

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Room 578, City Hall
25 January 2005**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Herbert Levy, AIA
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz
Robert Thomas, AIA

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

Jud Davidson
Wesley Wei, Wesley Wei Architects
Alan Markowitz
Marlise Ellis, Queen Village Neighbors
James Garrison, Hillier
David Marshall
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
David Ebby, Esq., Hangley Aronchick Segal & Pudlin, Rittenhouse Claridge, LP
David O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Sean Kelly, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Hope Zoss, Smith Memorial Playground and Playhouse
Pei-Chih Carter, Synterra Ltd.
Fred Maurer
Betsy Carson, Playcare, Inc.
Bob Hotes, DPK&A Architects
David Nazarian
Rachel Schade, Schade & Bolender Architects
William Burke, Art Commission
Robert Torres
Andrea Speizman, The Bellevue
Maksym Szpilczak
Gamal Sherif
Lee Waldron, Grenald Waldron Associates LTD Design
Stephan Salisbury, Philadelphia Inquirer
Shannon Yott, PWI Engineering
Inga Saffron, Philadelphia Inquirer
Karen Borski, Fairmount Park Commission
Gersil N. Kay, BCI
John Fruncillo, Roman Catholic High School Alumni
Donald Phimister
James Lokoff, 528 Pine Street
Frank Binswanger, Two Logan Square
Craig Slater, SRK Architects
Joe Angeloni

Dan Lavery, Colory Metal and Glass
Margaret Conver, Chestnut Hill Academy
Eric Rahe, Chestnut Hill Academy
Mark Wieland, Chestnut Hill Academy
David Smallets, Chestnut Hill Academy
Maleda Berhane, Chestnut Hill Academy
Timothy Calligan, Chestnut Hill Academy
Jason Sieminski, Esq., Drinker, Biddle and Reath, Chestnut Hill Academy

Robert Thomas, Acting-Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

210-212 New Street

Lagerhouse Development Associates, owner

Jud Davidson, applicant

History: Buildings combined, front facade added, 1923

Project: Architectural Committee review of details

At its December 2004 meeting, the Architectural Committee reviewed and approved an application for several alterations and additions to the building at 210-212 New Street, provided the plans were revised, especially the deck railing, and reviewed again by the Architectural Committee. The building is listed as non-contributing to the Old City Historic District. Pursuant to Section 6.5 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, the Committee may review and approve applications for non-contributing buildings without referral to the Historical Commission. This application proposes the deck railing details requested at the earlier review. It presents three options, labeled Scheme A, B, and C. Schemes A and C propose railing/planter combinations; Scheme B proposes a simple railing.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of Scheme B, pursuant to the Architectural Committee's initial approval.

Mr. Farnham presented the application and staff recommendation to the Architectural Committee. Jud Davidson, the architect, represented the project. Mr. Tyler explained that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum; only two members, Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Thomas, were present. Neither the applicant nor any member of the public objected to proceeding without a quorum.

Mr. Davidson presented the three front deck railing options. He noted that his client preferred the designs with planters. Mr. McCoubrey questioned Mr. Davidson about the face of the planters at the front façade; he rejected the proposed planters because they would be unarticulated. Mr. Thomas suggested that the railing run across the entire front façade and that any planters be positioned on the deck behind the railing. Mr. Davidson agreed that this was an acceptable solution.

The Architectural Committee approved the railing detail, provided the front railing runs across the entire width of the front façade and all planters are placed on the deck behind the railing.

146-148 Bread Street

Alan Markowitz, owner

Wesley Wei, applicant

History: c. 1890; Window cut to a door in northern bay after 1960

Project: Cut openings, add garage and entry doors – in concept

This application proposes the concept of cutting new openings and installing garage and pedestrian doors in the front façade of the former industrial building at 146-148 Bread Street. The Commission individually designated the building in 1982 and classified it as contributing to the Old City Historic District in 2003.

The application proffers two schemes for the three-bay front facade. Scheme A stipulates removing windows and doors and enlarging openings; elongating transoms; installing garage doors in the outer bays, and installing double-leaf pedestrian doors in the center bay. Scheme B removes the window and enlarges the opening in the southern bay, and installs garage doors in the southern and center bays.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The applicant should seek to satisfy the programmatic requirements with the existing garage and pedestrian door openings.

With the arrival of Ms. Pentz, the Architectural Committee attained a quorum. Mr. Farnham presented the application and staff recommendation to the Architectural Committee. Wesley Wei, the architect, and Alan Markowitz, the owner, appeared for the project. Mr. Farnham noted that a floor plan of the building would help the Committee make an informed decision. Mr. Wei explained that he was in the early stages of the project and had not yet drawn interior plans.

The owner discussed the limitations of the building and advocated two garages. Ms. Pentz asked if the garage proposed for the southern bay could be shifted to the northern bay, which has already been altered. Mr. Wei showed a proposed floor plan of the building to the Committee. He and the owner explained that they did not want to relocate the garage to the north because they would lose the natural light from the windows on the northern façade. Mr. Thomas rejected the notion of shifting one of the garages to the north and asserted that the architect should work with the existing openings. Mr. Wei countered that Mr. Tyler had suggested Scheme B, the plan with garages in the southern and center bays. Mr. Farnham interjected that Mr. Tyler did not approve of Scheme A or B, but had only stated that Scheme B was less disruptive than Scheme A.

