

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
28 December 2004**

Present

Vincent Rivera, Chair
Rudolph D'Alessandro
Herbert Levy, AIA
Suzanne Pentz
Daniela Voith, AIA

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

Also

Edwin Rivera
Jud Davidson
Neil Sandvold, Sandvold Blanda
Ray Diebel, Smith Playground
Gregory Oliveri
William G. Schwartz, 1904 Spring Garden Street
Robert D. Harvey, 1910 Spring Garden Street
Robert J. Hotes, DPK&A Architects
Betsy Carson, Playcare, Inc.
Tom McHall, RGV Builders
Rob Ventresca, RGV Builders
Paul Ventresca, RGV Builders
John Bushnell, Cope Linder Architects
Kevin Kelly
David W. O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbor's Association
Marlise Ellis, Queen Village Neighbor's Association
Brian Pinheiro
Melissa Pinheiro
Jeff Carson, City Sign
Steve Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Angela Tobin, 821 South 3rd Street
Christopher Tobin, 821 South 3rd Street
Steve Bolinger, Agoos/Lovera Architects
Anna Maria Ferraro, Positano Restaurant
Pei-Chih Carter, Synterra, Ltd.
James Lokoff, 528 Pine Street
Donald Phimister, 528 Pine Street
Raymond Rola, 1617 John F. Kennedy Boulevard
Mark Wieand, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Chris Tucker, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Timothy Calligan, Chestnut Hill Academy
Maleda Berhane, Chestnut Hill Academy
Jason Sieminski, Chestnut Hill Academy
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance

Vincent Rivera, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

210-212 New Street

Lagerhouse Development Associates, LP, owner

Jud Davidson, applicant

History: Buildings combined, front facade added, 1923

Project: Add penthouse, deck, balcony, windows, doors, gate, and fence

This application proposes several alterations and additions to a building on the south side of New Street, to the west of N. 2nd Street. The building is listed as non-contributing in the Old City Historic District. Pursuant to Section 6.5 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, if the application is approved by the Committee, it need not be reviewed by the Commission. The building as it now stands was created in 1923, when two older buildings on the lot were consolidated and the front façade added.

At the north or front façade, it proposes the addition of steps up to an extent balcony. At the east or side façade, it proposes new window and door openings, a balcony, and new steps to a parking area. At the roof, it proposes a large penthouse and roof deck. It also proposes a new driveway gate, fence around the yard, and sidewalk planter. Little detail information is provided. For example, no information about materials for the windows, doors, gates, or penthouse cladding has been included.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided the deck and railing are set back from the front façade of the historic building to the line of the addition (6'-6" from the front façade), with staff to review details including the gate and fence, pursuant to Standard 9.

Jonathan Farnham of the staff presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jud Davidson represented the owner. The Committee first discussed the deck and addition. Daniela Voith of the Committee noted discrepancies between the elevations and plans. She was especially concerned about the design of the railings and/or planters across the front of the deck. The elevation depicts a railing extending across the entirety of the façade; the plan shows it terminating before reaching the west property line. She pointed out the asymmetrical positioning of the addition and suggested that the railing should be extended to the west property line to restore the symmetry. Mr. Davidson acknowledged the discrepancies and stated that he and his client were still exploring the railing design and considering railings or planters. Mr. Rivera asserted that the drawings should represent the entirety of the proposal; if alternates are under consideration, they should be documented in the drawings. Mr. Rivera and Ms. Voith suggested that the applicant return to the Committee with an improved deck design.

The Committee reviewed the other aspects of the proposal. Committee members agreed that the new window and door openings as well as the new steps and sidewalk planter were acceptable, but asserted that the drawings needed to be complete and consistent. They noted the lack of details included with the application and contended that a further Committee review was necessary.

The Architectural Committee voted to approve the application, provided the deck railing runs across the entire front façade of the building, with the Architectural Committee to review details, especially the deck railing, at a subsequent Committee meeting, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the

property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

JF

2330 Madison Square

Gregory Oliveri and Peter Adels, owners

Gregory Oliveri, applicant

History: 1865

Project: Construct rear addition

This application proposes the demolition of a very small, non-historic rear vestibule and the construction of an infill addition in its place under an existing second-story bay. The south façade of the addition and existing bay above, which is now sided with asphalt shingles, would be sided with wood clapboards. The application claims that wood clapboarding is the historic material. To satisfy Rehabilitation Standard 9, the non-historic first-floor addition should be sided with a material other than the bay's historic clapboards. No information, such as an elevation drawing, has been provided about the east façade of the addition. An elevation drawing should be included in the application.

