Ciminera, Jr., Owner

Joe Serratore, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1849, Thomas U. Walter, architect

PROPOSAL: Roof deck with skylight, stairtower extension, rear alterations

This application for final approval proposes several alterations to the brownstone house at 1516 Pine Street. The vast majority of the alterations were given conceptual approval at the Commission's January 2003 meeting. Those alterations include the stair tower, decks, skylights, balconies, carport with deck and bridge, and covered walkway with vestibule. The only aspect of this application not given conceptual approval is a HVAC platform with screening wall on the roof of the rear ell (see sheet A-3).

Staff Recommendation: This application satisfies the requirements set forth in the Commission's conceptual approval.

Mr. Farnham said that the only new aspect of the proposal was an HVAC platform on the roof of the rear ell. The platform will have screening to hide the units. Committee members thought the railing should be metal rather than wood to match the railing on the roof deck. Architects Joe Serratore and Ivano D'Angella showed a sample of the Kalwall material to be used for the stair tower and roof of the walkway. Committee members inquired about the plans for the decorative bargeboard and window hood at the rear of the rear ell. The architects answered that the bargeboard would be repaired or replaced in kind, but that the window hood would be removed. Committee members contended that all of the building's original decorative features including the bargeboard and window hood must be retained.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend final approval of the entire project, with a metal railing on the HVAC platform.

226 South 16th Street aka 1601 Locust Street, University Club

Allan Domb, Owner

Gordon Fluke, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1929, Grant Simon, architect

PROPOSAL: Cut new windows and door in penthouse

Several applications related to the conversion from offices to residences of the high-rise building, now called the Lanesborough, at 16th and Locust Streets have already been reviewed by the Commission. This application for further alterations to the penthouse level proposes cutting a 1'-2" x 2'-2" hole for a future vent in the west façade at the 19th story and covering it with a painted metal panel (sheet A3.1A); changing one 18-light fixed window to a 6/6 double hung-window with 6-light transom on each of three facades, the north, east, and west, at the 20th story (sheets A3.1A, 3A, and 4A); and altering four windows and related modillions, one on each façade, at the 21st story. On the south façade of the 21st story, a 3-light window and three stone modillions in a row of five would be removed, the opening enlarged, and a French terrace-access door installed (sheet A3.2A). On the north, east, and west façades of the 21st story, 3-light windows and three stone modillions in rows of five would be removed, the openings enlarged, and 6/6 double-hung windows installed (sheets A3.1A, 3A, and 4A).

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the 20th-story window changes, provided the new windows meet the requirements set forth by the Commission for the other new windows in the building. Denial of the vent, pursuant to Standard 10. Denial of the 21st-story windows and doors, pursuant to Standards 5 and 10.

Penelope Benith, architect, attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Discussing the changes at the 21st floor, Ms. Benith explained that the enlargement of the 3-light windows and removal of the modillions would allow the space to be used as a bedroom. All of the Committee members felt that the modillions above the top-floor windows should be retained on the east, west, and north. The Committee and applicant discussed alternatives that retained the modillions including smaller, yet still enlarged window openings along with skylights to increase the light entering the space. They then discussed the new door opening at the 21st floor. The applicant contended that, with the previously approved rooftop addition, the proposed alteration to the south-facing window for a new door would not be seen from the street. Mr. Rivera wondered if the modillions could be moved or reconfigured to allow for full door height on the south façade. The Committee concluded that the new door opening was acceptable. Mr. Rivera observed that numerous proposals for this conversion project have appeared before the Commission and that the Commission has made many concessions; he asked how many more concessions would be requested and why the rooftop terrace access was not planned when the penthouse addition was reviewed and approved. Committee members agreed that the Commission had been asked to concede more with every new application and wondered when the requests for concessions would end. Turning to the vent, the Committee asked why the proposed vent could not be relocated to a roof. Ms. Benith admitted that the wall location was the easy, efficient design solution. The Committee asked the applicant to re-study the vent question to find an invisible alternative.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the 20th-story window alterations as proposed. For the 21st-story alterations, they voted to recommend approval of the new door opening on the south façade as proposed, but denial of the window enlargement and modillion removal on the east, west and north façade, pursuant to Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.]. The Committee voted to recommend denial of the vent, as proposed for the 19th story, west façade, pursuant to Standard 10.