Mr. Wei showed a photograph to the Committee documenting that the building to the south of the subject property includes a garage in the front façade. Mr. Farnham noted that the character of Bread Street is about to change significantly with the construction of the National Products townhouses just to the south. He added that the National development will provide parking for hundreds of units through two garage entrances on N. 2nd Street. The applicant contended that his situation was not analogous to the nearby development. Mr. Farnham clarified that he had not intended to equate the situations, but only to report that the National developer had expended a great deal of money to protect the character and pedestrian experience of the neighborhood including Bread Street. Mr. Thomas asserted that two garage doors in this building would detract from that pedestrian experience. Mr. McCoubrey agreed, stating that he opposed two garage openings in this building. Ms. Pentz concurred. The owner offered to redesign the garage doors to mitigate the impact on the street. The Committee reiterated that two garages were not acceptable. The Committee did concede that the central opening,

which is currently asymmetric, could be widened to the point of symmetry if necessary.

The Architectural voted unanimously to re commend denial of any changes to the existing transom openings in all bays and the existing door and window openings in the southern and northern bays, but approval of the widening of the center-bay opening to make it symmetrical beneath the transom (no more than approximately 2 feet-3 inches to the south), approval of a historically appropriate garage door in the center opening, and approval of a historically appropriate pedestrian door in the existing northern opening, 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.].

219-229 S. 18th Street

Rittenhouse Regency Affiliates, owner

Devin Aronstam, Lubert-Adler Management, Inc., applicant

History: Built 1925, Zantzing, Borie & Medary, architects

Major alterations 1957, Cronheim & Weger, architects

Project: Alter facades, construct additions – in concept

This in-concept application proposes to augment an in-concept approval given by the Commission in December 2004. The overall project proposes extensive alterations and additions to the former Penn Athletic Club building on Rittenhouse Square at the northeast corner of 18th and Locust Streets. The building was designed by the important Zantzing, Borie & Medary firm. Their original design of 1924 called for an elegant 12-story building with subtle detailing. It was not erected. In 1927, a somewhat clumsy building was constructed. It was five stories taller than the original design and devoid of much of the gracious detailing. The clumsy building was substantially and unsympathetically altered in 1957, when it was converted to an Army Corps of Engineers office building. During the insensitive conversion, several important decorative features were removed and many new features were added. The present project proposes to rebuild the debased building as a larger version of the elegant 1924 design.

At its December 2004 meeting, the Commission reviewed and approved in concept the following:

1. the restoration of all 1927 as-built historic fabric including the storefronts, main entrances, and arched window openings at floors 2 to 5;
2. the two-story corner additions and the four-story rooftop addition, provided the two-story additions are clad in a material distinct from the historic brick and provided the façade details are restudied to avoid replicating historic details, especially the recessed arches at the windows;
3. the new facing and openings in the upper corner facades, provided the façade details are restudied to avoid replicating historic details, especially the recessed arches at the windows;
4. inconspicuous pergolas;
5. the addition of window openings in the corner bays at floors 3 to 9;
6. the alterations to the windows in the center bays at floors 7 to 15, provided the details, especially the balconies, are restudied.

This application addresses some of the concerns raised by the Committee and Commission at the earlier reviews. Addressing Point 2, the cladding for the additions is now differentiated from the historic cladding in scale and coloring; the additions are set back from the planes of the historic facades. Addressing Points 2 and 3, the addition windows no longer replicate the historic windows. Addressing Point 6, the outer columns of windows and balconies in the center section of the 18th Street façade at floors 7 to 15 have been simplified.

Staff Recommendation: Approval in concept, pursuant to the Historical Commission's December 2004 approval in concept and Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application and staff recommendation to the Architectural Committee. James Garrison, the architect, and David Marshall, the developer, appeared for the project. Mr. Garrison explained that he had hoped to discuss the latest revisions to the design with the Committee, but that he did not wish to proceed with the

application to the Commission at this point in the design cycle. He reported that he planned to make further revisions to the design based on the Committee's comments before returning to the Committee and Commission for an additional review. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission does not have an established procedure for Committee-only comments. He suggested that the Committee make a recommendation to the Commission at the end of the review; he also advised the applicant that he could withdraw the application, if he chooses, after receiving the Committee's comments but prior to the Commission meeting on 11 February 2005. All agreed that this plan was acceptable.

Mr. Garrison provided an overview of the design revisions. He explained that the added masses are now more differentiated from the historic fabric: they do include replicated arches; they are more rectilinear, and they are sparer and plainer. Mr. Marshall added that they may propose northeast and southeast corner additions like those already proposed and approved in concept for the northwest and southwest corners. Mr. Thomas deemed the new additions acceptable. Mr. Garrison commented on the unique structure of the building.

Mr. Marshall reported to the Committee that his designers are restudying the massing of the rooftop addition and may reduce it in height by one story while adding one story sections to the north and south legs of the U-shaped building.

Ms. Pentz asked the applicants to comment on their proposals for materials. Mr. Garrison explained that they thought it would be folly to attempt to match the historic brick. Therefore they decided to clad the additions with terra cotta panels of a different color and unit size. He also stated that the windows in the additions had been expressed as larger than the historic windows to differentiate further the new and old.

Mr. Garrison commented that the current application does not address the storefronts and entrances. He reported that he has copies of the original plans for the building and will plan the ground floor to be historically appropriate. Committee members asked if the developer planned to retain the lively mix of commercial spaces at the street level. Mr. Marshall said that he did. He also remarked that he intends to reopen and landscape the rear atrium area as an outdoor dining area.