The application also proposes the replacement of the front door. More information should be provided, but the proposed door appears appropriate.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided the first-story addition is faced with a sand-finish stucco to differentiate it from the clapboarded bay, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Gregory Oliveri represented the ownership.. Mr. Levy and Ms. Voith objected to the unarticulated south facade of the addition and agreed with the staff that the new first-floor section needed to be differentiated from the historic second-story bay. They disagreed with the staff that the first-floor section should be faced with stucco. They suggested a skirt board to separate the new first floor and old second floor; they also suggested either a different wood clapboard or wood panels at the first floor. The applicant agreed to explore options to differentiate the two segments. The Committee also noted the need for an east elevation drawing for the addition and bay.

The Committee stated that the proposed door was appropriate as either a true or simulated double-leaf door. It suggested that the staff review the door details not included with the submission. Mr. Farnham reported that Mr. Baron had recently worked with a neighbor to determine the design of the historic door.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided the wood siding of the first-floor addition is differentiated from the wood clapboards on the second-floor bay, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [*Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*]; 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 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.].

JF

1904 Spring Garden Street

1904-1908 Spring Garden LLC, owner

William G. Schwartz, applicant

History: Commission approved demolition of extant building in November 2004

Project: Construct 5-story residential building

This application proposes the construction of a five-story residential building. The Historical Commission approved the demolition of the non-contributing building currently on the site at its November 2004 meeting. The front façade drawings included with the present application contradict one another. One specifies large brackets supporting the central bay; the other does not.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided the large brackets supporting the central bay are deleted, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney William Schwartz and architect Neil Sandvold represented the owner. Mr. Sandvold stated that he was willing to delete the brackets from the design.

Mr. Rivera thought that the design of the bay was not in character with the remainder of the building. Ms. Voith agreed and asserted that the windows in the bay as well as the dormers had been designed in a vocabulary unlike that of the rest of the building. She also noted that the dormers were awkwardly spaced. Mr. Rivera suggested that the architect rethink the designs of the bay, dormers, and small windows at the first floor.

The Committee stated that the design of the rear facade and the reconstruction of the historic rear wall are appropriate.

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

JF

1600-1622 Green Street

RGV Builder LLC, owner

John Bushnell, applicant

History: Vacant lot

Project: Review and Comment – Construct 16 townhouses

This application proposes the construction of 16 townhouses on a vacant lot on the west side of N. 16th Street between Green and Brandywine Streets. The development will not require the demolition of any structures.

Ten townhouses will face Green Street; six will face Brandywine. All will have rear garages entered from a driveway off N. 16th Street. The houses will be faced with brick. They will include small fenced front yards and roof decks. The houses are designed to

fit their context. Although not historic reproductions, they maintain the materials, scale, rhythm, fenestration patterns, and cornice heights of the neighborhood.

Staff Comment: The proposed buildings are appropriate to the Spring Garden Historic District.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect John Bushnell and developers Paul and Robert Ventresca represented the ownership. Mr. Levy objected to the designs for the Green Street buildings, contending that they look too much like Portico Row. Mr. Rivera countered that he often copied historic buildings while designing.

Mr. Levy asked the applicants how the townhouses would be priced. Paul Ventresca explained that the Brandywine units would be priced at \$750,000 and the Green Street units would be priced at \$850,000 and up.

Ms. Voith asked the architect to present the designs. Mr. Bushnell summarized the designs and the reasoning behind the design decisions. The Committee congratulated him for locating all of the garages at the rears, off the streets. Mr. Bushnell then presented his materials board with samples of the materials and colors. The Committee deemed the choices appropriate.

The Architectural Committee expressed its appreciation for the commendable presentation and commented that the proposal represents a very high quality of architecture. It especially noted the rear garages, which should serve as a model for similar developments.