1901 Vine Street, Free Library of Philadelphia, Main Branch

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Sandra Horrocks, Applicant

DATE: 1912-1927, Horace Trumbauer, architect

PROPOSAL: Signage

This application proposes two large signs at the central branch of the Free Library of Philadelphia, which looks onto Logan Circle and the Benjamin Franklin Parkway. One sign, labeled Sign A, would stand at the corner of 20th and Vine Streets. The proposed location for the second sign, labeled Sign B, is unclear. A photomontage included in the application positions it near the southeast corner of the building. A plot plan included in the application contradicts the photomontage and positions it to the east of the main entrance on Vine Street. The signs consist of aluminum plate cladding on aluminum frames. Each sign roughly resembles the front façade of a Greek temple, includes quoins and a pediment, and is painted gray with a brown base. The Free Library's logo appears in internally-illuminated Lexan plastic at the top of each sign. A 4-line, 13-character per line LED message center will mount in the center section of each sign. The library's web address will appear on the base of each sign in white vinyl letters. Sign A will be 16'-6" tall and 9'-8" wide. Sign B will be 11'-9" tall and 6'-4" wide. Wiring will run between the two signs and the building. The rudimentary wiring diagram included in the application lacks

details; any wiring should enter and exit the building below grade in existing conduits.

The staff contends that these signs would be incompatible with the library building and would be intrusions onto Logan Circle and the Benjamin Franklin Parkway, a significant setting that has been assiduously safeguarded for more than seven decades. They are inappropriate in size, form, materials, and lighting. They are far too large; they would obscure the library building as well as the under-appreciated flagpoles by artist John Donnelly, who executed all the sculpture on the building. One of the most important architectural sculptors working in the early twentieth century, Donnelly was responsible for numerous important commissions that grace governmental and institutional buildings throughout the country. He not only produced the famous sculptural group *Transportation*, which adorns the clock on the 42nd Street facade of the Manhattan's Grand Central Station, but also executed similar flagpoles as well as ornate doors for the Supreme Court building in Washington, DC. The signs' pseudo-historical forms mock the grand Beaux-Arts library building designed by noted designer Horace Trumbauer and his assistant Julian Abele, one of the country's first African American architects. The plastic and aluminum of the signs are incompatible with the limestone and granite of the building and surrounding wall. The internally-illuminated signs with LED banks would mark an unparalleled infringement on the Parkway and set a dangerous precedent for a stately boulevard that is not now marred by electronic signs.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Sandra Horrocks and William Fleming from the Free Library along with Jeffrey Carson from the City Sign Company attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Opening the discussion, Mr. Fleming stated that the building was not historic and therefore not under the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission. Mr. Farnham countered that it was listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places and under the Commission's jurisdiction; Mr. Baron retrieved a copy of the register and Mr. Fleming its listing with date of designation. Ms. Horrocks explained that the small existing sign at the front steps is not adequate and that the Free Library desires increased visibility for their programs and events. The Committee members all agreed that the concept of increased signage was acceptable, but that the signs proposed were not. They asserted that the signage should not mimic or compete with the architecture of the building. Although Mr. Levy thought the concept of a changeable sign was acceptable, he objected to the size of the proposed signs as well as the aluminum and plastic materials. Mr. Levy suggested reducing the overall size of the signs. The Committee members all agreed that the style, scale, and finish of the proposed signs were inappropriate to the important building and setting. Mr. Carson asked for suggestions or guidance to improve the design. Mr. McCoubrey suggested a smaller, simpler sign with neutral colors for the frame and base that would appear less intrusive. He also observed that the flagpoles and other site features are important. Mr. Fleming acknowledged that the western flagpole could be retained if the sign was moved inboard and reduced in size. The applicants stated that they would withdraw the application and re-submit a revised design that incorporated the Committee suggestions.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the signs as proposed, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment].

516 Queen Street

Timothy Woolford, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1810; addition c. 1890

PROPOSAL: New roof deck, façade alterations

The proposal involves adding shutters, a cellar bulkhead and a cellar window grate and a roof deck to this three- story row house. The roof deck will sit largely on the front portion of the roof although a rear ell exists. The deck will have high visibility from the sides because the neighboring houses have only two stories. The roof deck would be acceptable if pushed back to the area of the rear ell.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the shutters and cellar bulkhead and cellar window grate with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. Denial of the roof deck in its proposed location, per Standard 9.