Mr. Thomas inquired into the designs for the balconies. Mr. Marshall and his architect replied that they are still working out the details, but confirmed that no balcony would extend beyond the face of the historic building. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asserted that the balconies should be recessed within the additions and should not extend out beyond the addition facades. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the parapets enclosing the terraces at the corner additions. Mr. Garrison answered that those details have not yet been established. He added that the parapets will probably be taller than the required 42" and may be a combination of masonry and glass. Mr. McCoubrey strongly suggested that Mr. Garrison carefully study the intersections of the corner additions with the main central facades. He noted that they posed a particularly difficult design problem.

Mr. Gallery congratulated the applicants on their significant improvements to the design. He stated that the design was moving in the right direction. He applauded the applicants' embrace of the sparse, flat quality of the historic building. Mr. Gallery then offered four comments on the design. First, he contended that a reduction of the height of the top addition and the concomitant shift of some the addition to other sections of the roof would substantially improve the proposal. Second, he emphasized that the balconies in the additions should be recessed, not projecting. Third, he asked that the

architect set the corner additions back further from the facades of the historic building. Fourth, he suggested that the architect revise the end columns of central windows on the Locust Street façade as he had on the 18th Street façade. He concluded, advising that they continue with the flat, minimalist approach.

David Ebby, Esq., of Hangley Aronchick Segal & Pudlin, who represents the owner of the Rittenhouse Claridge, the building to the north of the subject property, addressed the Committee. He thanked Mr. Marshall for his forthrightness and stated that he hoped to continue the constructive dialogue. Mr. Tyler declared that this series of applications for the rehabilitation of the former Penn Athletic Club should serve as a model for complex proposals to the Commission. He commended the applicants on the quality of their submission.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval in concept, pursuant to the Historical Commission's December 2004 approval and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

537 Queen Street

537 Queen Development, owner

Maksym Szpilczak, applicant

History: c. 1825; third story and cornice added c. 1855; demolished and rebuilt 2004

Project: Construct rooftop addition

This application proposes the construction of a rooftop addition on the three-story rowhouse at 537 Queen Street. The Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the historic building at 537 Queen imminently dangerous in 2003 and the Commission's staff approved its demolition. In 2004, the owner rebuilt the building to match the historic building.

The proposed fourth story would be set back 15 feet from the cornice. It would be faced with stucco and fenestrated with wood casement windows.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9. The staff also recommends that the applicant apply for the rescission of this address from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places because of the total loss of historic fabric.

Mr. Farnham presented the application and staff recommendation to the Architectural Committee. Maksym Szpilczak, the owner, appeared. Mr. Tyler emphasized that there is no longer any historic fabric at the site; the building is entirely new construction. Mr. Szpilczak noted that the front steps had been salvaged from the old building.

Committee members asked about the heights of neighboring buildings. Mr. Szpilczak reported that the building to the east is four stories in height, one story taller than his building; the building to the west is three stories plus a large dormer. Mr. Thomas stated that the rooftop addition was acceptable, especially because the building is not historic and its neighbors are taller.

David O'Donnell, the president of the Queen Village Neighbors Association, and neighbors Marlise Ellis and Sean Kelly addressed the Committee. Ms. Ellis owns the property at 526 Kauffman Street, which abuts 537 Queen Street at the rear. Mr. Kelly owns the property at 528 Kauffman Street. Both are listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. O'Donnell, Ms. Ellis, and Mr. Kelly opposed the application. Mr. O'Donnell alleged that Mr. Szpilczak had "blatantly lied" when the Queen Village Neighbors Association (QVNA) reviewed the addition proposal. He testified that Mr. Szpilczak claimed to have already received the Commission's approval for the fourth-story addition when he appeared at the QVNA review. Mr. O'Donnell reported that the back-to-back properties on Kauffman and Queen Streets have very small rear yards. Therefore, this addition will impinge upon the light and air of the historic properties behind it. Ms. Ellis claimed that Mr. Szpilczak's zoning application for the fourth story had already been denied. Mr. Szpilczak explained that his zoning application for a two-family house had initially been denied, but, after he reduced the size of the building, it had been granted by right. He clarified that he had recently submitted a zoning application for the fourth story, but the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) had not yet acted on it. Ms. Ellis contended that the zoning approval for the two-family dwelling could not have been granted because no zoning hearing announcements had been posted. Mr. Szpilczak reiterated that the two-family zoning was by right. Committee members explained to Ms. Ellis that posters and hearings are not required for "by right" zoning approvals.

Mr. Thomas carefully defined the Historical Commission's and Zoning Board of

Adjustment's purviews for the neighbors. Mr. Tyler asserted that the neighbors' concerns should be addressed to the ZBA. He noted that neither the Queen Street nor the Kauffman Street properties are in historic districts. He stated that the Commission's jurisdiction is limited in this case to the impact of the proposed modifications on the individually designated property. In this case, the property is still listed on the Register, but the fabric is not historic; therefore, the proposal would have no impact on historic fabric. Committee members agreed that they could not recommend denial of the proposal on historic preservation grounds.

Mr. O'Donnell asked why the Commission had required Mr. Szpilczak to reconstruct the historic building if it did not intend to assert its jurisdiction over the new building. Mr. Tyler stated that the historic building, which had been deemed imminently dangerous, still stood when the Commission reviewed the demolition and reconstruction application. No historic fabric now survives at the site; the historic building is not on Queen Street, but in a landfill.