JF

1550 North 33rd Street, Smith Playground

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Robert J. Hotes, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1899, James Windrim, architect

PROPOSAL: Construct gatehouse, dismantle and store pavilion, restore and landscape playground

This proposal calls for renovations to the Smith Playground and structures. The applicants plan to disassemble an octagonal pavilion, restore an historic slide and adapt it for handicap accessibility, and construct a gateway building. They will modify the landscape with paths that partially reestablish an historic oval in front of the main building and move the parking area farther from the main structure, establish a separate picnic area and new paths with shallower grades to allow better accessibility.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the proposal except the removal of the pavilion, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Robert Hotes of DPK&A, Ray Diebel of Urban Engineers, Pei-Chih Carter of Synterra Ltd., and Betsy Caesar of Playcare, Inc. represented the project.

Mr. Hotes offered an overview of the project. He stated that he is seeking to balance historic preservation with the requirements of a modern, safe playground. He explained that a swimming pool would be removed. Mr. Baron noted that the application made no

mention of the pool. He asked Mr. Hotes to provide photographs of the pool. Mr. Hotes said that he would submit them. Mr. Hotes explained that the parking area would be moved away from the main building toward the street and that the oval walk in front of the main building would be restored. Relocating the parking would enhance safety. He remarked that the existing fencing would be removed and new fencing added to enhance safety and divided the food and non-food areas. Committee members asked for further information on the fencing. Mr. Hotes stated that he and his clients had not yet made the fencing decisions. The Committee asserted that it would need information on the fencing before it could review the proposal fully.

Discussion shifted to the historic slide building. Mr. Hotes stated that he planned to remove a non-historic shed addition at the upper end and a non-historic roof addition at the lower end. He also planned to replace the siding, roofing, and shutters. He added that he intended to remove the stairway running along the slide and extend the slide flooring across the entirety of the building. The slide flooring would be extended, running up the walls to the bottoms of the windows. Stainless steel screening would cover the window openings. A boardwalk would be added to the slide, replacing the stair and linking the top and bottom. Ms. Voith stated that she had not been provided with any information about some of the significant alterations to the slide building. She and Mr. Levy asked rhetorically if this was an in-concept application. They asked Mr. Hotes for drawings of the boardwalk, which would connect to the slide building. He pointed to it on the site plan, but offered no plans for it. The Committee insisted that plans of the boardwalk addition to the slide building must be submitted for review. Committee members asked about the removal of the slide stair and the alterations to the flooring and additions of the screen. Ms. Voith asserted that the stair is an essential part of the slide experience; children have as much fun watching their friends while climbing to the top as they do sliding down. Mr. Hotes stated that the stair is a hazard and is not within the Commission's purview. Ms. Pentz countered that the stair is within the Commission's jurisdiction, because the slide building is an open pavilion without a distinct interior. Members contended that they needed more details about the new flooring and screening to assess the proposal adequately.

Mr. Hotes then addressed the new gatehouse building, which would have a block base, wood siding, and metal roof. Ms. Voith stated that information about topography and context was essential to a complete review. She asserted that she had no way of relating the proposed building to the surrounding structures and site. She requested further information.

Mr. Hotes explained that a Fairmount Park guard house would be moved to the site. Committee members requested photographs of the guard house to determine if it would be appropriate to the site.

Committee members asked if the colors of the playground areas on the site plan corresponded to the actual colors of the paving materials. Ms. Caesar explained that they did not. The paving colors had not yet been determined.

Mr. Hotes turned the conversation to the hexagonal pavilion. He stated that it was located near the slide, that it had covered a large sandbox at one time but was now paved with concrete, and that he planned to dismantle it for possible later reassembly elsewhere on the site. Mr. Rivera asked when and where it would be re-erected. Mr. Hotes identified its new location on the site plan, noted that it would be used for picnicking, and asserted that it could re-erected as part of Phase 1 of the project. Mr. Baron pressed for a means to ensure that it would be moved, not dismantled and stored indefinitely.

