

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Room 578, City Hall
26 April 2005**

Present

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

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

Also

Joel Spivak
Janice Woodcock
Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission
David Waxman
Laura Kern
Arcangelo Guida
Al Shapiro
Stephen Goldner, SPG-3
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Jane Wilson
Steve Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Thomas Durnell
Kevin Smith, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
Jane Glenn
Ralph Fey
Marsha Bacall, Society Hill Towers
Bonnie Schorske, Martin & Company, LLC
Mary Isaacson, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
Jonathan Broh, J.K. Roller Architects
Tiffany Struthers, J.K. Roller Architects
Lauren Moore, Old City District
John F. Tucker, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Gagan Lakhmna, Allied Properties USA
Mike Guadagno, M & G Development
Gerry Gutierrez, Group G
Lanny Leibowitz, AIA
Kevin S. McDonnell, I. M. Christian Associates, Ltd
Anthony Buccini, I. M. Christian Associates, Ltd
Jonathan Wilson, 2124 Wallace Street
Chariss McAfee, CLCM Architects
Juliet Geldi, CLCM Architects
Don Ventresca, 1730 Pine Street

Scott Ritchie, Otto Design Group
Craig Deutsch, Harman Deutsch Architects
Ann Gitter, 2040 Rittenhouse Square
Lisa Neely

Daniel McCoubrey, Acting-Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:25 a.m.

4250 Belmont Drive, Belmont Mansion

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Janice Woodcock, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1742-50 by William Peters; stair tower added, c. 1765; 3rd floor added, c. 1850; repairs from fire, 1905

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitate building; reconstruct deck and porch, rehabilitate windows and stucco – in concept

Belmont Mansion returns: now for a rehabilitation that includes the retention of the third floor and restoration of details that can be found in photographs that date to 1871 and the turn of the 20th century. The most visible elements to be reconstructed include a widow's walk platform at the peak of the house with a picket railing and a flag pole and a first-floor porch that wraps around three sides of the house. The porch will have a terne-coated stainless-steel roof, wood posts with scroll brackets and a herringbone-patterned brick floor.

The rest of the rehabilitation includes the restoration of the windows, reconstruction of shutters on all of the floors and restoration of the façade, including the quoins and scored stucco on the rear wing.

Staff Recommendation: Approval in concept, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 6, and 9.

Ms. Spina explained the project and apprised the applicant of the absence of a quorum. Janice Woodcock, the architect, and Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission, attended the meeting and agreed to proceed with the review without the benefit of a quorum. Mr. Thomas inquired about the period of the proposed restoration. Ms. Woodcock responded that the proposed alterations would restore the character defining features period prior to the alterations made after the fire of 1905, which are intrusive elements. In response to Mr. Thomas' query about the site immediately around the building, Ms. Woodcock disclosed that historic research for the site is being undertaken. Mr. Stuhlman informed the Committee that the vinyl fence would be removed.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.], Standard 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.], Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]. When the proposal returns for final approval, the application should include all of the structural details for the retention of the third floor and roof and stabilization of the building.

1530 Spruce Street

Spruce 1530, LLC, Owner

Al Shapiro, Applicant

DATE: 1898 by Thomas Bennett, architect – significant to Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District

PROPOSAL: Replace wood balcony doors with steel

This application involves the replacement of fourteen doors that lead to balconies on the side façade of this corner building, which is listed as significant in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. The historic doors are half-glazed, paneled wood doors with single-light transoms and detailed transom bars. The owner proposes to replace them with half-glazed steel doors with single-light transoms and plain transom bars. These doors are visible from 16th and Spruce Streets.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6. The fire code does not require these doors to be fire-rated because they exit to the outside; they should be replaced in-kind.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. Mr. Thomas noted that when he visited the site he determined that the proposed doors are very visible and believes that the proposed steel doors are inappropriate. He added that existing doors of this building are character-defining elements.

Al Shapiro, the owner, and Arcangelo Guida, architect for the project, attended the meeting. Mr. Guida asserted that the replacement is predicated on energy efficiency. Mr. Shapiro argued that the existing balcony railing will obscure some of the proposed door. Mr. Guida offered the possibility of attaching applied molding to the metal door. Ms. Spina responded that the applied molding was a consideration if a fire-rated door was required for the fire code, which is not the case. Ms. Voith suggested that the applicant consider a replacement in kind with thermal panes. Mr. Shapiro stressed that he has explored many possibilities; however, the frames are very deteriorated and the proposed doors are an enhancement.

Ms. Voith concluded that the best approach for preservation would be to use wood doors and frames, which would accommodate settlement issues better.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to 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 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.].

1813 Spruce Street

Peter Mangiola, Owner

Joel Spivak, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850; bay added at 1st floor front, c. 1890

PROPOSAL: Build roof deck and penthouse, side addition, rehabilitate rear ell

This application involves the conversion of the former single-family house that now has apartments into condominiums and includes several parts. First, the entire rear ell will

be rehabilitated with new windows and brick pointing. Second, the proposal calls for removing aluminum siding on the bays and installing new wood siding; however, investigation shows that the bays originally were covered in metal with panels below the windows. Third, the plans show a rooftop penthouse and deck, with the deck over the main section of the building. It will have a setback of approximately twenty feet from the front façade. Fourth, in order to make the first floor unit handicap accessible and connected between the front section and rear ell, the plans call for a twenty-two foot long addition in the side yard of the building at the first floor. This addition is in the deep shadow of the building and would not be visible from a public-right of way. The original rear door for the property will be reused in the addition. Last, the owner would like to install a tongue-and-groove wood fence at the rear of the property to make the rear yard into a garden.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the rehabilitation of the rear ell with staff to review shop drawings of the windows and cleaning and mortar samples for the brick. Approval of the removal of the siding from the bays, but denial of the installation of clapboards. The bays should be restored either with metal or a wood sheathing to replicate the paneling, all pursuant to Standard 6. Approval of the side addition, penthouse and roof deck, provided that the roof deck is switched to the rear ell rather than the front section of the house, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and Roofing Guideline.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal and stated the Commission's position on roof decks on the main section of the roof. Joel Spivak and Peter Mangiola attended the meeting. Mr. Spivak informed the Committee that since the rear of the property is higher than the front, the proposed location for the roof deck is the least visible. Mr. Thomas concurred with the location of the deck. Ms. Voith pointed out the inconsistencies in the drawings and asked that a mock-up be erected for a determination of visibility.