Mr. Thomas and Mr. Levy suggested that the owner and neighbors attempt to reach a compromise. Mr. Szpilczak offered to meet with the neighbors and the Association.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, 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.]. It also recommended that the applicant apply for the rescission of this address from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places because of the total loss of historic fabric.

1550 N. 33rd Street, Smith Memorial Playground and Playhouse

City of Philadelphia and Smith Memorial Playground, owners

Robert Hotes, DPK&A Architects, applicant

History: 1899, James Windrim, architect

Project: Construct gatehouse, dismantle pavilion, rehabilitate slide, add playground, landscape grounds

This application proposes renovations and additions to Smith Playground, an historic playground in Fairmount Park.

It stipulates the renovation of an historic slide and its adaptation for accessibility. The renovation would include the demolition of later additions, the removal of an unsafe interior stair, the addition of safety enhancements, and the construction of a large boardwalk linking the top and bottom of the slide. The boardwalk would include two structures called tree houses.

The application also proposes the disassembly and storage of an historic octagonal pavilion; it would be re-erected within five years at a new location on the grounds.

A gateway building to house restrooms and other facilities would be constructed. The building is designed in a style reminiscent of turn-of-the-century park pavilions.

The application also proposes several modifications to the landscape including the laying of new paths to improve accessibility; the addition of playground areas; the partial reestablishment of an historic oval in front of the main building; the relocation of the parking area away from the play areas; the creation of a picnic area; the demolition of a non-historic pool; the addition of fencing, and the addition of an historic gatehouse salvaged from elsewhere in the park.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application and staff recommendation to the Architectural Committee. Hope Zoss, the executive director of the Smith Memorial Playground and Playhouse, Robert Hotes of DPK&A, Pei-Chih Carter of Synterra Ltd., and Betsy Caesar of Playcare, Inc. represented the project.

Mr. Hotes offered an overview of the project. He reported that the playground has been closed because it does not meet safety standards. Ms. Carter provided an overview of the site planning including tree maintenance, relocation of the parking, separation of food and play areas, demolition of the non-historic pool, construction of new playgrounds and gateway building, and rehabilitation of the slide. Ms. Caesar, the playground consultant, discussed the proposed playgrounds. She stated that the overall goal was to create a safer, more accessible version of the historic playground. She noted that the new equipment would be ground-based like the old. She provided a lengthy review of the safety requirements for the giant slide. She asserted that it needed to be modified to create a zone without entanglement and obstruction points. Mr. Hotes offered additional details about the slide renovations including the demolition of non-historic additions and the insertion of supervision openings and a sit-down bar. He discussed three options for creating a smooth, flush zone for the 42 inches above the surface of the slide. The first option proposes a metal mesh, which would look like a window screen, at all window openings. The second option proposes infilling the bottom third of the windows with wood or glass. The third option proposes to raise the entire building 12 inches to create a smooth zone below the windows.

Mr. Hotes presented the plans for the gateway building, which will be reminiscent of turn-of-the-century park pavilions. He showed color charts to the Committee for the slide and gateway building.

Mr. Thomas thanked the applicants for the thorough presentation. The Committee asked about the rationale for the tree houses. Ms. Carter explained that the tree houses on the boardwalk had been devised to keep children away from the low tree limbs and thereby meet the strict building code for playgrounds. The Committee and applicants discussed the changes to the slide. Committee members asked Ms. Zoss about her preference among the three options to create a smooth, safe zone within the slide. She stated that she preferred raising the entire building rather than covering the windows and eradicating its historic openness. Mr. Thomas opined that raising the structure in this case would not substantially detract from its historic appearance because it is out in the open and only seen in the context of the ever-changing landscape. Mr. Hotes offered the possibility of an interpretive display in the new gatehouse that would provide a history of the site.

Mr. Levy asked where the pavilion would be stored after it is dismantled. Ms. Zoss explained that it would be stored in the basement of the playhouse. Mr. Hotes added that the basement is very large; it runs under the entirety of the large plinth on which the playhouse sits.

Ms. Pentz inquired about the height of the fences. Ms. Carter stated that they would be limited to six feet.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal with the third slide option, raising the building 12 inches, 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.].

2044 Spruce Street

David Nazarian, owner

Rachel Schade, applicant

History: c. 1880, perhaps G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, architects

Project: Demolish chimney; add elevator tower, deck, roof hatch, HVAC equipment; replace windows

This application proposes several alterations and additions to the grand late nineteenth-century mansion at the southeast corner of 21st and Spruce Streets. It proposes the demolition of a chimney and the construction of an elevator tower in its place. The chimney appears to be visible from 21st and Cypress Streets. It also proposes the construction of a large roof deck with access from the new elevator and a roof hatch. Two railing options are offered for the deck: a wrought iron railing based on historic railings on the building and a contemporary cable railing. New rooftop HVAC equipment is proposed. Finally, the replacement of first-floor rear windows with French doors is planned. The deck with railing, roof hatch, HVAC equipment, and French doors would not be visible from any public right-of-way.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the deck with wrought iron railing and hatch; HVAC equipment, and French doors, with staff to review details. Denial of the demolition of the chimney and addition of the elevator tower, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application and staff recommendation to the Architectural Committee. Owner David Nazarian and architect Rachel Schade appeared for the project.