Ms. Voith, Ms. Pentz, Mr. Rivera, Mr. D'Alessandro, and Mr. Levy again insisted that the application was incomplete. Ms. Voith asked for more information on the relationships between the historic and proposed structures at the site. Ms. Pentz requested more information on the slide modifications and additions. Mr. Rivera noted that this inadequate application consists merely of a site plan and a few details. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. Mr. Hotes countered that he needed to comply with strict safety standards. Ms. Voith replied that he needed to provide complete information on the proposal regardless of the safety standards driving the design. Mr. Levy stated that the Committee could not judge the application without complete information.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial owing to the incompleteness of the application. It suggested that the applicants provide complete information on the relationships of the old, new, and relocated buildings to the site and to one another including a section through the site; complete plans for the slide with boardwalk; plans for the playgrounds; plans for all new fencing; photographs of the pool to be demolished and the guard house to be added.

JF

2027-2039 Sansom Street

Sansom Asset Management, Owner

Steven Bolinger, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1925, garage

PROPOSAL: Replace non-historic storefront

The application proposes renovations to a storefront in an Art Deco parking garage. Plans call for the removal of a white brick veneer and installation of a new storefront of metal panels. The new storefront as designed would cut into the original masonry fabric that remains behind the non-historic brick veneer. The staff has requested that the applicant revise the proposal to retain the hidden historic fabric and base the new storefront on the piece of historic storefront that exists on the western end of the building. The architect is planning to revise the design.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the design as submitted, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. He noted that it had been revised since the plans were distributed to the Committee. Architect Steven Bollinger represented the project.

Mr. Bollinger explained that he had revised the application after Mr. Baron informed him that it is likely that the historic storefront openings survive under the non-historic masonry veneer. He now plans to remove the non-historic veneer and install a storefront window system in the historic opening.

Committee members inquired about the proposed sign. Mr. Bollinger stated that it would be opaque and externally lit. He noted that the lighting would recreate the sense of a spotlight on a stage.

Ms. Pentz inquired about new mechanical systems. Mr. Bolinger pointed out ducts that would run up the exterior of the building at the rear. Ms. Voith expressed her opposition to the exterior ductwork and asked if it could be run through the interior. Mr. Bollinger stated that he would consult with the building owner to determine whether running the ductwork through the interior is feasible.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised design, which stipulates the removal of the non-historic brick veneer and the installation of the new storefront and the sign, but denial of the exterior ductwork. It suggested that the ductwork be run through the interior of the building to the roof.

JF

235 Bainbridge Street

Melissa Pinheiro, Owner

Nick Malespina, Applicant

DATE: Built between 1761 and 1770 for George Leadbetter, mariner and tavern keeper

PROPOSAL: Legalize the removal of a pent eave and addition of a coved pent eave

The project calls for the legalization of the removal of a half-gable pent eave and its replacement with a new coved pent eave. The half-gable pent eave was installed with the Commission's approval in 1979. The new pent eave would have a cove rather than flat soffit, would include lights in the cove, and would be roofed with slate. The illegally removed eave had lights in the flat soffit, but no record of their approval by the Commission can be found. Neither the shape nor the projection of the proposed pent eave is historically appropriate. The proposed eave is very flat and elongated in shape; it would project 26.5" from the facade. Historic coved eaves are tall with a bold, short curve; they project about 16.5" from the facade. The slate roofing proposed for the eave is also historically inappropriate. Cedar shakes or weathered wood-colored timberline asphalt/fiberglass shingles would be appropriate.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Melissa and Brian Pinheiro, the building owners, represented the application.

The members of the Architectural Committee reviewed the application and unanimously agreed that the pent eave proposed is inappropriate for this c. 1765 house. Mr. Rivera stated that the shape of the cove and the amount of projection do not approximate a mid-eighteenth-century coved pent eave. Ms. Pentz stated that the cove should be stucco or plaster, not wood as is proposed. Mr. D'Alessandro asserted that the proposed molding for the fascia is not suitable. He contended that it is simply a conglomeration of interior moldings unrelated to the Georgian pent eave. Ms. Voith stated that the contractor who executed the drawings does not understand historic architecture. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed and added that the pent eave, as designed, would quickly rot and fall apart. He noted also that no ventilation is provided for the lighting. Ms. Voith suggested that the applicants retain a qualified preservation architect. Committee members noted that large projection (26.5") is appropriate for a half-gable pent eave such as the one removed from this building without a permit, but not a coved pent eave.