Tim Woolford, owner, and Edward Robinson, architect, attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Mr. Woolford stated that they have attempted to reduce the visibility of the deck by pulling it back 10 feet from the front. He added that there are existing HVAC condensers on the rear ell and they wanted the deck located as far forward as possible to enjoy a better view of the skyline. Mr. Baron observed that the Commission generally approves roof decks on rear ells, but not on the main buildings. Mr. Levy suggested relocating the condensers to allow more potential space for the deck at the rear. Mr. Robinson added that to further minimize visibility he proposes a 36 inch railing rather than the 42 inches required by the Building Code. The applicants expressed a willingness to modify the design per the Committee's suggestions.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the shutters, cellar bulkhead and cellar window grate with staff to review details. The Committee voted to recommend approval of a roof deck, no wider than the rear ell, set back in line with the rear of the roof access bulkhead with staff to review details and an HVAC condenser location mock-up.

Bladen's Court aka 117-19R Elfreth's Alley aka 138-40 N. Front Street

Charles Datner, Architect/Applicant

PROPOSAL: Addition to north wall

The proposal involves the construction of a new building, which will attach to the existing north wall of Bladen's Court. The applicant proposes to remove some brick in the existing wall at the second floor level that remains from a former building on the site. In addition, the architect proposes to remove some stucco in-fill in the same wall and re-stucco those openings but with recessed stucco.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 10.

Charles Datner, architect, and Darren Ouellette attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Baron presented the project. Mr. Ouellette stated that they have met with and have incorporated the concerns of the Elfreth's Alley residents into the design as proposed. The Committee discussed the context and significance of Bladen's Court. Ms. Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey had concerns about the effect of a 42-foot, blank stucco wall on the Court. The Committee discussed methods to mitigate the effect of the new wall including the incorporation of windows and/or facing the wall with brick. Mr. Ouellette responded that he would prefer to have windows but the neighbors were opposed. Mr. Datner stressed that the design retains and repairs the existing historic brick wall and the new construction is set back behind it. The

Committee observed that the brick wall and corbelled brickwork was likely a fragment of the façade of an early house that faced the Court. Committee members suggested relieving the new wall with windows and detailing or somehow recognizing the historic cornice line. The Committee also suggested facing the new wall in brick on top of the existing brick wall to the height of the historic cornice line and setting back the new stucco wall above.

The Committee voted to recommend denial of the wall as proposed.

241-43 Chestnut Street

Carol Caton, Owner

Doug Seiler, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 241: c. 1857, Stephen Button, architect; 243: c. 1897, Wilson Eyre, architect

PROPOSAL: Additions, façade alterations

This application proposes several alterations and additions to two buildings at 241 and 243 Chestnut Street. They include a 6-story rear addition at 241 Chestnut; the conversion of four front-façade windows into fire escape doors and extension of the 3rd to 6th-story fire escape balconies from 239 Chestnut to 241; a 2-story addition at the rear of 243 along S. 3rd Street; and a basement accessway with railing at 243 along S. 3rd Street. A similar proposal for these properties was reviewed by the Commission in April 2003. The Commission approved in concept the rear additions and basement access, but denied the window conversion and fire escape extension as well as a dormer on 243, which is not included in this application.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the 6-story rear addition at 241 Chestnut and the basement accessway with railing at 243, pursuant to the Commission's conceptual approval and Standard 9. Denial of the conversion of four front-façade windows into fire escape doors and extension of the 3rd to 6th-story fire escape balconies from 239 Chestnut to 241, pursuant to the Commission's earlier denial and Standard 9. The staff opinion on the 2-story addition at the rear of 243 was mixed. All staff members recommend denial of the proposed canopy extending out from the south doorway. It would obscure the quoins on 243, which the Commission has stated it will protect. Some staff members recommend approval of the submitted design without the canopy. Others recommend approval, provided the glass façade panels are given a vertical orientation. Others contend that the design is inappropriate for the context.