Discussion then turned to the bays. Mr. Spivak noted that he proposes to move the wood panels from the side bay to the rear bay. The Committee concluded that panels on the bays should match the historic configuration and the historic material on the side bay should stay on that bay.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal subject to a mock-up for determination of visibility of the deck and the retention of the panels on the bays, with staff to review details.

3 Rector Street

Rector Street Associates, Owner

Brett Feldman, Esq., Applicant

DATE: c. 1880 – contributing to the Manayunk Historic District

PROPOSAL: Demolish building; construct 4-story multi-unit residential building with parking

This proposal calls for the total demolition of the historic building and the construction of a four-story, multi-unit residential building in its place. The inventory for the Manayunk Historic District lists the extant building as contributing to the district, and it reflects the industrial history of the neighborhood. The application includes some financial hardship information making a claim that the building could not be sold and reused as it is; however, the Manayunk Ordinance which governs the Manayunk Historic District does not provide such relief.

The proposal for new construction is four stories with brick facing and stuccoed corners,

beltcourses, and balconies. Large industrial-type windows punctuate the symmetrical facades. Cars will enter the first level parking from Rector Street and the openings along the tow path will remain open to allow ventilation of the parking area.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to PM §§ 704.2.1 and 704.2.2.

Laura Kern, Esq., Stephen Goldner, the architect, and David Waxman, the developer, attended the meeting. Ms. Spina presented the application, which is listed under the Manayunk Ordinance, and noted that she met with Mr. Waxman and Mr. Goldner previously to explain the differences between the Manayunk ordinance and the regular Historic Preservation Ordinance. Mr. Tyler emphasized that this property is contributing to the Manayunk historic district.

Ms. Kern said that although this property is governed by the Manayunk Ordinance, it should not preclude the development of the property, which has been vacant since 2001. She said she has received a positive response from some members of the community for the residential proposal and noted that an article in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* quoted Councilman Nutter's support of more residential projects in the neighborhood.

Mr. Tyler asserted that given the language of the Ordinance, any relief would be predicated on the Commission's decision or remediation at the Review Board of License and Inspection. Ms. Voith commented that this property has great significance and is one of the few remaining industrial properties in the district. Mr. Thomas and Ms. Pentz concurred. Mr. Tyler informed the applicant that if the property is situated within the flood plane, then an Army Corps of Engineer's permit may be required. If this federal involvement exists the project would be subject to a Section 106 review by the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

Kevin Smith, Manayunk Neighborhood Council, offered his opposition to the proposed demolition, which is highly visible from the Manayunk canal and towpath. He refuted Ms. Kern's assertion that the community supports additional residential developments. Mr. Smith strongly urged the re-use of the historic building. Ms. Kern reiterated that she had quoted from a newspaper article.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, concurred with Mr. Tyler; however, he expressed concern that relief at the Board of License and Inspection Review will not insure review of the new construction by the Architectural Committee and Commission. Ms. Spina stated that upon application for a building permit, the Department of Licenses and Inspections would refer the application to the Historical Commission, PM § 704.2.1 of the Property Maintenance Code, which requires the Historical Commission review of all new construction in the Manayunk Historic District.

Ms. Voith inquired if the property has been sold. Ms. Kern responded that the property is under an agreement of sale. Ms. Voith thought it important that the minutes reflect that the denial is based on preservation grounds and the potential for re-use of the historic property.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to PM § 704.2.1 of the Property Maintenance Code - No buildings or portion of the exterior thereof within the historic district shall hereafter be constructed, altered, repaired, demolished, or partially demolished unless a permit has first been obtained from the Department; and PM 704.2.2 - All applications for such permits shall be forwarded by the Department to the Historical Commission for review and approval, before issuance of the permit. No

permit shall be issued unless the proposed work has been approved by the Historical Commission staff as preserving the historical character of the district.

529 Delancey Street

Nick Ventura, Owner

Jane Wilson, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1804; front façade re-faced in tapestry brick, 1920s; façade stuccoed and cornice altered, mid-1960s

PROPOSAL: Cut new and alter windows on side elevation, install shed dormer and bay on rear

The proposal only entails the side and rear of the building; the owner plans to return to the Commission with an application for the front façade. The application calls for cutting several windows in the visible side façade and altering several extant windows. Although stuccoed, this façade dates to 1804.

On the rear, the proposal includes creating a one-room addition at the first floor, cutting a two-story bay that projects from the second and third floors, and cutting a large shed dormer at the roof. This would entail the removal of a large amount of historic fabric that dates to 1804. Owing to the side yard, the shed dormer would be visible from Delancey Street, but the rear of the property abuts the yards of other houses.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. One staff member recommends denial of the windows and shed dormer only.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Ralph Fey and Jane Wilson, the architects, attended the meeting. Mr. Fey gave an overview of the proposed alterations and noted that a complete restoration of the front would occur at a later date. He stressed that the proposed dormer would access a deck.

Mr. Thomas expressed concern about the cutting of windows on the property line, owing to the adjacent building's side yard. He also pointed out that the alterations to the wall as well as the addition of the dormer will have visibility from Delancey Street. Ms. Voith opined that the proposed alterations contradict preservation with the removal of historic fabric.

Mr. Fey asserted that the owner is less motivated to penetrate the side façade, but would like additional openings in the rear. Mr. Thomas thought that the existing windows provide adequate light, but supports the proposed alterations to the first floor rear owing its non-visibility from the street. Ms. Voith and Ms. Pentz agreed that the windows on the side façade removed too much historic fabric and proved too visible from Delancey Street.

Mr. Tyler disagreed with the Committee about cutting new windows on the side façade; however, he believes that the proposed enlargement of the bottom window on the rear compromises the symmetry. Mr. Tyler concurred with the Committee about the proposed dormer.

Steve Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association, speaking on behalf of the association had no official position about the proposal since the Association has not reviewed the

proposal. He believes that additional research should occur concerning the window openings.

Ms. Spina suggested that the applicant consider a single dormer between the rafters and the Committee agreed. Mr. Tyler noted that there was a tendency not to have dormers on houses that had windows in the gable ends; however he acknowledged the house already had an original dormer on the front façade.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the alterations to the 1st, 2nd and 3rd-floor rear as proposed and approval of a single dormer at the rear. The Committee recommended denial of the shed dormer at the rear as proposed and denial of the windows proposed for the side façade.