The Committee also rejected the notion of lights in a coved pent eave. The applicants explained that they wanted the lights for security. David O'Donnell, the president of the Queen Village Neighbors Association, supported the applicants' desire to add lighting to the street. Committee and staff members suggested mounting lights elsewhere on the facade of the building. The applicants replied that they could not run electrical service to the facade of the building. The Committee responded that electrical service is already available at the facade for the lighting that was removed with the pent eave.

The discussion turned to the roofing material proposed for the pent eave. The

applicants stated that they did not want cedar shakes because mold and mildew grow on them; they did not want asphalt shingles because they find them unattractive. They proposed slate instead. Committee members explained that eighteenth-century pent eaves would not have been clad in slate. One member noted that slate was rarely employed as a building material in the 1700s; he noted that the famous "Slate Roof House" was known as such because of the extreme rarity of its roofing material. The applicants then informed the Committee that they planned to install a slate substitute, not real slate. They claimed that several pent eaves in Society Hill and Queen Village are clad with artificial slate, which is very durable. Committee members doubted that the Commission had ever approved slate or a slate substitute for a pent eave. They suggested an asphalt shingle that replicates a cedar shake.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the legalization of the removal pent eave, denial of the proposed pent eave, which is inappropriate in shape, projection, and detailing, denial of the lights within the pent eave, and denial of the slate or artificial slate roofing, 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.].

JF

821 South 3rd Street

Christopher and Angela Tobin, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Replace windows, rehabilitate facades, add decks, add entranceway with steps and replace garage door

The proposal calls for alterations to this corner property including establishing a new entrance on the side of the building, constructing decks at the rear, removing the perma-stone from the front facade, painting stucco on the side façade, as well as installing new windows. The new side entrance is an ensemble salvaged from an elaborate Federal style mansion. The staff does not object to cutting down a window into an entrance, but the proposed door removes too much fabric and creates a false historical impression. The applicant has said he wishes to install windows with applied muntins for cost and design reasons, but the applicant has not supplied any information to show the proposed windows.

Staff recommendation: Approval of: decks, new garage door and removal of the perma-stone from the front facade with staff to review details pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of the new entrance, pursuant to Standard 3. The application for the windows is incomplete.

The owners of the house, Christopher and Angela Tobin, attended the meeting. Mr. Baron presented the project and explained that the front of the house has permastone and the side has painted stucco.

The conversation began with the windows. Mr. Baron noted that the application lacked any detailed information on the proposed windows. Mr. Tobin said that he would prefer double-insulated windows, but that cost is an issue. He investigated several companies and the cost for the 19 windows ranged from \$28,000 to \$35,000 for true-divided-light windows. He proposes to use simulated-divided-light windows, which one vendor can provide for \$17,000. The Committee suggested using single-paned, true-divided-light

windows and an interior storm sash. Those windows would prove much cheaper, longer lasting and, in the long run, more economical.

Mr. Tobin asked if the house could have two-over-two windows rather than six-over-six windows, since this pane configuration would make the double-insulated windows cheaper. Mr. Baron explained that the date of the building, c. 1835, indicates that the house originally would have had six-over-six windows. Although some houses on the block may have two-over-two windows, they are later alterations.

Mr. Baron also discussed some differences between the windows offered by several of the companies mentioned by Mr. Tobin. For instance, the simulated-divided-light windows offered by Pella have a separate frame so that they build down on the daylight-opening of the window and are only appropriate for openings that no longer have the original frames.

The Committee discussed at length the differences between true-divided-light windows, single-pane windows, insulated windows, simulated-divided-light windows, et cetera. The Tobins said that the windows in the house are broken, with glass and actual window units falling out. The Committee decided to allow simulated-divided-light windows on the side elevation only, but the front elevation must have true-divided-light windows. The Committee members emphasized that this recommendation should only be taken as a single circumstance owing to the owner's situation of needing to replace so many windows at one time.