Committee members questioned the owner and architect about the chimney to be demolished. Ms. Schade conceded that it is visible from the south and west, but added that it is the least visible of the many chimneys on the building. She also noted that she would like to use brick salvaged from its demolition to repair a much larger, more visible, more ornate chimney. Mr. Levy and Mr. Thomas granted that the chimney to be demolished is minimally visible and relatively insignificant. Committee members agreed that the other changes would not be visible and would not detract from the character of this significant house.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the application as submitted, with staff to review details.

200-216 S. Broad Street, Bellevue

Bellevue Associates, owner

A. Robert Torres, applicant

History: 1904, G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, architects

Project: Add pedestrian bridge between hotel and adjacent building

This application proposes the construction of a pedestrian bridge across Chancellor Street, an alley separating the historic Bellevue Hotel from a non-historic building to the south. The bridge would be added at the fifth-story level of the Bellevue. It would be built of metal and glass. Its construction would require the removal of a paired window with decorative stone surround and a small amount of stone cladding. The bridge would be set back 131'-6" from the Broad Street façade of the building.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application and staff recommendation to the Architectural Committee. Bellevue general manager Andrew Speizman and architect Robert Torres represented the project.

Mr. Tyler reported that he had visited the site and determined that the proposed location of the bridge was appropriate. He also noted that the proposed bridge, which is sleek and clean, is designed to be as unobtrusive as possible. He compared it to an existing, less appropriate bridge, which is bulkier and more ornamental. Committee members agreed with Mr. Tyler that the design is appropriate and the loss of historic fabric is minimal. William Burke of the Art Commission asked if this section of Chancellor Street is public or private. The applicants responded that it is private. Mr. Burke stated that the Art Commission would therefore not have jurisdiction over the project.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, 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.]

Boathouse Row

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Karen Borski, Interim Director of Fairmount Park Commission, Applicant

DATE: History: # 2 Fairmount Boat Club: 1904, Walter Smedley, architect

3 Quaker City Barge Club: 1860; rear addition, 1874

4 Pennsylvania Barge Club: 1892, Louis Hickman, architect; addition, 1912, C. E. Schermerhorn, architect

5 Crescent Boat Club: 1869-71; addition, 1891, Charles Balderston, architect

6 Bachelors Barge Club: 1893-94, Hazelhurst & Huckle, architects

7 & #8 University Barge Club: 1870; enlarged, 1893

9 Malta Boat Club: 1873; enlarged 1901, Hewitt Bros., architects

#10 Vesper Boat Club: 1873; addition, 1898, Howard Hagar, architect

#11 College Boat Club: 1874-75, addition, 1920; addition 1938

#12 West Philadelphia Rowing Club: 1878, addition 1968

#13 Undine Barge Club: 1882-83, Furness & Evans, architects

#14 Philadelphia Skating Club: 1860, James Sidney, architect

#15 The Sedgeley Club: 1902-03, Arthur Brockie, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace exterior lighting

This application calls for replacing the incandescent lights that outline the boathouses with LED lights.

Equipment: The information says that the nodes will be of the dome type, .74" in height. For every 100 nodes a junction box is required. These junction boxes range in size from one-foot square to two-feet by two-and-one-half feet. The specifications do not note which size is required in each location. The cables come in several colors to match the background, but the application does not specify that this will be done.

Mounting: The cables can either be affixed with tubing or clips. By inference the application says that clips will be used, but does not say how often the clips will be laid. However, it is unclear how many of the existing holes from the existing lighting can be reused for the new clips. All clips and nails (or screws) will be stainless steel. The application does not specify the mounting for the junction boxes. For lights on chimneys, the papers detail that a "bonding material" will be used, but offer no other information.

Patching: No details of existing holes from the previous lighting have been included.

Staff recommendation: Approval in concept; however, the application lacks many pertinent details including the actual mounting of the cables and junction boxes so that no historic fabric is damaged, information on how power will be connected to the cables, and repair from the existing lighting scheme. At a minimum, it should be noted that all attachment in masonry should be done in mortar joints and if any material other than nails are used, actual specifications should be included. A mock-up on one of the houses should be installed for the Committee to see.

Ms. Spina presented the application.

Karen Borski of the Fairmount Park Commission and Shannon Yott of the lighting design company attended the meeting. Ms. Borski said that she conferred with Richard Tyler and that he suggested the erection of a mock-up. She thought that the mock-up should occur on the railing of the Undine boathouse so that observers could congregate at the fish ladder on West River Drive. Ms. Yott informed the Committee that mounting details are being worked out by an architect. She noted that supports would be every

two feet with stainless steel fasteners, and they are investigating having the fasteners in the mortar joints for the chimney pieces. She disclosed that the contractor would be responsible for patching any existing holes and the painting of any patched area, but again the details are only in the preliminary stages. Ms. Yott said that the contractors will be instructed to re-use as many of the existing holes as possible. Mr. McCoubrey inquired if the short domes are diffusing elements or clear. Ms. Yott said that the domes are actually frosted nodes, $\frac{3}{4} \times \frac{3}{4}$ of an inch, containing 3 color elements; red, blue and green, which help to blend the lights together and alter the LED intensity. The changeable system was selected owing to its similarity to the current incandescent lights; however, in order to change the color the nodes would have to be re-programmed individually. Ms. Yott explained that the existing lighting has bulbs every 9 inches; the new installation would have a node every 8 inches on center. Owing to additional rows of lights on some of the houses as well as the decrease in spacing, the number of lights will increase from the existing installation by 3,000 to a total of 9,000 points of light.