54 E. Haines Street

Owner/ Applicant: Thomas Durnell

History: c. 1750

Project: Replace roof with standing-seam copper roof

This application proposes the installation of a copper standing-seam roof on an eighteenth-century house in Germantown. This building would not have had a copper roof at any point in its long history. Its original roof would have been a cedar shake roof. It is very likely that the cedar shakes would have been replaced with a painted tin-plate or terne-plate standing-seam iron roof in the mid nineteenth century. In the mid twentieth century, the earlier roofing was replaced with asphalt shingles, the current roofing. The staff can approve a cedar shakes; painted terne-coated standing-seam metal; or Timberline-shape, weathered-wood-colored asphalt shingles, which resemble cedar shakes; but not a copper roof. The copper roof, which would develop a green patina, would not replicate either a historic cedar or metal roof.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 6.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Steve Kurtz, the contractor, and Thomas Durnell, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Durnell explained that the significant house was neglected for many years and that he is restoring it. He asserted the proposed copper roof would last for many years without maintenance. He claimed that it would long outlive his ownership of the building and could protect the building during the stewardships of less conscientious, future owners.

Ms. Voith recognized the applicant's care and respect for the building. She suggested that the applicant consider a lead-coated copper roof, which would look more like the historic metal roof because it would not develop a green patina. She also noted that the lead-coated copper has a longer life than copper alone. Mr. Kurtz, the contractor and an historic roofing specialist, agreed that the lead-coated copper would last longer and not develop a patina, but he added that this building is perfectly suited to a copper roof. He explained that copper roofs suffer from erosion at points where large amount of rainwater are channeled. This roof would not suffer significantly from that sort of abrasion because the roof is simply pitched and configured; the water would run off evenly across the entire roof. The Committee decided that either a copper or lead-coated copper roof would be acceptable and offered the owner the options. It warned the applicant that a copper roof would remain shiny and metallic for many years before it developed a patina.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a standing-seam metal roof in either copper or lead-coated copper, with the staff to review details.

223 S. Jessup Street

Owner: Martin & Co., LLC

Applicant: Bonnie J. Schorske, Martin & Co., LLC

History: c. 1825

Project: Legalize pointing, masonry cleaning and sealing, and stucco

This application proposes the legalization of stuccoing, pointing, brick replacement, and masonry coating or sealing done earlier this month without a building permit or the Historical Commission's review. Stuccoing requires a building permit regardless of whether a building is designated as historic because it is sometimes used to mask structural problems. Randy Baron of the Commission's staff discovered the contractor preparing to begin the project and advised him that the work required the Commission's review and a permit. On 5 April 2005, Jon Farnham of the Commission staff encountered the contractor working without approvals. Mr. Farnham was alerted to the illegal work when the contractor asked him if he had seen a cement truck in the area.

The building stands at the southeast corner of Jessup and Irving Streets. The new stucco was applied in a broad band below the first-story windows on the north or Irving Street façade. The stucco projects out from the building more than an inch and has a very rough finish. The metal edging used along the top, which should be covered with stucco, is visible at several points. The north façade was not stuccoed at the time of designation, but was stuccoed several years ago without Commission review. The recently applied stucco replaced and expanded upon the earlier illegal stucco. The north façade was also spot pointed after some bricks were replaced. The brick match is acceptable, but the pointing is sloppy and the mortar appears to be very hard. It does not appear to be the 1:2.5:6 mortar specified on the permit application. Finally, the façade was coated with an unidentified sealant, which is not noted on the permit application. The bricks on this façade, as opposed to the front façade, now have a distinct sheen; innumerable drips of the sealant are evident of the new stucco below. The sealant poses a distinct hazard to the façade because it may trap moisture inside the wall.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the legalization of the pointing, new bricks, and sealant because the remedies would be even more deleterious than the flawed work already undertaken; denial of the stucco, which should be removed and the brick beneath repaired, pursuant to Standards 5 and 7 and the Masonry Rehabilitation and Masonry Preservation Guidelines.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Bonnie Schorske, the owner, acknowledged that the work had been undertaken with the Commission's approval or a permit. However, she contended that there were several conditions that need immediate remediation because her tenants had complained of moisture in the basement. She explained that her contractor removed ivy, replaced bricks, spot pointed, added the stucco band, and coated the façade with a sealant. Committee members inquired about the type of sealant used. Ms. Schorske replied that she believed it to be Thompson's Water Seal. Committee members replied that that product is not appropriate for treating historic brick facades. Mr. Farnham explained to the applicant that such sealants can be very detrimental to brick facades because they can trap moisture behind facades, leading to spalling and other failures. Mr. Farnham also noted that the hard mortar used would eventually lead to spalling.

Ms. Schorske stated that her contractor also suggested the stucco to prevent water infiltration. The Committee members were highly skeptical of the claims that the sealant and the stucco would halt the basement water problem. Ms. Pentz stated that the

applicant should search for the true cause of the water infiltration. She suggested that the owner investigate the roof drainage, downspouts, and storm water drains. The Committee members agreed that the work undertaken was unlikely to cure the water problems, but they also agreed that undoing the work might further harm the building. Ms. Pentz noted that the removal of the sealant and the stucco could prove damaging to the brick. They regretted the illegal work, which will exacerbate the poor condition of the façade, but determined that no further action is the best action.

The Committee remarked on the lack of a sidewalk along the façade. Ms. Schorske acknowledged that the sidewalk area is not paved, but is dirt. She stated that she would like to add plantings along the side of the building. The Committee replied that she should determine the ownership of the strip of land before altering it. The Committee also stated that she should not plant close to the fragile brick façade. They noted that the roots may damage the foundation, leading to additional water infiltration. They also commented that plantings against the façade may exacerbate the moisture problem because the façade will not dry quickly. They suggested that any planting along the façade be restricted to above-grade planters with adequate drainage. They also recommended paving the sidewalk area to facilitate the drainage of storm water into the street. Finally, they recommended that the owner avail herself of the expertise of the Commission and its Committees and staff before undertaking any additional work.