David O'Donnell of the Queen Village Neighbors Association said that the neighborhood has become so out-priced that young people cannot afford it. He would like the Committee to approve products that do not cost more so that young home-owners are encouraged to do work on their houses. Ms. Voith countered that single-paned, true-divided-light windows with interior storm sash are the best buy on the market and the Committee is not making the applicants spend more money, but encouraging them to save money in the long run.

Discussion then turned to the entrance on the side elevation. Mr. Tobin showed atlases that demonstrate that the rear ell dates to the 20th century. He purchased the proposed door, transom and sidelights from a house that was being torn down in Chestnut Hill. Ms. Tobin noted that the corner is a bus-stop and many people congregate on the front steps. She would like another entrance to the house for safety.

Mr. Baron said that the staff did not object to cutting an entrance on the side, but that the proposed design is too ornate for the vernacular row on Queen Street. Committee members agreed. They suggested cutting the window down to a single-leaf door with a simple transom. The Committee believed the design of the steps to be appropriate.

The Committee members briefly discussed the rest of the application. Mr. Rivera believed that the deck over the garage should be pulled back so that it sits on the parapet wall and not have an overhang. The garage door should be a wood paneled door.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of simulated-divided-light windows on the side elevation only and true-divided-light windows on the front elevation; cutting a single-leaf door and transom on the side façade, rear decks with the 2nd floor deck pulled back to sit on the parapet wall and a new wood, paneled garage door, all 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.]. The Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposed entrance on the side elevation, pursuant to Standard 3 [Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.].

lms

107 Kenilworth Street

Antonio DeSimone, Owner/Applicant

DATE: built before 1807; top story removed, new facade c. 1925; rehabilitated
/reconstructed, 2003-4

PROPOSAL: Legalize façade rehabilitation changes, 4th floor addition and deck

The applicant approached the Commission staff to restore the façade of this circa 1800 building which had its top floor removed and a mid-20th century brick façade added. The staff of the Historical Commission worked with the applicant's architect on the design of a new brick façade to restore the original appearance of the building based on an 1807 fire insurance survey and physical evidence on the property. The owner was to return to the Commission with the design for the remainder of the building. However, the owner completed construction without getting other approvals or any permits for the non-façade work and the façade was not restored according to the approved plan. The façade design was modified because the owner wanted more headroom at the 3rd floor and asked the contractor to make the brick wall taller. The 3rd floor windows were moved up to accommodate this request. The façade, however, substantially complies with the approved design. The owner no longer wishes to reestablish the cellar bulkhead. The design of the 4th floor was built with a notched back to accommodate a deck. This can be seen from the street because the house to the east is lower.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standard 7 of the Restoration Standards [Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated from by documentary and physical evidence.].

No one representing the applicant attended the meeting. Mr. Baron described the proposal and made some suggestions for mitigating the problems with the restoration of the building.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal on the condition that the applicant builds the cellar bulkhead and applies the correct molding to the dormer according to the previously approved elevation drawing.

lms

212 Walnut Street

Aldo Lamberti, Owner

Jeff Carson, Applicant

DATE: 1976, Geddes Brecher Qualls & Cunningham, architects – non-contributing in Society Hill Historic District

PROPOSAL: Add signage

This application calls for four signs, one on each façade of the building. On the north and east facades, the signs would be internally illuminated and sit in the spandrel

between the first and second floors. On the south façade, the sign measures eight feet by eight feet and would be illuminated by an external florescent light. On the west façade, the fourth sign stands at the staircase and is internally illuminated. Unlike the submission previously seen by the Committee, this sign does not obscure the curved, brick wall.

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

Mr. Levy recused himself from the discussion.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. Jeff Carson of City Sign, Anna Maria Ferraro of Positano Restaurant, and Dominic Aspite, the expeditor for the project, attended the meeting.

Mr. Carson stated that he and Ms. Ferraro met with residents of the Society Hill Towers last week to discuss the sign proposal, specifically the sign for the south façade that would face the towers directly. The reaction to the sign was mixed with about half of the attendees in favor and half opposed.

The Committee discussed the sign to the west the most. Ms. Voith commented that she believed the design of those on the north and east were most in keeping with the architecture of the building and the one on the west was intrusive. Ms. Pentz agreed, for, although the design met with the Committee's request of not touching the brick wall, it does interfere with the staircase. Mr. Rivera said that the signs on the west and south seem to appeal to the vehicular traffic, but they should focus more on the pedestrian experience. Mr. Carson countered that it is the pedestrians from the movie theater that the restaurant owner wants to attract with the sign on the west and the reason for its location.