Mr. Levy commented that the Undine boathouse has a copper fin on its roof. Ms. Yott responded that the proposed lighting would be located on either side of the copper fin.

Gersila Kay thought that other options for lighting should be explored, such as glass fiber-optic, and questioned the need to cool the LED boxes. Ms. Yott said that running cable for the fiber-optic system proves cost prohibitive, especially to get illuminators in the proper location. She noted that cost estimates have been submitted and that John Dougherty has offered the services of the electrical workers union, and other sponsors have volunteered to offset some of the cost. Ms. Kay questioned the darkening of the current lights and the brightness of the proposed lighting. Ms. Borski acknowledged that the proposed lights are not as bright as incandescent lighting.

Lee Waldron disclosed that his firm, Grenald Waldron Associates, was involved with the original lighting concept for boathouse row at the request of Mayor Frank Rizzo. His partner, Ray Grenald, designed the current lighting scheme because the incandescent lights are historically of the same time as the construction of most of the boathouses. He believes that boathouse row is an entry point into the city and that the proposed lighting would compromise the artistic expression of the design by turning Boathouse Row into billboards. He urged the Committee to recommend the exploration of other options, which would not compromise the artistic expression of the city. Mr. Waldron thought it important that the conceptual approval be made clear if based on white lighting or if it included the allowance of color lights.

Mr. Levy thought that for a good representation, the mock-up should include the lighting of a half gable, and two rows which come together. Mr. Rivera stressed the importance of the attachment details being submitted in writing. Mr. Tyler concluded that the proposed lighting would emulate the existing in tone, spacing and size of existing lights with the capability to change color.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend conceptual approval, subject to a mock-up, with the attachment details to return to the Committee.

301-313 North Broad Street, Roman Catholic High School

Trustees of Roman Catholic High School, Owner

John Fruneillo, Applicant

DATE: 1886, Edwin F. Durang, architect; addition, 1997, Ueland Junker McCauley, architects

PROPOSAL: Add exterior lighting

As a part of the institutional lighting along the Benjamin Franklin Parkway and North Broad Street, Roman Catholic High School would like to illuminate the outside of its building. The proposal includes installing single and double-headed light fixtures at the second and third floor sills on the Vine Street and North Broad Street façades and two at the corner turret. All of the fixtures and electrical cable will be mounted on the exterior in the mortar joints of the stone. Except for one double-headed fixture at the second floor, all of the fixtures will be mounted on the sills or belt-course to limit their visibility and all of the equipment will be painted to match the color of the stone.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina explained the project and expressed the staff's concern that a portion of the bay would be cast into a shadow. John Fruneillo, the applicant disclosed that an additional fixture would be added to the bay to minimize the shadows. He submitted revised plans that show the two fixtures. Mr. Rivera questioned the cables. Mr. Fruneillo responded that the cables would be positioned on top of the ledges and all the fittings would disappear into the mortar joints. He presented a sample of the proposed cable and noted that, if necessary, the cable could be painted to match the masonry of the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised proposal with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and Standard 10 [New additions and 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.].

528 Pine Street

James Lokoff, Owner

Donald Phimister, Applicant

DATE: c. 1805 by Benjamin Woolston; rehabilitated, 1971 – significant in Society Hill Historic District

PROPOSAL: Demolish part of rear ell, build rear addition, add roll-up gate and parking pad

This building has the historic configuration of a four-story main section with gabled roof, piazza with curved wall, and three-story rear ell. The proposal entails the demolition of thirty-five (35) feet of the rear ell and a one-story addition that wraps around the newly truncated ell. The addition will widen the rear ell to the full width of the property so that the family room measures 16' by 24'. The addition will have large glass doors leading out to the yard, brick walls and a hipped, standing seam copper roof. The new rear wall for the rear ell will be brick and the window at the second floor will have a balconette.

At a previous meeting, the Committee asked that the applicant return with additional information concerning the additions to the rear ell. The only new information about the rear ell that has been included is a plot plan that explains that the first addition measures 16'-10" and the second addition measures 19'-9". No historical research has been included. Both of these will be demolished completely and over half of the original rear ell will be demolished at the first floor to accommodate the wider room.

The proposed gate at the rear of the property will be of tongue and groove wood with a wood trellis.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2, Standard 9, and Standard 10, Building Site Guideline. The applicant should undertake research to determine the dates of the additions to the rear ell. The addition should not be the entire width of the lot since this destroys the historic solid/void relationship of the rear ell and side yard.

Ms. Spina presented the application. Donald Phimister, architect for the project, and James Lokoff, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Lokoff said that since the previous meeting, he has met with the Society Hill Civic Association and has received its support of the project. He noted that the proposed powder room in the new addition has been eliminated and that the rear wall's material has been changed to brick. Mr. Phimister presented photographs of Addison Street which includes the breaks in the additions. He informed the Committee of his inability to find information on the history of the 2nd addition. Mr. Lokoff alluded to skylights in the roof of the addition. Ms. Spina noted that the plans show a metal roof without skylights.