The Architectural Committee recommended legalizing the brick and stucco work because undoing the illegal work would further damage the fragile facade.

920 Clinton Street

Owner: 920 Clinton Street Condominiums, NWJ Companies

Applicant: Jonathan Broh, J.K. Roller Architects

History: built 1838; altered c. 1910

Project: Demolish bay, construct side and rear additions, replace windows, rehabilitate façade, reconstruct rear wall with gates

This application proposes a series of alterations and additions to the rowhouse at 920 Clinton Street. The large rowhouse is uniquely situated; the front façade faces Clinton Street; the rear façade faces Pine Street. Virtually all exterior facades are visible from the public right-of-way.

The rowhouse was constructed in 1838. About 1910, the building was renovated in the Colonial Revival style. Several side and rear bays, a side addition, leaded glass windows, and other features were added at that time.

The application proposes the following (overview and recommendation numbering keyed to elevation drawings):

1. The installation of wood true-divided-light windows at the Clinton Street façade and wood simulated-divided-light windows at the Pine Street and side facades. Significant leaded-glass windows would be replaced with wood simulated-divided-light windows at the first-story side facade.
2. The reconstruction of a second-story side porch at the east running south from the Clinton Street facade.
3. The construction of a one-story side addition with a roof deck. It would necessitate the demolition of a first-story side bay. This and all new additions would be clad with Meteon plastic panels.

4. The enlargement of the dormer on the Pine Street slope of the main roof and the addition of a roof deck on the piazza. The dormer window was converted to a fire escape door many years ago.
5. The reconstruction of a two-story addition atop a one-story side addition at the piazza.
6. The construction of a large three-story addition along the rear ell in the side yard. It would necessitate the demolition of a second-story bay.
7. The construction of a one-story infill addition beneath the second-story Pine Street bay.
8. The reconstruction of a second-story deck at the Pine Street façade.
9. The construction of a third-story deck at the Pine Street façade. It would necessitate the cutting of a historic six-over-six window into a door. A second historic six-over-six window at the deck would be replaced with a casement window.
10. The reconstruction of a brick and marble rear wall and the addition of wood gates to create two parking entrances in place of the existing one.

Staff Recommendation:

1. Approval of wood true-divided-light windows at the Clinton and Pine Street façades and wood simulated-divided-light windows at the side façade, provided all leaded glass windows are retained and restored.
2. Approval of the reconstruction of the second-story side porch based on the Commission's historic photographs, but denial of the proposed fenestration.
3. Approval of the demolition of the first-story side bay and construction of a one-story side addition with a roof deck, provided it is faced with an appropriate material. Denial of all proposed Meteor plastic panels.
4. Denial of the enlargement of the dormer on the Pine Street slope of the main roof. Approval of the addition of a roof deck on the piazza, provided the dormer is not further altered (the window was converted to a fire escape door many years ago).
5. Approval of the reconstruction of a two-story addition atop the one-story side addition at the piazza, provided it is faced with an appropriate material.
6. Denial of the construction of a large three-story addition along the rear ell in the side yard.
7. Approval of the construction of a one-story infill addition beneath the second-story Pine Street bay, provided it is faced with an appropriate material and the decorative metal column is retained.
8. Approval of the reconstruction of a second-story deck at the Pine Street façade.
9. Approval of the construction of a third-story deck at the Pine Street façade and the cutting of a window into a door, provided the new door is based on the historic window. Denial of the replacement of the historic six-over-six window with a casement window.
10. Approval of the reconstruction of a brick and marble rear wall and the addition of wood gates.

These recommendations are made with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 6, 9, and 10.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Tiffany Struthers and Jonathan Broh of J.K Roller Architects attended the meeting.

Mr. Broh offered to defer to the staff's recommendations for the window alterations. He asserted that the proposed Meteor plastic panels would approximate the painted finish on the existing metal-clad additions. Mr. Farnham noted that some of the additions are wood and others are brick. The Committee posited that the painted metal on some of

the bays is not original, but is a later unsympathetic addition. Mr. Broh offered to reconsider the cladding materials for the additions.

Mr. Thomas asserted that the large side addition at the rear, which would occupy the side yard, would be highly visible from Pine Street, and would negatively alter the historic massing, scale, and character of the property. Other Committee members agreed and stated that the large addition to the side of the rear was inappropriate. They concurred that they could not recommend its approval.

The Committee turned its attention to the proposed alterations to the rear brick and marble garden wall along Pine Street. Mr. Farnham noted that the wall had been rebuilt with the Commission's approval several years ago. He added that pieces of unused marble coping left from the rebuilding are stored in the rear yard. Mr. Thomas and Ms. Voith asserted that adding a second vehicular gate and curb cut on Pine Street, which is a major street, would compromise the pedestrian environment. Ms. Voith questioned the staff's recommendation of approval of the wall alterations. Mr. Farnham responded that the wall had been rebuilt and that the curb cut would not result in the loss of any on-street parking. The Committee stressed that the extant wall should be retained, but that new wood gates in the existing openings would be acceptable.

The Committee unanimously agreed that the rear dormer should not be enlarged. Some Committee members posited that the roof deck at the dormer is acceptable because the dormer window has already been converted to a door for the fire escape and because the deck would be situated on the ell, not the main roof. Ms. Voith asserted that the deck's visibility should be ascertained and documented.

The Committee addressed the proposals at the rear of the rear ell. They agreed that the ground-story infill addition under the deck was acceptable. They asked the staff if the second-floor deck at the rear had been permitted. Mr. Tyler disclosed that the property was designated in 1958 and that the deck was built without benefit of a permit. He suggested that the deck should not be legalized. Most Committee members agreed and signaled that the rebuilding of the deck should not be recommended for approval. Some suggested that if it was approved that its width should be limited to the width of the bay behind it. Mr. Broh noted that the access to the deck is through a door on the side of the bay. The Committee stated that, if approved, the deck could be accessed through one of the large arched windows at the rear, not the side, of the building. The Committee also agreed that the deck proposed at the third-floor rear on the bay was not acceptable. Committee members rejected the cutting of the window to a door and the installation of the casement. They stressed that this façade should be treated like a primary façade.

Discussing the second-floor enclosed porch on the Clinton Street façade, the Committee asserted that the architect should work with the staff to restore it as it is pictured in the Commission's early twentieth-century photographs.