Steven Weixler of the Society Hill Civic Association noted that the applicant has not appeared before the Civic Association. He said that the Society Hill Towers objected to the proposal because of the scale of the signs and their internal illumination. He also received an e-mail from Mary Bomar of the National Park Service who questioned the signs owing to the context.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the spandrel signs on the north and east, but denial of the signs on the south and west. Mr. Levy recused.

lms

528 Pine Street

James Lokoff, Owner/Applicant

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

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

This building consists historically 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' and then a small wing extends off of the rear for a powder room. 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

clapboard, even though it is a masonry structure, and the window at the second floor will have a balconette.

According to the Bromley Atlas, at least the middle section of the rear ell existed by 1910. The end section of the rear ell is an addition, but may also have historic importance. It is unclear how much of these sections will remain after the proposed demolition.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10, Building Site Guideline [Not Recommended: Radically changing buildings and their features or site features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the property so that, as a result, the character is diminished.] and Additions Guideline [Not Recommended: Attaching a new addition so that the character-defining features of the historic building are obscured, damaged, or destroyed.].

Ms. Spina described the proposal. Jamie Lokoff, owner of the property, and Donald Phimister, architect for project, attended the meeting. Mr. Phimister noted that about two-thirds of the rear ell will be demolished completely, the brick and stucco portions as shown in the photographs. The proposal includes restoring the brick of the ell that remains. The new rear wall of the ell would be wood clapboards.

Committee members did not object to the demolition per se, but wanted documentation of exactly how much of the ell would be demolished with section details and historical documentation of the additions. Staff noted that at least the stucco portion of the ell appears to date to at least 1910. Mr. Rivera and Mr. Levy questioned the need for the additional appendage housing a powder room. Mr. Lokoff said that he thought it would be more accessible for children who were outside than the one on the other side of the family room.

When Mr. Phimister submitted a sightline drawing that showed a gate at the rear of the property, Ms. Spina noted that a gate was not part of the original proposal. Committee members objected to a metal, roll-down gate. When asked, Mr. Lokoff admitted that part of the reason for the demolition of the rear ell was for the accommodation of parking in the rear lot.

Steven Weixler of the Society Hill Civic Association noted that the Civic Association has not reviewed the project; however, he anticipates that it would object to the project owing to the loss of historic fabric. He also emphasized that the rear of the property is visible and faces Mother Bethel AME Church.

The Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal, owing to lack of information.

lms

327 South 2nd Street

Beverly Blynn, Owner

Daniel Mehan, Applicant

DATE: 1965 – contributing to Society Hill Historic District

PROPOSAL: Enclose roof deck

On the visible rear of this house, the proposal calls for enclosing the roof deck. The slope of the rubber roof would be extended in the same plane and a series of casement windows would be installed to create a wall of glass. No other house in this row has the roof deck enclosed; this would set a precedent for the row. The owner is asking for the

deck enclosure because the roof below the deck structure leaks.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

No one representing the project attended the meeting. Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Committee members concurred that enclosing the deck would destroy the solid/void relationship the deck creates at the 3rd floor and would disrupt the pattern along the entire row.

Steven Weixler of the Society Hill Civic Association noted that the Civic Association's zoning/preservation committee has not seen the application, but would recommend denial as well.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend 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 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.].

lms

1617 John F. Kennedy Boulevard, Suburban Station

One Penn Management, LLC, Owner

Raymond Rola, Applicant

DATE: 1929-30, Graham, Anderson, Probst & White, architects

PROPOSAL: Add window film

As a part of the expansion of the existing restaurant space, the proposal calls for blacking out a window on the front façade of the building next to the window that was blacked out prior to designation. The window that is proposed to be altered is adjacent to the JFK Boulevard entrance of the Station.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. This will further deaden the pedestrian experience along JFK Boulevard. Using frosted glass or photographs (like Walgreens at the other end of the building) to hide the activity behind the glass, but allowing light and visibility would be a better solution, especially in the prominent location.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Raymond Rola, architect for the project, noted that he could alter some of the interior spaces so that the kitchen was not right at that location. He asked if he could install the frosted film like that in the other windows along the façade that exists. The Committee agreed, and Ms. Spina noted that that change could be approved at staff level.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the blacking out of the window, but approval of the frosted film, up to one-half of the window, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.].