Doug Seiler, architect, and William Caton, owner, attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Farnham presented the project. Mr. Seiler stated that the fire escape expansions are critical to the success of the project. He explained that the interior plan could not accommodate the modification of the existing elevator shaft for an accessible lift as well as an additional interior stair to satisfy egress requirements. For the rear addition, Mr. Seiler stated that the restaurant tenant envisioned the addition as a glass jewel box. He contended that the design neither copies the Wilson Eyre building at 243 nor looks historical, but intentionally contrasts with the historic building. The Committee discussed the design of the addition. Mr. Baron stated that the proposed design does not conform to the criteria for additions in the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*. Mr. Levy stated that the addition should be "set apart" and not attempt to match Eyre's design. Mr. Seiler noted that the Commission had asked that the design express more verticality and they were willing to modify the proportions of the glazing. Mr. McCoubrey suggested simply eliminating every other horizontal muntin, leaving larger units of glazing with vertical orientations. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the door location was awkward and the door and canopy compromised the effect of the "niche" to set the addition apart. Committee members also thought that the canopy compromised the quoins on the historic building. Mr. Seiler agreed and thought that the canopy could be deleted, the door could be shifted to the left or north, and the black metal grating material in the niche extended down to the sidewalk. He also stated that the metal

picket and glass railing at the roof terrace could be set back from the glass wall to the plane of the niche, and the roofline of the addition could be emphasized and aligned with the beltcourse of the Wilson Eyre building. The applicants stated that they would withdraw the portion of the application related to the glass addition at the rear of 243 and re-submit a revised design in the future that incorporated the Committee suggestions.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the fire escape expansions and 6-story rear addition at 241 Chestnut as well as the basement access at 243, with staff to review details. The Committee voted to recommend denial of the addition at the rear of 243 as proposed, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

35 South Strawberry Street

Roberto Pupo, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1910

PROPOSAL: Storefront alterations

This application calls for infill at the storefront for security reasons. Presently, the two doors appear in a recess and the single-paned storefront window stands at the building line. The proposal calls for leaving the transom area recessed, but installing a new wall at the building line, creating a vestibule. The new wall will have a single-leaf door and multi-light transom and sidelight. The storefront window will be changed to a one-over-one double-hung window. When the Commission approved the storefront, the owner was to ensure that both doors had half-glazing with panels below.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. The owner should change the 6-panel door to a half-glazed panel door as required by the previous approval.

Roberto Pupo, the owner, attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina presented the application. Mr. Pupo showed an image of the proposed door and sidelight. He explained that the recessed entrance collects trash and other undesirable activities late at night and asked for any suggestions or guidance. Ms. Spina suggested increased lighting with a motion detector. Mr. Pupo responded that a light with motion detector exists. The Committee discussed the evolution of the storefront. Mr. McCoubrey stated that although the storefront fabric was not historic the recess should not be enclosed as proposed. The Committee and applicant discussed a swinging metal gate as an alternative. The applicant stated he would revise the design and incorporate the Committee's suggestion for a swinging metal gate.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.] and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.].

149 South Hancock Street

Front Street Development Associates, Owner

Joseph Pacitti, Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Complete demolition, construction of 11-story building

The developer for the northern parcel of the land between Front and Hancock Streets wishes to demolish the last remaining historic building and erect an 11-story building with a penthouse. The application is based on financial hardship.

The new construction occupies the entire lot at the first four floors and has a set back at the south façade on the upper floors and a small penthouse. Commercial space is proposed for the first floor along Front and Sansom Streets, parking on floors two through four, and office space on floors five through eleven. The loading/service area will be located on Hancock Street. However, the ground occupied by the historic Bouvier building, which will be demolished, will simply be open space leading to the loading dock.

The plans do not include details, such as materials or window types.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9 and 10. Given that the owner has submitted a financial hardship application, the Financial Hardship Committee should review the proposal.

Ms. Spina presented the project. All three Committee members at the meeting immediately noted their opposition to the demolition of the historic Bouvier building. Ms. Pentz stated that the Commission has very specific criteria for demolition and that it is in the public interest that this building be preserved. Leonard Ciccotello, the architect representing the application, enumerated the history of the site and the many attempts to redevelop it. Mr. Levy introduced the letter received earlier in the day from the National Park Service, which detailed the Park Service's opposition to the application. Penny Bachelor, a resident of the neighborhood, noted her opposition to the project. Committee members questioned the financial hardship portion of the application given that the applicant does not yet own the building. They decided that, from a preservation perspective, they must reject the application.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.]. Since the proposal includes a financial hardship application, the Committee recommended sending the application to the Financial Hardship Committee.