Finally, the Committee agreed that the rebuilding of the addition at the piazza was acceptable because it would not be visible from the public right-of-way.

Ms. Voith concluded that there are so many issues of concern with this application that the applicant should withdraw it, conduct additional research, and undertake additional redesign before resubmitting. Mr. Broh stated that this application was a preliminary effort to gauge the opinion of the Committee and that he would consult with his client about withdrawing the application.

Mr. Farnham asked the Committee to give the applicant additional direction to allow him to prepare a better application for a future meeting. The Committee suggested that, when reviewing a subsequent application, they may recommend approval of the first-story rear infill addition, the restoration of the Clinton Street side porch with a metal roof, the side addition and deck directly behind the Clinton Street side porch, and the reconstruction of the two-story addition at the piazza.

Mr. Broh again noted his intention to consider withdrawing the application. Committee members expressed concern about the possibility that Mr. Broh might not withdraw, but instead proceed to the Commission at its 13 May 2005 meeting. Ms. Voith suggested that all aspects of the design that can be recommended for approval should be recommended as "in concept" only because of the myriad details that have not been defined or that may change as the design is refined. Her fellow Committee members agreed.

The Architectural Committee recommended the following:

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

All recommendations are 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 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.]; 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.].

101-113 Walnut Street

Owner: 101 Walnut Street, LLC

Applicant: John F. Tucker, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects

History: vacant lot, 103-105 Walnut Street, built c. 1845, demolished 1996

107-109 Walnut Street, built c. 1872, demolished 1996

Project: Construct 12-story residential building

This application proposes the construction of a 12-story residential building with parking at the ground level. The lot, which is located at the northwest corner of Front and Walnut Streets, is currently vacant. The buildings that once stood at 103-105 and 107-109 Walnut Street were individually designated on 26 May 1970. On 13 December 1995, the Commission approved the demolition of the buildings, provided a “fence wall” was constructed. The buildings were demolished, but the required wall was never built. On 12 December 2003, the Commission created the Old City Historic District; the lot was included in the district and classified as “non-contributing.” The Commission, however, has not rescinded the earlier individual listing.

In 2003, the current development team (owner, 101 Walnut Street, LLC; architect, Bower Lewis Thrower; and attorneys, Ronald Patterson and Carl Primavera of Klehr Harrison) sought approvals for a different residential project at this site. On 13 March 2003, Laura Spina of the Commission staff stamped the zoning application for that project “Subject to Historical Commission Approval of Building Permit Application,” informing the development team of the Commission’s jurisdiction because of the site’s individual listings on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. On 8 August 2003, with both the individual and district designations in place, the Department of Licenses & Inspections mistakenly issued a building permit for foundations without referral to the Commission. The foundation permit expired, for no work began within the required six months.

On 15 March 2004, the City Planning Commission approved the Walnut Street façade of the currently proposed building.

The current application does not provide adequate information, especially about the façade materials. The façade drawings are not sufficiently annotated.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 14-2007(6)(k)(.4) of the Commission’s ordinance. The proposed building is not compatible with the character of the Old City Historic District in materials, features, size, scale, proportion, and massing. The building would overwhelm its smaller historic neighbors and forever change the Old City skyline. The unbroken walls, garage door, and overhanging balconies would detract significantly from the streetscape.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Mary Issacson of Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers, developer Gagan Lakhmna, and architect John Tucker of Bower Lewis Thrower Architects represented the application. Mr. Tucker disclosed that the proposed new construction would consist of 10 residential units, terraces over the garage and on the roof, parking on the ground floor, and a lobby. The materials would consist of pre-cast on the lower level and metal panels on the upper floors. Mr. Lakhmna argued that the Commission’s jurisdiction should be limited to 45-day-review-and-comment jurisdiction because the lots are currently vacant.

Mr. Thomas questioned the proposed building's compatibility with the surrounding Old City streetscape. He pointed out that Front and Walnut are very important streets and that the design of the base of the building is very important. He stated that the base should offer interest to pedestrians and reveal activity inside the building. Mr. Tyler cited the recently reviewed project at 300 Vine Street, which offers an admirable treatment of the garage level. Ms. Voith contended that this design for the Front and Walnut building would have an extremely negative effect on the streetscape. She asked the applicant to provide an elevation of the entire Walnut and Front blocks to demonstrate how the proposed design would relate to the surroundings. Mr. Thomas inquired about the basement and Mr. Tucker responded that the basement would be used for storage. Mr. Thomas suggested that the applicant consider relocating the parking to the basement to allow the west end of the street-level building to be used for commercial or restaurant space to enliven the streetscape. Committee members concurred that the first floor should be redesigned. They rejected the blank walls, garage door, trash door, and other features unsympathetic to the pedestrian experience of the historic neighborhood. Mr. Lakhmna was emphatic that this building's use be limited to residential. He rejected any commercial space in the building.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance commented that this is the worst design he has ever seen for Center City. He contended that the design should be compatible with the streetscape. He stated that he would accept a well-designed building with contemporary styling that would contrast with the surrounding historic district. Mr. Gallery posited that a six-story building spread across the site with two units per floor would be more appropriate. He asserted that there is no precedent for the proposed design, with the projecting balconies, which are inappropriate in Old City. He reminded the Committee that Walnut at Front Street is the entrance to Penn's Landing. Mr. Gallery commented on the choice of materials, which he believes is inconsistent with the character of the Old City Historic District. He opined that townhouses would be more appropriate. He also suggested that the entire area between Front and Hancock north of Walnut should be planned at one time.

Marsha Bacall, a resident, claimed that the ambiance and flavor of Old City would be disrupted by the proposed new construction. She lamented the construction of I-95 and suggested that this section of the city should be treated with more consideration.

Joel Maumer of the Society Hill Towers Neighborhood Association stated that the developer should meet with the neighborhood to discuss his proposal. He noted that an appropriate building on this vacant lot would enhance the neighborhood, but asserted that neighbors must be involved.

The Committee concluded that the design should be significantly improved. The street facades should be altered to enhance the street life; the parking should be relocated to the basement; the scale and height of the building should be reduced; the projecting balconies should be deleted; the north wall should be articulated; and the quality of the styling should be improved. They concluded that the proposed building is not compatible with the streetscape.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and Section 14-2007(6)(k)(.4), which mandates that "in

making its determination as to the appropriateness of ...construction , the Commission shall consider ... the compatibility of the proposed work with the character of the historic district ...including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape."