Ms. Pentz asked about the dates of the additions. Ms. Spina responded that said that the middle section dates to between 1895 and 1910, according to atlases in the Commission's office, but the staff did not have information on the second addition. Mr. Phimister thought the second addition to be from the 1940s. Mr. Rivera pointed out that, as proposed, a gutter problem would arise where the addition meets the existing building. He suggested that the wall of the addition be raised by building up the brick portion as much as possible for drainage and that a flat roof with a parapet be installed rather than the proposed hipped roof. This would render any skylights invisible. Mr. McCoubrey expressed concern about the side wall's extending outward, and recommended that the parapet be kept as low as possible.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with a flat roof and

parapet, instead of a hipped roof.

227 South 6th Street, Lippincott Building

Frank Binswanger, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1900, William Prichett, architect; penthouse addition, 2004, Cecil Baker, architect

PROPOSAL: Modify approved screen walls at rooftop terrace

When the Commission originally approved the penthouse on this building the terraces for the different units were divided by wood walls. These walls sloped so that they were six feet at the building and sloped down to four feet at the railing to minimize their appearance from the street. One of the penthouse unit owners wants more substantial walls separating his unit from his neighbor's. The three walls would slope from eight feet at the building wall to six feet at the railing and would be covered in stucco rather than wood.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The Commission labored over the design of the penthouse to make it as compatible with the historic building as possible and to make the appearance at the building's edge as minimal as possible.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. Mr. Tyler noted that at a previous committee meeting, he had referred to the committee a modification in the screen walls as a detail. He noted that the owner also sought the use of stucco instead of the approved wood. The Committee thought the dimension change acceptable; however, it thought that the use of stucco would be unacceptable. He then wrote to the owner giving approval of the height change, but not the material change.

Frank Binswanger, the owner of the condominium unit, Wilson Lopez, and Justin Wieser, the architect for the alteration, attended the meeting.

Mr. McCoubrey expressed concern about consistency throughout the penthouse area and, since none of the proposed wall screens have been built, these should be the prototype for all. Ms. Pentz suggested that the proposed screen follow the contour of the roofline at the end of the parapet. This design would allow two-thirds of the wall to remain eight feet in height while minimizing the added height at the railing.

After further deliberation, the Committee agreed that the stucco would be an acceptable material.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the modifications, provided that the screen's slope follows the slope of the roofline. Mr. Levy recused.

1217 Pine Street

1215 Pine Street Partners, Owner

George Acevedo, Applicant

DATE: 1826-34, Jesse Came, house carpenter; storefront added, c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitate façade, alter storefront, replace roof deck

This early 19th century building has a later 19th century storefront that has been altered considerably. The proposal calls for rehabilitating the front façade with new six-over-six windows on the upper floors and installing two casement windows, a four-panel door and some of the paneling in the storefront. The storefront originally would have had another set of doors and the paneling should be reconfigured to reflect that.

On the roof, the deck will be removed and reinstalled at the rear of the property so that it will not be visible.

On the rear of the property the façade will be restored with new six-over-six windows, six-panel door and two nine-light windows. The rear is not visible from a public right-of-way.

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

Ms. Spina presented the proposal to the Committee. She indicated that the staff thought that the left paneling at the entrance should resemble a double-leaf door.

Craig Slater, the architect, attended the meeting. He noted that the window replacements would be wood-true-divided-light. He also proposes to replace the smaller transom with a larger transom and replacing the storefront with large casement windows. Mr. Slater said that the deck replacement would occur at the rear to minimize its visibility.

The Committee reviewed the plans and concurred with the staff about the paneling in the door area. It also thought that the transom lights should read evenly.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval but with double-leaf doors at the storefront instead of paneling and with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 and 9.

436 Walnut Street

ACE-INA, Owner

Daniel Lavery, Applicant

Date:1915;addition,1972-73

PROPOSAL: Replace windows

This proposal, similar to one seen last month, involves an application to install simulated-divided-light metal windows in this two section office building. Last month's submission resulted from staff's working with the applicants architect and another window manufacturer using old photographs and surviving window pieces to find the design of the original windows. In the present proposal the panning for the most part will match the original brick mold and none of the dimensions vary by more than a quarter of an inch, except the sill which is $\frac{1}{2}$ inch. This application is similar to the one the Commission approved in December.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standard 6.

The meeting was attended by Greg Mason and Dan Lavery, both of Collery Window. Ms. Spina pointed out the similarities of the applications and the difference of the $\frac{1}{2}$ inch of the sill, increasing slightly the daylight opening. She also mentioned the lesser depth of the muntin which is shallower by $\frac{3}{16}$ ths of an inch. Mr. Baron mentioned that he had called the applicant to discuss adding a deeper muntin and a different molding on the central vertical mullions to make it more like that on the original wood windows. The applicant said that this would increase the cost of the windows which might be a hardship to the owner. Committee members said that that would be a matter for the Hardship Committee. Mr. Lavery also expressed concern about the weather tightness of using a panning shaped like the original molding on the central mullion. The Committee, noting the design of last month's proposal, thought it could be successfully achieved.

Committee members discussed the difference between the proposal which carries the window brick mold down the sides of the central mullion creating the appearance of two self contained individual units and the original design which has a simpler molding reinforcing the appearance of paired windows. They thought the difference significant enough to ask the applicant to rework his proposal to match the molding on the center mullion better. They said the new drawing could be faxed for their review.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposed replacement windows on both the north and south sections of the building subject to the modification of the molding on the central mullion to match the original better with the Committee to review the detail 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.].

500 West Willow Grove Avenue, Chestnut Hill Academy

Chestnut Hill Academy, Owner

Eric Rahe, Architect/Applicant

Date: Wissahickon Inn: 1882-84, Hewitt Brothers, architects, and William Mackie, builder; Commons Building: 1905, Frank Miles Day, architect; Kingsley Gymnasium: c. 1907, Frank Miles Day, with major additions, 1956 and 1959, Martin & White, architects; Kline Sciences Building c. 1950, Martin & White architects.

PROPOSAL: Demolish Buildings; construct two buildings and parking lot – in concept

This is an in-concept proposal with three phases. Phase one includes the demolition of the Commons building and the construction of the new Commons building in its place. Phase two calls for the complete demolition of the Kingsley Gymnasium and the construction of a new gymnasium on the site. Phase three is the demolition of the Kline Science Building and the construction of a new science building and the expansion of the existing parking lot on the opposite side of the former Wissahickon Inn.

The Commons Building houses the school's cafeteria with the original gymnasium to the east; Frank Miles Day designed both buildings. The Kingsley Gymnasium was added to these in the 1950s. The school added squash courts, the only portion of the building that will remain, to the southwest of the complex. The building footprint of the proposed Commons and Woodward Gymnasium would wrap around the existing circular drive and a large wing would extend toward the Wissahickon Inn. The steep slope of the Wissahickon watershed limits the development of the site as documented by letters from the Planning Commission and Department of Licenses and Inspections.

The application argues that the three existing buildings do not meet the school's programmatic needs.

The hearing was attended by Margaret Conver, business manager for Chestnut Hill Academy, Eric Rahe, Mark Wieand and David Smallets of Bower Lewis and Thrower architects, Maleda Berhane and Timothy Calligan of the Aegis Property Group and Jason Sieminski of Drinker, Biddle and Reath.

Mr. Rahe described the three phases of the master plan and explained that they cannot proceed without in-concept approval for all phases. He explained that in developing the plan they had five priorities:

1. the preservation of open space
2. respect for the Wissahickon Inn and the historic district
3. the concerns of the neighbors
4. preservation of the watershed
5. Chestnut Hill Academy's programming and fundraising needs.

Mr. Rahe outlined the consideration of five options which did not involve the demolition of the Frank Miles Day buildings.

Option One called for reusing the existing buildings for their current use and expanding them. He pointed out that the existing dining commons has about 6700 square feet. They see a need for close to 10,000 feet. Similarly the existing gym is 4230 square feet and they need 5940 feet. The existing Commons has columns that support the roof, making it hard to expand. Option Two looked at shifting the gym more into the slope of the watershed which they said the Planning Commission would not favor.

Option Three calls for reusing the old gym for dining. They thought this was unacceptable because they want the public space of the dining hall to be right on Willow

Grove Avenue, in a location more inviting to the community. Option Four called for swinging the new gymnasium space into the area now occupied by the Kline Science building. This they thought unacceptable because it called for shifting their strategic plan and building a new science center first. They think they have greater need for a new lunch room and gym space. Option Five calls for building the gym on the other side of the Wissahickon Inn building. They thought this a poor idea because it would take up more valuable open space and impinge on the view of the Inn from the other side of Willow Grove Avenue with such a large facility. They also said that there would be a financial premium with this plan because of the need for better building materials and in terms of operations.

Messrs. Riviera and Levy thought scheme five offered advantages in terms of the gym being closer to the fields and parking. Ms. Conner said that the school uses the parking at the skating rink and that they are trying to group indoor sports together. Mr. Calligan emphasized that separating the sports facilities would cause long-term financial strain on the non-profit because it would mean more staffing and maintenance in the future.

Ms. Pentz said that the loss of these historic buildings runs counter to the Commission's mandate. She thanked the applicants for showing the consideration of options and said that it showed that with a little more thought there is a solution that does not call for the demolition of the significant buildings.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance said that it was telling that the preservation of the historic buildings was not one of the five criteria used in developing a plan. He said that the ordinance is very clear that if the public interest argument is used, that demolition must be a necessary interest. He said that Judge Matthew Carrafiello in a recent order emphasized that historic preservation is itself a public necessity and the interest must therefore be for the general public and overwhelming in nature. Mr. Gallery thought this was neither. He said that the school has shown by its own arguments that there are other possible options. Mr. Gallery thought this application should be sent to the Hardship Committee, but he thought that the cost difference for option five of \$200,000 out of \$16,000,000 or about 2.3% was not significant. He said that scheme five offered other benefits besides the preservation of the buildings, including the much greater preservation of the slope of the watershed and a more efficient building. In terms of the community interest, Mr. Gallery said he consulted with the Chestnut Hill Historical Society which reiterated its opposition to the school's demolition plan.

Mr. Riviera agreed that there seems to be an architectural solution and not a strong case for hardship.

Mr. Rahe said that historic preservation was a consideration, but that for them this meant the preservation of the open space and the views to the Inn. He said that the Commission should also consider the additional operating costs when making its determination. Ms. Conner also noted that the Academy made a commitment to preserve the Inn building and, with its limited resources, saw that the main building was given the greatest emphasis.

Mr. Sieminski, counsel for the Academy, believes that the school has a valid public interest argument but that the financial hardship is their chief argument. He stressed the need for an efficient layout and expressed concern for the unknowable costs of a less efficient layout.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal in concept

based on architectural grounds and the Secretary of the Interior Standards but agreed to recommend that the Commission send it to the Financial Hardship Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron
Jonathan Farnham
Diane M. Hughes