512-14 South 3rd Street

Gargoyles Ltd., Owner

Anthony Bracali, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 512: 1858 as a firehouse, attributed to Stephen Button, architect; 514: c. 1940

PROPOSAL: Cut new windows, roof decks

This application is for the conversion of two buildings at the southern boundary of the Society Hill Historic District. The building at 512 has brick infill in the second floor windows. The application calls for new aluminum-clad, multi-light casement windows in the upper floors. However, the proportions of the transoms and windows differ from those existing in the 3rd floor. Also, window openings in the rear will have new windows. On 514, the proposal stipulates widening the openings on the upper stories and installing new, aluminum-clad, casement windows. New window openings will also be cut on the rear of the property.

Both buildings will have roof decks, each set back approximately 30 feet from the front and rear façades.

Staff recommendation: Approval, in concept, of the new windows in front façade of 512 South 3rd, pursuant to Standard 6; however, they should be wood and match the historic pane configuration and details. Approval of the windows as proposed in the front façade of 514 South 3rd and the rear windows in both buildings, pursuant to Standard 9. Approval of the roof decks, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10 and the roofing guideline.

Ms. Spina presented the project. Confirming the significance of the firehouse at 512 S. 3rd Street, Mr. Baron noted that the famous architect Stephen Button had designed the building for the Southwark Fire Company. He also added that it was later converted to a synagogue and then a Yiddish theater. Mr. Baron further added that some of the details of the windows proposed for the front of 512 should be refined. The applicant agreed to rework the windows. Mr. McCoubrey asserted that the windows being added to the front façade of 514 should not be identical to those proposed for the historic building at 512. The applicant again stated his willingness to work with the staff to develop the window designs. The Committee then concluded that the rear windows and the roof decks were acceptable.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; 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.]; and the roofing guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as ... decks and terraces ... 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.].

327 Race Street

Pat Karasidis, Owner

Charles Datner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Basement access with railing

This application calls for a new basement areaway and door. The work would remove a granite step original to the storefront and extend four feet out onto the sidewalk. The below-grade, single-leaf door would include the area of the present bulkhead opening, but would extend beyond it. The new concrete stairs would cut across two-thirds of the storefront and would be surrounded by a galvanized pipe railing.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2.

Ms. Spina presented the project. Committee members asked if the applicant had received the approval of the Streets Department for the proposed incursion onto the sidewalk. Charles Datner, the architect, replied that he had. Pat Karasidis, the owner, explained that he needed the new basement access because his neighbor to the east had recently closed off an alleyway that had provided passage to an exterior basement entrance. Mr. Datner confirmed that the owner needed direct access to the basement. With the loss of the side entrance, the only remaining entrance to the basement is an interior entrance within a rental unit. Mr. Datner also conceded that the construction of the proposed entrance would require the removal of an original granite step at the western bay of the storefront. Ms. Spina explained that the storefront originally included two entrances, one in each outer bay. The original steps had survived at both bays even though the western entrance had been closed long ago. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he did not like the impact of the proposal on the front façade. Mr. Levy and the owner discussed the closing of the alley and the loss of the exterior entrance to the basement. Mr. Baron asked if the applicant could create a basement entrance at the front façade using an existing opening that may have been a coal chute. Mr. Datner replied that it might be possible but it would depend on the locations of utilities. Committee members noted that the applicant could move his electrical service if necessary.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]. The Committee suggested that the applicant redesign the entrance to fit into the existing sidewalk opening.