263 N. 3rd Street

Owner: M & G Development

Applicant: Gerry Gutierrez, Group G Architects

History: c. 1840 as a four-story building; all but first story demolished after 1921

Project: Add four stories, renovate existing first story

This application proposes the construction of four stories atop this one-story Non-contributing building in the Old City Historic District. It was constructed as a four-story building about 1840. At some point after 1921, the top three stories were removed, leaving the extant one-story building.

The first floor would be developed as restaurant space and the upper four floors would be devoted to residential space. The building would be faced with painted stucco and topped by a tall mansard clad with synthetic slate. The mansard would hide a roof deck and rooftop mechanical equipment. A stair tower would stand at the rear. The rear of the building faces Bodine Street and the entrance plaza to the Painted Bride Art Center.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided the stucco is color-integral, not painted; the window-railing combinations are refined (double-hung windows should not have railings; tall casements should); and the rear façade facing the Painted Bride is improved; with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Mike Guadagno and Gerry Gutierrez, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Gutierrez said that he is receptive to refining the railing designs at the windows. He is agreeable to a color-integral stucco. He stated that the mansard derives from historic precedents in Old City. He offered that the rear façade would be redesigned and the trash collection relocated to the interior to improve the building's east façade.

Mr. Gallery of the Preservation Alliance commented on the mansard, which he contended is inappropriate for Old City.

Most Committee members objected not to the mansard as a roof type, but to this particular design. They noted that the mansard was oddly proportioned; the windows appear to be set too low in the roof. They acknowledged that the mansard was tall to high rooftop decks and mechanical equipment, but suggested that the architect redesign it to make it appear less tall. They also asserted that its pitch is far too steep. Mr. Baron suggested a hipped or gambrel mansard with two pitches, a steep lower pitch and a shallower upper pitch. Committee members concurred, but noted that the pitch of the lower portion of the roof must still be reduced; as submitted, it is nearly vertical. The owner of the building agreed that a mansard with two pitches might solve the proportion problem.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided a gambrel or hipped mansard is substituted for the proposed mansard; the stucco is color-integral, not painted; the window-railing combinations are refined; and the rear elevation facing Bodine Street and the Painted Bride is improved, with the Architectural Committee and staff to review the revised proposal and 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.].

307 South 17th Street aka 1636 Spruce Street

George Bochetto, Owner

I. M. Christian Associates, LTD, Applicant

DATE: c1860 designated individually 1970, contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Residential historic district 1995.

PROPOSAL: Legalize cornice replacement, mortar removal; clean brick

This application proposes to legalize work that exceeded a permit to repair a gutter. Although the applicant was asked to return for a new permit if visible fabric needed to be replaced, the contractor decided to remove the entire crown molding on the north and west facades of the building and to replace it with a similar molding. No original material was preserved to gauge the accuracy of the new molding. The applicant said that the molding was rotten and could not be saved. In addition, the contractor replaced several brackets and the bottom portion of the pilasters surrounding the dormers also without a permit or Historical Commission review.

Masonry work was also undertaken without a permit or Historical Commission review. The mason has cut out the joints on the bottom half of the building and the owner wishes to continue to cut out the remaining joints. The owner does not intend to repoint the brick after the joints are cut out. He then wishes to clean the façade using a water pressure of 600 pounds per square inch. The Commission routinely limits power washing of brick facades to 500 psi.

The building has had a history of work without permits. Under the previous owner, the beaded board in the pediments of the dormers was replaced with glass and a window in the stoop was in-filled with glass block. A violation was issued in 1999 for that work and the Commission voted in June of 2001 to deny legalization of the work. Not only was that work not corrected, but the slate roof tiles have subsequently been painted a glossy grey. The new owner purchased the property with the aforementioned violation on record.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6. The building should be re-pointed to prevent water infiltration, with staff to review details. In addition, the other violations should be corrected. The staff lacks the evidence to fully gauge the degree to which the new woodwork matches the old, but the bracket seems to differ from the original in some details

Mr. Baron explained the application, noting that no examples survive of the bases of the dormer pilasters or the cornice crown molding to gauge the authenticity of the new woodwork. He noted that the brackets in the photographs appear to have a metal cladding and a curved end molding, which is not replicated on the new wood brackets.

Kevin McDonnell and Anthony Buccini attended the meeting. Mr. McDonnell explained that they had gotten a permit to repair the gutter, but, after discovering rotten woodwork, decided to replace the cornice and some brackets. He said that he thought that the brackets might have been covered in metal as a repair. Committee and staff members thought that the metal was probably original since the bays have a metal cladding. The

applicant claims that the owner wants to restore the property, which has undergone faulty repairs. Mr. Buccini proposes to restore the cornice and the front of the pilasters and replicate the crown molding. He stressed that the work proceeded without the benefit of permits owing to an emergency situation. He presented a letter to the Committee outlining the proposed alterations. The owner now proposes to repoint the building; the Committee rejected with the mortar mix.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the new conjectural woodwork with a curved molding added to the roof brackets to match the photograph and subject to the repointing of the wall with the appropriate mortar, restoring the bead board on top of the dormer windows, removing the glass block from the stoop, and installing a new wood window as mandated by the Commission in 2001, with staff to review details.

265 South 19th Street

Premier Fiduciary Properties I, LP, Owner

Lanny Leibowitz, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855, alterations c.1960

PROPOSAL: New windows, remodel bay, legalize deck

This application proposes several alterations to the facades of this corner building. On the front, side, and rear façades, the architect proposes the installation of new wood, two-over-two windows. No details have been provided. On the side façade, the plans show the removal of balconies that were probably added in the 1960s and their replacement with stucco-finished bays. The building probably featured a two-story bay in this location. Masonry work will include closing cuts made for air-conditioners and installing matching brick. Plans also call for a small rear addition and legalizing a rear roof deck that appears in the designation photograph.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the windows, deck and masonry work pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of the new bays, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron outlined the proposal. Lanny Leibowitz, the architect, presented revised drawings to reflect the staff's recommendation of a single two-story bay. He proposes to remove the rear stucco and then restucco and add a painted metal bay. Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the height of the windows in the bay. He thought that they should mimic the existing windows' height. Committee members concurred that the single painted metal bay should have several horizontal moldings, a cornice, and windows to match the height of the existing. Mr. Leibowitz presented a new drawing showing a single two-story bay with a stucco finish.