lms

500 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; Gymnasium, Frank Miles Day; Kline Science Building: c. 1950, Hatfield, Martin & White, architects; Kingsley Gymnasium: addition 1956 and 1959, Hatfield, Martin & White, architects; Squash courts: Voith & Mactavish

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 behind the rear of the Wissahickon Inn. The steep slope of the Wissahickon Watershed at the back of the grounds limits the development of the site.

The application asserts that the three buildings do not meet the school's programmatic needs for its growing student body. It also claims that an addition to the Commons building or converting the Gymnasium to the Commons does not accomplish the Academy's goals; however, the application does not address the Committee's question of having two gymnasiums.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the demolition based on historic preservation grounds, but referral to the Financial Hardship Committee.

Ms. Spina briefly presented the proposal. Tim Calligan and Jason Sieminski, consultants for Chestnut Hill Academy and Mark Wieand, architect for the project, attended the meeting. Mr. Wieand then gave a slide presentation demonstrating two options the Academy had explored with the preservation of the Frank Miles Day buildings: one included an addition to the Commons and one turned the gymnasium into the Commons. Mr. Wieand and Mr. Calligan argued that these options proved infeasible for the school.

The Committee members observed that the existing Commons is only 300 square feet smaller than the proposed, yet the proposed can hold 100 more students. Mr. Wieand said that the existing Commons space is colonnaded and this prohibits the use of much of the space. When the Committee saw a photograph of the interior, they noted that the columns do not actually function and proposed removing them to allow more usable space. Mr. Calligan also mentioned the poor acoustics in the room and Ms. Pentz said that there are many measures that could be taken to improve the acoustics as well.

The Committee members did not agree that the option to turn the gymnasium into the Commons could not be done for several reasons. One, the amount of gymnasium space used in the scenario does not match the actual master plan requested by the Academy. Mr. Calligan admitted that the school is using two different square footages when comparing the gym space, saying that in the actual master plan the school

compromised the size of the fourth court but in actuality would like to have four full-size courts. Two, when the old gym is converted, the new gymnasium does not have to be connected to the Commons. As pointed out by John Gallery, the new gymnasium could be located near the actual playing fields on the other side of the Wissahickon Inn. Mr. Calligan rejected this idea, arguing that the Academy did not think the community would agree to this idea, since the gymnasium would be large and block the view of the Inn. Three, the Academy claims that this scheme gives them too much space and not enough presence on Willow Grove Avenue. The Committee rejected these claims, saying that the architects simply have not taken the time to explore this option and to consider an entrance addition on the street and using the extra space for storage or other uses.

Mr. Sieminski emphasized that the Academy must adhere to limitations imposed by the Planning Commission owing to the existence of the Wissahickon Watershed. The Committee acknowledged these, but noted that the requirement to preserve historic structures is just as valid.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance commented that the Academy's application calls for retaining the open space of the campus in the public interest. He opined that the application does not meet the Commission's requirement of "necessary" to the public's interest. He also noted that the "public" has a broad definition and an occasional use by a couple of neighborhood groups does not constitute a broad public interest. Ms. Pentz agreed, saying that the public has gained nothing but the loss of historic buildings.

Mr. Gallery continued by addressing the financial hardship aspect of the application. He claimed that the application does not have enough information. He noted that if the Commission should grant any demolition, it should be subject to the school's having the funding in place and construction drawings completed for the permits. He concluded by saying that although open space is important, its preservation does not take precedence over historic resources.

Mr. Calligan said that the Academy has made a presentation to the preservation committee of the Chestnut Hill Civic Association, but they have not voted on the project.

The Committee did not think the application was ready to move to the Financial Hardship Committee because the applicant had not exhausted all of the possible architectural solutions.

The Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal, owing to an insufficient investigation of the architectural options, especially Re-use Option #2.

lms

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Farnham
Laura M. Spina