1226-32 Walnut Street aka 225-35 South 13th Street, St. James Hotel

Royal Bank, Owner

Jeffrey Bossert, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1901-04, Horace Trumbauer, architect

PROPOSAL: Relocate door, replace entrance for ADA, new awnings

This proposal differs from the one seen by the Committee last month and includes several parts. First, the bank proposes to remove the curved awnings and install new shed awnings at the transom bars of the windows. Second, the owner wishes to switch the entrance from the westernmost bay to the one next to it. The removal of the entrance will include demolition of the doors and decorative wood surround. The new entry will have a metal system colored to match the stone. The packet includes an image from c. 1930 that shows an entry in a different location than the ones being changed and the two westernmost bays as windows. The new entry will also have a sloped sidewalk to meet ADA requirements. Third, the proposal no longer includes an

ATM machine at the street, but a new entry in the easternmost bay leading to a lobby machine as requested by the Committee. However, the new entry will include the demolition of the decorative wood surround and the installation of aluminum double-leaf doors. Fourth, new wall plaques for signage, but the proposal does not include details of material or attachment.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the awnings, if attached below the transom bars, pursuant to Standard 9 and the storefront guideline. Approval of the plaques; however they should be attached in the mortar joints and not into the stone, pursuant to Standard 10 and the storefront guideline. Denial of the new doors, pursuant to Standards 2, 9 and 10. To have an ADA compliant access in the eastern bay, the applicant may install a single-leaf door, but should retain the decorative door surround. Although the image from 1930 shows an entrance in a location different than those today, the applicant proposes to move the entrance to yet another location on the building and remove the historic door surround.

Ms. Spina presented the project. Joseph Campbell and Robert Tabas of Royal Bank and architects Jeffrey Bossert and William Alesker represented the application. Mr. Bossert presented an overview of the project. Most significantly, the owners would like to move the entrance, which is currently in the westernmost bay of the Walnut Street façade, one bay to the east, making the westernmost bay into a window. Mr. Alesker elaborated, explaining that they had experimented with several alternatives but had not been able to develop a suitable interior design with the entrance in the westernmost bay. He also claimed that the entrances on Walnut Street had been moved several times during the history of the building. Mr. Bossert added that the surround in the westernmost bay can be left in place when the door is changed to a window, but, he asserted, the surround is not original to the building. Mr. Campbell seconded the assertion, stating that the surround is only about 20 years old. Ms. Spina noted that the surround is clearly visible in Commission photographs taken in the 1970s, and Committee members agreed that the decorative surrounds have historic value and should be preserved. Mr. Bossert then stated that his client was willing to adjust the design for the ATM door in the easternmost bay, replacing the proposed double-leaf door with a single-leaf door with sidelights and retaining the decorative surround. The Committee members and applicant discussed the awnings and agreed that they should not cover the transom bars. They also discussed the proposed plaques and decided that they should be anchor-mounted, not adhered with epoxy. The Committee agreed that given the dearth of mortar joints, the plaques could be mounted directly into the stone if necessary.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal provided that the awnings mount below and do not cover the transom bars; the plaques are anchor-mounted, not epoxy-mounted; a single-leaf door with sidelights is substituted for the currently proposed double-leaf door in the easternmost bay; and that the surround is preserved in the westernmost bay, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; 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.]; and the storefront guideline [Not recommended: Using inappropriately scaled signs or other types of signs that obscure, damage or destroy remaining character-defining features.].

929 Clinton Street

Alan Goldstein and Dianne Chambless, Owners

Alexander Rice, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840; ½ floor removed, n.d.

PROPOSAL: 5th-story addition with dormer, façade alterations – in concept

This application for approval in concept proposes the restoration of the top ½ story of this building, which was lost many years ago in a fire. The addition will have a gambrel roof with a central dormer window. The cornice will replicate the cornice at 927 Clinton and the dormer will have a pedimented shape with clapboard cheeks. At the rear of the addition, doors will lead out to a rooftop deck. The deck will sit on an extended piazza that will house a new elevator. The existing three-story rear ell will not change.

On the front façade, the application includes new 6/6 true-divided light windows, six-panel wood door and shutters on all floors, but details are not included. Also the owner wishes to install a herringbone brick sidewalk and a gas lantern over the front door.

Staff recommendation: Approval in concept of the fifth floor, pursuant Standard 9; however, the roofline should have a gabled shape, rather than gambrel. Approval of the sidewalk, windows, door and shutters with staff to review details including shop drawings, pursuant to Standard 6. Denial of the gas lantern, pursuant to Standard 3.