Mr. Leibowitz also introduced a new drawing with newly cut side windows and new longer windows for the first-floor front. The Committee discussed whether the longer windows would cut into original brick and marble under the cast stone façade and whether the front windows, if replaced, should match the originals. It was decided that this issue should be reviewed again after the staff has inspected the building to determine the extent of the original materials.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the upper-floor windows, deck, masonry work, and one-story addition at the 3rd-floor level. They also recommended approval of the two-story side bay, subject to a revised design in painted wood or metal with horizontal cornices and belt-courses, 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 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.]. Denial of the new first-floor windows pending receipt of an application with further information, 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 with documentary and physical evidence.].

2124-26 Wallace Street

Jonathan & Lorraine Wilson, Owners

Charles Loomis, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Rebuild façade, alter windows and cornice line

An application to modify the front façade of this double carriage house was reviewed by the Historical Commission at its December 10th 2004 meeting. At that time, the Commission approved the restoration of several openings, but denied the proposal to raise the cornice and the heads of the second-floor windows. Since that time the applicant has appealed the Commission's decision to the Licenses & Inspections Review Board. While undertaking permitted interior work, the applicant has inspected the inside of the front wall and found voids between the inner and outer wythes of brick. An engineer has examined the wall and proposes two alternate courses of action. Option One involves repair of the existing façade including rebuilding some portions of the wall and pinning the wall with closely spaced Heli-fix anchors and nine star bolts. The applicant says that this would require greater maintenance and would be less uniform in appearance. Option Two involves demolishing the façade and rebuilding it with the higher cornice and raised second-floor windows in a fashion similar to, though not identical to, the proposal the Commission denied in December.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the Option One repair, with staff to review details; denial of the demolition and reconstruction of the façade, pursuant to the Commission's decision of December 2004 and Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and asserted that the Standards argue for the preservation of the actual historical fabric. Concerns about the loss of a uniform appearance are not addressed by the Standards.

Jonathan Wilson, the owner, Juliet Geldi, and Chariss McAfee, the architect, attended the meeting. Ms. McAfee disclosed that the opening of the wall has shown that the wythes of brick have been separating. She noted the extensive alterations, which have changed the proportions of this building. The cornice was removed, the windows replaced, and the existing lintels changed. The wall is four inches out of plumb, causing major problems. Ms. McAfee pointed out that anchors in the joints would be very visible and that saving the façade will not cure the problem. She added that, if preserved, the appearance will not be pleasing. She proposed to replace the wall, doors, windows and cornice.

Mr. Baron offered that the appearance of the new brick and the size of the joint would differ from the historic. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the Heli-fix anchors can be installed from the interior, preserving the historic look of the wall. Mr. Wilson remarked that the building would appear wounded. Ms. McAfee stressed that the misalignment of the wall is a critical problem.

Committee members discussed whether the replacement wall should follow the design of the original as stipulated by Standard 6, but several members thought that the Standard did not apply because the building was already severely compromised when the roof was raised.

Allan Rubin of the Spring Garden Civic Association argued that the façade is not salvageable and concurs with the applicant.

Several Committee members thought that the Department of Licenses & Inspections should render a decision about the condition of the building. Mr. McCoubrey stated his belief that the building has already been compromised.

Three members of the Architectural Committee recommended approval of Option 2 to rebuild the wall with a thin mortar joint, with staff to review details.

Mr. D'Alessandro did not agree and recommended that the façade should be repaired, 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 with documentary and physical evidence.].

1730 Pine Street

1700 Street Properties, Owner

Don Ventresca, Applicant

DATE: c.1840

PROPOSAL: Legalize replacement deck on roof

This application proposes the legalization of a roof deck that is situated largely on the rear ell of the rowhouse.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided the deck is pulled back to sit only on the rear ell, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Ventresca explained that the owner began to replace a deck that existed when he bought the building.

Committee members thought that the deck would not have visibility from the front. They contended that the Commission should maintain its consistent policy of denying applications for decks on the main blocks of the rowhouses when they can be situated on rear ells.

The Committee unanimously recommended approval of the deck, provided the front is pulled back about nine feet to sit only on the rear ell, 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 Roofing Guideline: "It is recommended ... to design additions to roofs such as...decks, 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.”

319 Market Street

Owner/Applicant: Markanni Enterprises, Inc.

History: Built 1831, designated on September 1970 and December 2003, classified Significant

Project: Removal of canopy and alley door and construction of pergola.

This application proposes changes to an existing side deck. The deck appears to have been in place prior to the year 2000, when this property had much work legalized. The applicant proposes to eliminate the existing canopy and railing and replace them with a pergola design of pressure treated posts resting on top of the existing stucco wall. The design would also include planters in between posts. There are no proposed changes in this application to the existing stucco wall along Market Street.

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

Mr. Gerry Gutierrez and Mr. George Markakis attended the meeting. Mr. Danta presented the proposal.

Mr. Gutierrez explained the need to replace the deck owing to its deteriorated condition and elaborated on the design of the new deck. Mr. McCoubrey inquired if the new pergola would be keyed into the building. Mr. Gutierrez replied that it would not, that it would rest on the low wall adjacent to the building.

The committee unanimously concurred with the staff's recommendation to approve the proposal.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, 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.]; 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.]; and the Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as decks so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

114 Quarry Street.

Owner/Applicant: Nik Vedejs

History: Built 1908, designated on December 1984 and December 2003, classified contributing.

Project: Alteration of window into door to access a new proposed balcony

This applicant proposes to add a balcony and reconfigure a window into a door to access it. 114 Quarry Street, the address given in the application, was consolidated with 141-43 N. 2nd Street; both buildings are now internally connected. The proposed work would in fact take place at 141-43 N. 2nd Street.

The proposed balcony would be accessed through a new door, which would be cut into

an existing window opening. The door would retain the existing window's width and would be a two leaf design. The balcony would be located on the building's North façade at the third-floor level. It would extend 5 feet front the façade of the building and would expand 22 feet encompassing four bays. The balcony would be supported by steel cables at three points, which in turn would be attached to three steel beams projecting from the façade.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the proposed balcony. However, the staff suggests that the condo association develop a master balcony plan with design, dimensions, materials, etc. for the entire building that all unit owners can follow. This recommendation is made pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

Mr. Scott Ritchie and Mr. Giovanni Caputto attended the meeting. Mr. Danta presented the proposal.

Mr. Ritchie explained the proposal and mentioned that the condo association had already approved the exterior changes. Mr. Rivera recommended that the association should approve a balcony master plan to be followed by all condo owners in the future. Mr. McCoubrey had some reservations regarding the design. He mentioned that if all the owners decided to integrate balconies to their units the elevation would become overrun by cables. Mr. Baron pointed out that this was a side elevation, to which Mr. Ritchie also added that the units were two stories and not visible from North 2nd Street. Mr. Rivera contended that the balconies should not encroach on neighboring property lines. Mr. Ritchie replied that the adjacent building, over which the proposed balcony would suspend, is part of the same condo and owned by the same association. Mr. D'Alessandro mentioned that although the proposed balcony would not be seen from North 2nd Street, if the association would approved a master scheme it should specifically mention that balconies would not be allowed beyond the existing eastern most windows.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided the applicant submits a letter to the Commission confirming the adoption of master plan defining this balcony type for the entire building prior to the 13 May 2005 Commission meeting, with staff to review details. If such a letter is not received prior to the Commission meeting, the Committee recommends denial of the proposal, 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].

1519-21 Wallace Street.

Owner/Applicant: Spring Properties Development

Project: New construction on vacant lots

This application proposes new construction on a vacant lot. The lot was vacant at the time of the designation of the Spring Garden Historic District and appears to have been recently subdivided. The proposed new construction would be a three-story, three-bay brick townhouse. This application is for review and comment of the proposed new construction pursuant to the *Rules & Regulations* of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, Article 8.1, section 14-2007(7)(d).

Staff Recommendation: The staff commends the design, which is compatible with the historic district, but suggests that the decks not be visible from the front façade.

Mr. Greg Deutsch and Mr. Allan Rubin attended the meeting. Mr. Danta presented the proposal.

Mr. Deutsch explained the changes to the design that had taken place since the application was submitted. He explained that the lot lines would be redrawn to yield two equal width townhouses. He also elaborated on other changes, such as, the elimination of roof decks and changes to the brick coursing, garage doors, and window sills.

Mr. Levy inquired on the reasons for reconfiguring the lots. Mr. Rubin mentioned that same width houses would maintain consistency of the streetscape. Mr. Levy added that these lots were not equal widths historically, thus the houses that stood on them would not have been equal widths either. Mr. McCoubrey questioned the reasons for single-pane transoms throughout the front facade. He mentioned it would look better if the transoms were divided to carry the verticality of the façade and the two leaf door design. Mr. Rivera objected to the crossbar design of the garage doors. He mentioned it would give the impression of a carriage house door and would not be appropriate in this context. Mr. D'Alessandro seconded the suggestion to change the design of the doors and suggested that the lintels be dropped so as not to align with the entryway to the house. Mr. Rivera also suggested changing the location of the second-floor bathrooms from the bedrooms to the hallway in order to increase the size of the bedrooms.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the new construction, with staff to review details.

1527 North Street.

Owner/Applicant: Spring Properties Development.

Project: New construction on vacant lots

This application proposes a new three-story, three-bay townhouse on a lot vacant at the time of designation of the Spring Garden Historic District. The house would be located at the corner of North and Sydenham Streets. This application is for review and comment of the proposed new construction pursuant to the *Rules & Regulations* of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, Article 8.1, section 14-2007(7)(d).

Staff Recommendation: The staff commends the design, which is compatible with the historic district, but suggests that the second-floor square windows be lengthened to full height, the balcony rails be simplified, the mullions on the windows be proportionate, and the water table be shortened to a point below the ground-floor window sills.

Mr. Greg Deutsch and Mr. Allan Rubin attended the meeting. Mr. Danta presented the proposal.

Mr. Deutsch presented updated drawings to the committee members and proceeded to explain changes to the design that had taken place since the submittal of the application. Mr. Rivera requested an explanation for the recessed panels with different brick sizes and coursing below the second-floor windows. Mr. Rubin explained that this treatment is found in other houses along North Street. Mr. Rivera mentioned that it should be articulated differently, given that the infill looked like an afterthought. Mr. D'Alessandro seconded Mr. Rivera's point and added that the sill should be brought up

to meet the bottom of the windows owing to their water shedding function. He pointed out that functional elements, such as sills, should not be treated as decorative elements. This point was seconded by all Committee members. Lastly, Mr. Levy mentioned that the water table should be dropped below or at the level of ground-floor window sills.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with staff to review details.

2038-2040 Rittenhouse Square

Owner: Stephen and Ann Gitter

Applicant: Lisa Neely

History: Built c. 1890, designated February 1995

Project: Replacement of existing skylight and addition of roof deck with stair access

This former carriage house is located in the middle of the 2000 block of Rittenhouse Street. Its rear elevation faces a service alley. The application proposes the construction of a zinc-clad stair access to the roof, which would open onto a new roof deck. The stair access would be flush with the west parapet wall and set back approximately 24 feet. The roof deck would have two levels and would be set back 10 feet from the front façade and 22 feet from the rear façade. In addition, the applicant proposes to replace an existing skylight with a new bronze and aluminum skylight.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the new skylight and roof deck, provided it is set back of 15 feet from front façade, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Ann Gitter, Ms. Lisa Neely, and Mr. Vittorio Ginzburg attended the meeting. Mr. Danta presented the proposal.

Ms. Neely elaborated on the proposed design and the choice of materials. She brought samples of the proposed materials and circulated them among the Committee members. She pointed out in her explanation that the current skylight was not historic, dated to the 1970s, and that it currently leaked. She also explained her awareness and consideration regarding visibility of the roof deck. She stated that the proposed setback would be sufficient to prevent visibility owing to the proposed railing height. Mr. Levy asked if the proposed railing height was consistent with code compliance. Ms. Neely replied that it was compliant since it was based on the distance of the drop off. The Committee members commended the owner and architect on the choice of materials.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval, 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.]; 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]; and the Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as decks so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jorge Danta and Diane M. Hughes