Ms. Spina presented the project. Alexander Rice, the architect, explained that the building now houses seven units; the owner would like to renovate, creating two rental units as well as an owner's unit on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th floors. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the staff had verified that there had once been a 5th story on the building. Ms. Spina stated that there had been, but it was destroyed in a fire. Mr. Levy assessed the applicant's design for the new roof, which is a gambrel, and stated that the original gable roof would have had a much shallower pitch. He asked if original roofs had survived on neighboring buildings. Mr. Rice answered no original roofs had survived. The building to the east at 927 Clinton Street had been damaged in the same fire; the building to the west is a later, larger apartment building. Ms. Spina asked about 925 Clinton. Mr. Rice explained that it was a shorter building, but it did have a gabled roof with a pedimented dormer. Ms. Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey of the Committee stated that they could not accept the gambrel shape of the proposed roof. Mr. McCoubrey added that the relationship of the dormer to the front façade was important; the historical relationship of the two, he contended, should be maintained. Mr. Baron and Ms. Spina noted that the gambrel roof shape is typical of buildings from early to mid-18th century and not appropriate for a mid-19th century building. Committee members suggested that Mr. Rice experiment with various slopes of a gabled roof and asked that he prepare sight-line studies to determine the visibility of possible roof designs.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept of the addition of a 5th floor with the roofline to be determined pending the outcome of sight-line studies, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]. Approval of the sidewalk, windows, door, and shutters, with staff to review details including shop drawings, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]. Denial of the gas lantern, pursuant to Standard 3 [Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical

development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.].

2100-10 Fairmount Avenue

Donato Spaventa, Owner

Angela Vendetti, Applicant

DATE: 1922

PROPOSAL: Cut new storefront windows and door, awnings, handicap ramp

This application returns for final approval. The applicant has incorporated suggestions by the made by the Committee at their previous review. The proposal calls for new coupled, casement windows on the 21st Street façade and two, tripled casements on the Fairmount Avenue façade. A third opening on the Fairmount Avenue façade will have a single-leaf, metal door with sidelights and a single casement window. The windows will be made of metal and have a horizontal muntin to reflect the double-hung windows on the upper floors. The proposal also includes new concrete steps and ramp with simple aluminum picket railings. Canvas-like awnings will be installed in each opening.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the windows, steps, ramp, railings and awnings, pursuant to Standard 9 and window guideline. Approval of concept of new door, but the door should be designed to match the rhythm and fenestration of other openings, pursuant Standard 9 and the entrance guideline.

Ms. Spina presented the project. William Jelen, the architect, further explained the design and stated that minor adjustments could be made to accommodate the staff's comments related to the Fairmount Avenue entranceway. Committee members suggested that the architect work with the staff to overcome the awkward design of the entranceway, which contrasts with the other openings. They advised that the exterior steps be moved slightly to the east to allow the door to be repositioned and the composition improved.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the entranceway design is improved, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; the window guideline [Recommended: Designing and installing new windows when the historic windows are completely missing. The replacement windows may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the window openings and the historic character of the building.]; and the entrance guideline [Not recommended: Introducing a new entrance or porch that is incompatible in size, scale, material, or color.]

507 North 21st Street

Carol Kaminski, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: New steps and garden wall

This Spring Garden Historic District house, with its twin at 505 North 21st, is a rare example of the Italianate Villa style that reads as a single mansion. The twin at 505 retains its historic brownstone wall with wrought-iron fencing, but the wall at 507 was demolished at some point.

The existing steps at 507 are brick and concrete; they are not historic. The application for 507 calls for a new grey, simulated-stone retaining wall and steps along the 21st Street façade and partially along Brandywine Street, with a return back toward the building that will terminate at the porch. The wall will have simulated-stone coping, four-foot newel posts, and steps at the front and side of the house. The height of the wall will match that of the stone portion of the wall at 505.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the project. No one representing the project attended the meeting. Mr. McCoubrey asked for more detail on the neighboring historic brownstone wall at 505, which Ms. Spina provided. Mr. Levy stated that he was willing to recommend approval of the project. Mr. Baron objected to the proposed materials, a cast stone wall system by the O.P. Henry Company, stating that it would not match the original wall in color, texture, or block size. He recommended instead that the applicant erect a CMU wall faced with brown stucco, scored to match the neighboring block pattern. The CMU and stucco wall, Mr. Baron added, would be less expensive than the proposed wall.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend either the proposal as submitted or a brown stucco wall, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired].

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey R. Barr, Historic Research Technician
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner