

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

**TUESDAY, 27 APRIL 2010
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DAVID AMBURN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

John Cluver
Rudy D'Alessandro
Sean Evans
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Erin Coté, Historic Preservation Planner II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Louise Cruz Vizcaino
Chris Carnall
Richard Villo, Michael Ryan Architects
Lorna Katz-Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Jason Thompson, Rissay Ltd.
David Searles, Saylor Gregg Architects
Peter Saylor, Saylor Gregg Architects
Richard Rabera, Franklin Institute
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP
Dominick Fareri
Vincent Mancini
Cynthia Philo, Old City District
Chris Phillips
Joel Darras, O'Donnell & Naccarato
Michael Welde, Ace USA
Joseph Mariutti
Susan Mattison, Landscape Architect
Carey Jackson Yonce, Firm Architecture
Alan Razak
Tim Kerner, Terra Studio
Chris Reid, Daroff Design
Stephen Beacham, Daroff Design
Michael Williams, Hill International
Caroline Wyspianski
Edwin Jesiolowski

David Virgil, Ewing Cole
Viki Sand, Atwater Kent/Philadelphia History Museum
Michael Kuldiner, Esq.
Justino Navarro, Spring Garden Civic Association
Louis Acciavatti
Malede Berhane, Concordis Advisors
Luis Pagan
Ron Patterson, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers, LLP
Richard Stokes, Stokes Architecture
Michael Palermo, Starr Restaurants
Kevin Rasmussen, Rasmussen/Su Architects
Marci Seder

CALL TO ORDER

Mses. Gutterman and Pentz and Messrs. Cluver, D'Alessandro, McCoubrey, and Evans called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

121 N CHRIS COLUMBUS BLVD, PIER 11

Applicant: Joseph Forkin, Delaware River Waterfront Corporation

Owner: City of Philadelphia

History: 1901, altered 1932, superstructure demolished mid twentieth century

Designation: Contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Convert pier into park

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert Pier 11 to a park. The pier has been called Pier 10, Pier 11, and the Race Street Pier over time. It would be renamed the Race Street Pier. The pier was constructed by the City of Philadelphia in 1901 as a recreation pier, after Delaware Avenue was widened. The recreation structure consisted of a one-story base covering the entirety of the pier with an ornate hall atop it at the eastern end. The upper portion of the recreation structure was demolished and the lower portion was refurbished in 1932. The remaining superstructure was demolished in the mid twentieth century. The pier is currently an unimproved concrete deck on wood pilings. It has no superstructure.

The Delaware River Waterfront Corporation is proposing to landscape the pier as a park. It would include walkways, decking, lawns, trees, seating, railings, and lighting. The primary features would be an elevated lookout and terraced seating.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

The Committee members asked why the Commission was reviewing this project. Mr. Farnham responded that the pier is located within the Old City Historic District and is classified as contributing. The Committee members commended the project, asserting that it would be an asset to the district. Mr. Evans asked if the wharf drops in the south side of the pier would be preserved. Mr. Farnham stated that the plans show that two will be infilled and two will be

covered with grates. He noted that they are not original; they do not appear in early photographs of the pier.

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

1827 SPRUCE STREET

Applicant / Owner: Louise Cruz Vizcaino

History: c. 1870

Designation: Contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Legalize clad windows in front façade

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of clad windows in the front façade of this Italianate apartment building in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. The property owner spoke to Jorge Danta of the Commission's staff about window replacement on 24 September 2009 and received information regarding the Commission's review process. Mr. Danta did not provide any approval or assurance of a later approval. Despite the conversation, the owner of this apartment building installed the clad windows and capped the sills without the Commission's approval or a building permit. The Board of Revision of Taxes classifies this building as an apartment building with five or more units. Therefore, a building permit is required to replace windows at this property regardless of its historic designation status. If the owner had applied for the required permit, she would have been referred to the Historical Commission to seek an approval before the permit could be issued.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Louise Cruz Vizcaino and Chris Carnall, her son-in-law, represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the new windows that were installed without the Commission's approval lack the historic shutter hardware.

Mr. Carnall, a realtor, stated that he encouraged the owner, his mother-in-law, to replace the windows. He reported that he was unaware of the need for the Commission's approval. He was adamant that he would not have chosen wood replacement windows because of their need for regular maintenance. He explained that he is responsible for the upkeep of the building. Mr. Carnall stated that the windows were installed according to the specifications that Mr. Danta had supplied to him. Mr. Carnall invited the Committee and staff to view the windows, asserting they would not be able to tell the difference in materials. Mr. Baron countered his claim, saying that he had already visited the site and found the difference notable.

Mr. D'Alessandro explained to the applicants that the Committee is bound to apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to applications. The Committee does not have the discretion to take any extenuating circumstances into account. He suggested that the applicants reserve those arguments for the Commission.

Mr. Carnall reported that the property is in a deteriorated condition. He claimed that the new windows are of a fine quality. He questioned the condition of windows in a neighboring house. He again stated that he was unaware that a permit was needed. He noted that he had only

replaced the sash. Mr. Baron stated that their window supplier, Matus Windows, has extensive experience with the Historical Commission and is aware of the responsibilities and requirements when working on a property that is historically designated. Mr. Carnall stated that he was aware that the property is located in an historic district, but he insisted that the windows are appropriate for the district. He noted that the street is very dirty and this type of window is easy to maintain. The Committee members contended that the replacement of the windows altered the building's appearance and therefore required the Commission's approval. They reiterated their lack of authority to recommend legalization of such an application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6.

117 AND 121 PINE STREET

Owner: David and Lisa U'Prichard

Applicant: Richard Villa

History: 117 Pine, open lot, rowhouse demolished during the Redevelopment Era

119 Pine, c. 1829; shopfront added, c. 1890; connected internally to 121 Pine and front façade rebuilt without front door, c. 1970

121 Pine, c. 1830

Designation: 117 Pine, Contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

119 Pine, individually designated, 2/24/1970; Contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

121 Pine, individually designated, 12/8/1969; Contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Demolish rear wall, roof, and dormer, add elevator tower and windows, construct deck

OVERVIEW: This property on the 100-block of Pine Street consists of two connected rowhouses and an open lot.

The application initially proposed significant alterations, especially at the roof level of the rowhouse at what would be 119 Pine Street. However, it has been significantly amended since the Architectural Committee meeting. It proposed and still proposes an elevator tower at the rear of the main block of 119. The addition of the tower would require some demolition of the rear wall of 119. It proposed to demolish the rear roof and dormer at 119 and construct a new, flatter roof to make room for an elevator stop and other amenities at the upper floor. It no longer proposes to demolish the rear roof and dormer. It does now propose skylights in the rear dormer. The rear roof at 121 was previously altered for a deck. This application proposes to construct a new deck on 119 that would connect to the deck on 121. The deck as originally proposed would cantilever over the exposed party wall and lot at 117. The revised deck does not cantilever. The application also proposes to add and alter windows and window openings in the exposed party wall. As originally proposed, the new windows would have included a large triangular window in the front section of the gable. The party wall windows have been revised.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the initial application prior to revisions, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. McCoubrey recused, owing to the involvement of his brother's construction firm in the project. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Richard Villa represented the application.

The Committee asked the applicant about the new windows in the party wall. Mr. Villa stated that he is proposing to enlarge some openings and cut other entirely new openings. The new windows would be wood. Mr. Cluver asked about the demolition of the building at 117. Mr. Villa responded that it was demolished in the mid 1960s. Mr. Villa explained that the upper windows in the party wall are vinyl replacements. The lower, arched windows are wood framed and not being replaced. The Committee members posited that the vinyl replacements were illegally installed. Mr. Cluver asked if the party-wall windows were in place at the time of the designation. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission approved the initial installation of the windows in the party wall, but not the replacement windows. Mr. Cluver stated that the window openings cut in the party wall many years ago were placed sympathetically. The new, enlarged openings now proposed are not sympathetic. Messrs. Evans and D'Alessandro agreed. Mr. Cluver said that the triangular window is completely inappropriate. He suggested that a half-round window centered under the ridge would be appropriate. Ms. Pentz stated that the proposed windows would "obliterate the party wall." The Committee members opined that the proposed openings are not appropriate for the historic building.

Ms. Pentz objected to the demolition of the rear slope of the main roof and dormer at 119. She asserted that the Committee could not sanction such demolition. Ms. Gutterman agreed and also asserted that the cantilevering deck was inappropriate as well. She suggested that the design should be modified to save the roof and dormer and to pull the deck back. Mr. Villa reported that the owners are willing to pull the deck back to the house so that it does not project out beyond the party wall. Mr. Villa explained that the elevator design is very complicated because the floor levels are not the same at 119 and 121 Pine. The elevator would have many stops. Inserting the elevator would necessitate the demolition of the back wall of the main block. The elevator would be located where the wall now stands. The roof would be reconstructed to provide head room at the top elevator stop. Mr. Evans questioned whether the proposed changes would be visible from the street. Other Committee members suggested that they might be. The Committee members all agreed that the proposed demolition and modification to accommodate the elevator was unacceptable. They suggested that the architect redesign the project to save the rear roof, wall, and dormer and to pull the deck back within the footprint of the building.

Lorna Katz-Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association asked if the association's letter had been presented to the Commission. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission had not received it. Ms. Katz-Lawson stated that she would forward it to the Commission. She said that the letter asserts that the project is inappropriate for the historic buildings and should be denied.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he agreed with the staff recommendation. He contended that the demolition and modification does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He asked the Committee to recommend denial.

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

235 BAINBRIDGE STREET

Owner: David Suisman & Holly Link

Applicant: Jason Thompson

History: c. 1760

Designation: individually designated, 6/24/1958

Project: Construct roof deck.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck on a rare and important mid eighteenth-century building. The front section of the roof is an unusual half gambrel with a dormer; this roof is a character-defining feature. An addition was constructed at the rear of this building, perhaps as early as 1840. The deck would be located on the addition. The rear portion, where the deck is proposed, is a flat roof that stands slightly taller than the peak of the gambrel. The deck would have a planted area closest to Bainbridge Street and the railing would be set back 11'. A pilot house providing access to the roof exists, but the Commission's files evidence no approval for this pilot house. It was not shown on plans that the Commission approved for the property in the 1970s and 1980s.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Jason Thompson represented the application.

Mr. Baron informed the Committee that the Commission approved the rehabilitation of the house in 1979. He contended that a deck would not be appropriate because it would be visible from Bainbridge Street. The Committee members asked about the pilot house, which currently grants access to the roof. Mr. Baron stated that the 1979 rehabilitation plans did not include the pilot house. He explained that the Commission's files do not include a record of the approval of the pilot house or a deck.

Mr. Thompson explained that he would add a structure made of 2" x 10" framing that would sit on the bearing walls of the three-story rear section of the building. Mr. Cluver asked why he is proposing a new structure on top of the parapet that would "hover" over the historic part of the building. He asked the architect to explain why he cannot place the green roof on the existing roof behind the parapet. Mr. Thompson explained that the extant roof could not support the loads. To retrofit the roof to accommodate the loads would the addition of new structure into the roof. The construction would be "invasive." With the proposed system, the vegetation would be held in trays that would sit on the deck.

Ms. Pentz asked about the legality of the existing pilot house. She stated that there is no evidence that it was ever approved by the Commission or permitted by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. She contended that the pilot house was already a detriment to the historic building. Adding a deck with green roof would exacerbate the problem. She advocated for denial of the proposal. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Baron asked about the current deck. Mr. Thompson stated that there is no deck currently. There are some railings, but no decking. The occupants use the roof itself as a deck. Mr. Evans stated that the pilot house looks very new. He contended that it must have been constructed after designation. Mr. Thompson responded that the current owners purchased the house about nine months ago. The Committee members asked the applicant how much he proposed to add to the parapet with the new structure. He stated that he would be adding 16¾". Mr. Cluver stated that he was opposed to any addition to the parapet height that would be visible. He suggested pulling the deck back from the front

façade. Mr. Evans countered that a minor change to the parapet was worth the storm water management gains. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he would be opposed to any railing along the front of the planting trays. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the deck structure should be set back at least a couple of joists from the parapet wall. Several Committee members suggested that the face of the structure should be clad with a material that blends with the existing parapet. Mr. Baron asserted that the Committee should not recommend the legalization of the pilot house if it is not legal. All Committee members agreed that the pilot house should not be legalized if it is not legal now. They contended that the applicant must provide the documentation demonstrating that it is legal; the Commission's records provide no evidence that it was constructed legally. Mr. Evans suggested painting the pilot house a different color, making it less obtrusive. Mr. Baron agreed, stating that the yellow vinyl siding on it is not appropriate. Mr. Thompson stated that the pilot house was recently clad with cedar siding that has been sealed. Mr. Evans noted that, if the pilot house is now clad in cedar, it has been altered without an approval or permit since the application photographs were taken. The Committee members concluded that the legality of the pilot house must be confirmed before any project is approved.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, unless the applicant provides documentation demonstrating that the extant pilot house and railings were approved and permitted. If the pilot house and railings are legal, then the Architectural Committee recommends approval, provide the deck structure is set back from the front façade and the face of the structure is clad with a material that blends with the existing parapet, with the staff to review details.

201 N. 21ST STREET, THE FRANKLIN INSTITUTE

Owner: The Franklin Institute, City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Michael Sklaroff, Esq.

History: 1932-1934, John Windrim and Morton Keast, architects

Designation: individually designated, 9/2/1976

Project: Construct addition on south side

OVERVIEW: The application proposes the construction of an addition to the Franklin Institute building. The addition would house exhibition, education, conference, and circulation spaces. The addition would be constructed behind the southern arm of the main wing facing Logan Circle. It would connect to that wing and the Franklin Memorial, the grand rotunda behind the main portico.

At its June 2009 meeting, the Commission reviewed and approved in concept an application to construct such an addition to the building. The design approved in concept by the Commission had been revised subsequent to the Architectural Committee's May 2009 meeting based on comments offered by the Committee. The design currently proposed is consistent with the design approved in concept.

Architects John Windrim and Morton Keast designed Franklin Institute building to occupy the entire block with wings facing all four streets, Logan Circle, and Winter, Race, and 21st Streets. However, owing to funding limitations during the Great Depression, the design was revised several times. Ultimately, only the Logan Circle and Winter Street wings and the Franklin Memorial rotunda were constructed. The grand, central hall that was planned to run north-south to the west of the Franklin Memorial, linking the north and south porticos, was never

constructed. Therefore, the north portico along Winter Street, which is centered on the north façade, does not open onto an interior space. The south portico was never constructed. In 1990, a large, asymmetrical addition known as the Mandell Futures Center, designed by Geddes Brecher Qualls Cunningham, was erected to the west of the rotunda, forever preventing the completion of the original, symmetrical, Windrim design.

The new addition would be located to the south of the rotunda behind the wing facing Logan Circle to Race Street. It would connect to walls of the historic building that were not ornamented or finished with fine materials because they were originally intended to serve as interior walls. The addition would mediate between the original neo-classical building and the bold Late Modern Mandell Futures Center addition. The Race Street façade would include a very large bay that would allude to but not replicate the central porticos on the east and north facades. The bay would be faced with a shimmer wall, a wall with many small metal panels that would move independently with the wind and reflect light in artistic ways. The addition would be contemporary in style, but would defer to the historic building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Commission's June 2009 approval in concept.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz recused, owing to her firm's involvement in the project. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Richard Rabera of the Franklin Institute, architects Peter Saylor and David Searles, and attorney Michael Sklaroff represented the application.

Mr. Saylor provided an overview of the project with a Powerpoint presentation.

He stated that they would open the south doors from the rotunda, as originally intended, for the first time, connecting the rotunda to the new addition. The fire stair on the Mandell Center would be removed and a new fire stair included in the addition. The addition would have a loading dock, but most of the loading facilities would be moved from the current position on Race Street to 21st Street. The exit from the parking garage would be shifted to the west. A garden would be developed between the addition and Race Street. The ground floor would be a conference and education center. The second floor would include the permanent brain exhibition. The third floor would be used for temporary exhibitions. The south lunette of the rotunda would be lighted naturally through a skylight. The addition will allow, for the first time, complete circulation through the building; the dead ends will be eliminated. The designers are seeking LEED certification. Mr. Saylor showed videos of the proposed shimmer wall, which will be designed by artist Ned Kahn. He also showed massing studies for subsequent additions down Race Street; he is not seeking approval of these additions, but is merely demonstrating that his design will not preclude future expansions. He showed images of the transition from his addition to the Mandell Futures Center. He will use the same brick on the west wall of the addition as was used at the Center.

Mr. Evans asked if the shimmer wall would be lighted at night. Mr. Saylor replied the bottom part of the wall would be lighted very subtly. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the wall would produce glare. Mr. Saylor replied that the panels have a satin finish that would not produce glare. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the artist can control the opacity or transparency of the wall. Mr. Saylor stated that he could. Currently, the design calls for five-inch panels separated by one-inch gaps.

Mr. Cluver objected to the overall massing and location of the addition. He asserted that the original Windrim plan should be respected. He contended that the addition should not project beyond the face of the historic south wall. He stated that the primary attribute of Windrim's plan is its symmetry, balance, and harmony. This addition proposes to abandon that balance. Mr. Saylor stated that the construction of the Mandell Futures Center in the 1980s forever prevented the original plan from being completed. He stated that his design is respectful of the historic building. Mr. Baron noted that the Commission has already approved the massing and location of the addition in concept.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance spoke in support of the design. He stated that he admires the shimmer wall. He noted that he has seen other works by this artist; the effect is very subtle. Mr. Gallery stated that the addition should not be perceived as a new central portico, but should instead be seen as akin to the section of the historic building on the north façade between the corner pavilion and the central portico. Mr. Gallery suggested the addition of a vertical reveal on the Race Street façade to the west of the shimmer wall to make the addition symmetrical. He advocated for a recommendation of approval. Mr. Cluver reiterated his opinion, saying that the addition violates the massing of the original design. He suggested setting the stair tower back from the façade. Mr. Saylor and others rejected that suggestion.

Mr. Evans acknowledged that he had concerns about the in-concept design, but supports the proposal. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that, although he agrees with Mr. Cluver in theory, he believes that the current proposal is excellent, given the later addition. Mr. McCoubrey asserted that the design is terrific; he advocated for a recommendation of approval. Ms. Gutterman suggested adjusting the façade at the west end of the addition to improve the balance. Mr. Evans disagreed, asserting that it helps with the transition to the Mandell Center. Mr. Saylor stated that the simpler design, which he is proposing, will allow for additions in the future. All but Mr. Cluver agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Commission's June 2009 approval in concept.

2122 SHUNK STREET

Owners: Dominick and Maria Fareri

Applicant: Vincent Mancini, Landmark Architectural Design

History: 1915-16, James and John Windrim, architects

Designation: Contributing to Girard Estate Historic District, 11/10/1999

Project: Legalize demolition and rebuilding steps to a different design

OVERVIEW: The applicant proposes to legalize the rebuilding of the front steps of this twin house in Girard Estates. In 2005, the Commission received multiple calls from neighbors claiming that the historic steps of the building were being demolished and new steps were being built in their place. The staff visited and photographed the site and requested that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issue a stop work order. The work was not stopped because it constituted a potential trip hazard; however, the owner was informed that a violation would be issued. Work continued and the steps were completed. The staff submitted written requests for violations in 2006 and 2009 as well as multiple times during that period by telephone. The original steps were a straight flight of concrete steps with brick railing walls. The new steps were

built entirely of brick with a flared shape. They do not match either the steps in the row or on the adjoining twin.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Dominick Fareri and architect Vincent Mancini represented the application.

Mr. Fareri explained that he had intended to undertake the replacement of the steps many years ago, before the district designation, but, owing to several setbacks, did not have an opportunity to replace them until after the designation. Mr. Mancini explained that the steps were designed to complement original brick accents on the house like the window trim and water table. He stated that he has a remedy that the Committee might accept, but stated that he would hold it in reserve until he hears comments on the steps from the Committee.

Mr. Evans asked if the steps that were removed were original. Mr. Baron stated that they were the original steps. Mr. Evans asked if other houses in this style in the area retain their original steps. Mr. Baron stated that there are several in the area that retain their steps.

Messrs. D'Alessandro and Evans stated that they could not recommend approval of this legalization.

Mr. Mancini stated that he would estimate that 30% of the houses in Girard Estate have altered steps and porches. He added that steps deteriorate and are replaced. It is part of the evolution of the neighborhood.

Mses. Gutterman and Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the large, ornate new steps distract from the historic architecture. They all opposed legalization.

Mr. Mancini stated that he could cover the brick treads with concrete to look more like the original treads and place planters along the wing walls. Ms. Gutterman stated that the wing walls were the most unacceptable part of the new steps and should be removed. The Committee members stated that they do not have the authority to recommend legalization when applications do not satisfy the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

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

110 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: John & Arlene Shegda

Applicant: John McGillion, Crocodile Philly

History: 1852

Designation: individually designated, 5/26/1970; Contributing to Old City District, 12/12/2003

Project: Alter storefront

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the storefront of this mid nineteenth-century commercial building in the Old City Historic District. The storefront retains its historic granite piers, albeit covered with a very thin layer of green stucco. The applicant proposes to replace the non-historic doors and windows in the historic openings in the center and east bays. The

applicant proposes a double-leaf aluminum door in the eastern bay and aluminum casement windows in the middle bay. The transoms would be replaced with fixed aluminum windows. The Commission files include a fire insurance survey that describes the original storefront design and dimensions. The identical storefront at the adjacent building to the west has been restored. The applicant proposes to retain the existing wood door in the west bay of the storefront. This door was in place at the time of designation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

The Committee members discussed the proposed windows and door and decided that they do not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. They noted that the historic stone storefront survives and should be restored based on historic documentation like the adjacent storefront.

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

138 NORTH 3RD STREET

Applicant: Christopher Phillips

Owner: Joseph Weiswasser

History: c. 1830

Designation: individually designated, 12/31/1984

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

Project: Legalize signage and awning

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a flat wall sign, awning, and other alterations on the façade of this storefront. These alterations were made without the Commission's approval or a permit from the Department of Licenses and Inspections. The lessees of the store met with the Commission's staff in March 2010 and discussed ideas to install a flat wall sign and awning to conceal an illegal air conditioning window unit in the north transom, and paint the wood doors green and white. The staff explained that removal of the transom and installation of the window unit is an illegal condition and installation of an awning could not be approved at staff-level and would need to go before the Commission for review. However, the staff could consider an application for a flat wall sign and storefront painting. In April 2010, the Department of Licenses & Inspections notified the Commission's staff that exterior alterations were made without a permit; violations were subsequently issued. A photograph submitted in this application shows the current conditions of the façade and indicates, in addition to the wall sign, awning, and window unit, that white boards were attached to the marble piers and the marble capitals were painted white. The proprietors of the business operate a second branch of the business at 4254 Main Street in Manayunk, which is also designated as historic.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Christopher Phillips and Chai Kanchanahoti represented the application.

Mr. Phillips apologized for working without an approval or permit, acknowledging that they “jumped the gun.” Mr. Kanchanahoti explained that they opened the shop quickly on a very limited budget. He stated that they are unable to spend any additional money on the property. He explained that they sought to improve the appearance of the storefront and disguise the air conditioning unit. The white boards were attached using existing holes in the pockmarked surface. The awning was added for cosmetic purposes. He claimed that the awning would also protect the historic window and door from the weather and prevent the marble from being slippery when wet. He asserted that many storefronts in Old City have air conditioners in the transoms. Mr. Phillips stated that there is no other location in the building for the air conditioner. He explained that the sign and panels on the pilasters were installed with construction adhesive.

Ms. Pentz stated that she did not object to the awning.

Mr. Evans asked the staff when the air conditioner was installed. Ms. Sell stated that it was installed in the transom at some point after the designation of the Old City Historic District in 2004. Ms. Sell stated that the air conditioner in a transom was inappropriate and suggested that it be relocated. Mr. Kanchanahoti reported that he has \$15 in his bank account and cannot make any alterations to his shop. He added that he may consider making corrections “after selling more flowers.”

Mr. Evans asserted that the panels should be removed from the pilasters. Mr. D’Alessandro agreed. Mr. Evans contended that the scale and proportions of the sign are inappropriate. He suggested a window sign. Mr. Kanchanahoti stated that the sign covers purple paint. The Committee members replied that the paint should be removed, not covered. Messrs. D’Alessandro and Evans stated that the adhesive used to affix the sign and panels should be removed. Mr. Cluver stated that the Committee should recommend denial of the application. He added that the applicants should continue the discussion that they started with the staff, but then abandoned when they did the work without an approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

428-36 WALNUT STREET

Applicant: Mike Welde

Owner: Ace American Insurance Company

History: 1915, addition, 1972

Designation: Contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Install metal windows with panning

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace all eighth-floor wood windows with aluminum windows and panning. Sixteen of these windows are six-over-six, double-hung sash with four-light sidelights and fanlights and six are six-over-six double-hung sash. The elevations of the proposed windows are similar to the original elevations. However, the panning details on the head and sill do not precisely match the curvature of the original moldings. The original arched windows have a metope detail that the application shows can be replicated in a decorative casting system. However, there are no photographs or drawings showing measurements or details of the metopes.

In February 2005, the Historical Commission approved the replacement of six-over-six double-hung wood windows on the second through seventh stories with aluminum windows and panning. A design for the panning was created to mimic the profiles of the original moldings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: No recommendation pending additional information from the applicant.

DISCUSSION: Mr. D'Alessandro recused from the review owing to his business relationship with the applicant. Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Engineer Joel Darras and owner's representative Michael Welde represented the application.

Mr. Darras introduced information about the existing windows as well as revised shop drawings.

Ms. Pentz asked the applicants to highlight potential discrepancies between the existing and proposed windows. Mr. Darras stated that he has not had an opportunity to revise some of the details to better reflect the historic windows, but would work with the staff to improve the designs. Mr. Cluver stated that the Committee should consider the overall proposal and allow the staff to work out the details with the applicants.

Mr. Evans asked how the earlier replacement windows had been approved. Ms. Sell stated that the Commission reviewed and approved them as an acceptable match for the historic windows. Mr. Darras noted that these windows will be at the eighth floor, above the windows already approved. The variances from the historic will not be detectable.

Mr. Evans noted that the lower windows are all rectangle without ornaments. The windows under consideration today are arched and ornamented. Mr. Darras stated that the frames will be retained and panned. The sash will be replaced.

Ms. Sell explained that she had visited the site on several occasions to discuss the project with the applicants. She stated that the details are not easily discernable from the street. She explained that the staff had considered approving the application at the staff level, especially in light of the fact that the Commission approved the lower windows, but elected not to because the proposed brickmold panning detail was not a good match. She stated that the applicants are willing to revise that detail to better match the historic brickmold. Ms. Gutterman contended that the sill detail is not a good match for the historic sill. The applicants and staff responded that the eighth-floor sills are imperceptible from the street. Mr. Darras said that he would improve the detail of the sill.

Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Evans asked that the minute reflect the fact that the Committee would not have approved the replacement windows on the lower floors. The staff noted that the Committee is advisory only and does not have the authority to approve or deny, but only to advise.

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

Mr. McCoubrey excused himself from the meeting.

2514 S. 18TH STREET

Owners/Applicants: Joseph Mariutti and Katherine Padetti

History: 1908, James and John Windrim, architects

Designation: Contributing to the Girard Estate Historic District, 11/10/1999

Project: Legalize porch replacement

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the replacement of the front porch of this Colonial Revival twin in the Girard Estate Historic District.

In July 2009, the staff observed that the porch had been reconstructed inaccurately in Fypon, the façade had been stuccoed, and new vinyl windows with snap-in muntins had been installed in the double window and oculus without the approval of the Historical Commission or a building permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. A violation was subsequently issued. The designation photograph taken in January 2000 shows the porch as well as the front façade, which was covered in siding and had double windows and a vent at the second story. The applicant seeks legalization of only the porch portion of the violation at this time.

During the July 2009 site visit, the staff also observed that the porch was being reconstructed at the adjoining property, 2512 S. 18th Street. As at the property in question, the porch cornice had been removed without the approval of the Historical Commission. The Commission's staff sent a letter warning the property owner that if the illegal condition was not corrected or legalized within 30 days, the Commission would request a violation. In August 2009, the owner of the adjoining property submitted an application to restore the porch in wood, which the Commission's staff approved. The restoration is currently underway.

The Girard Estate Historic District inventory explains that the distinguishing features of this building type include a "full-width front porch . . . with classical Doric columns, denticulated cornice with metopes and triglyphs, [and] Doric railing around [the] roof."

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Joseph Mariutti represented the application.

Ms. Pentz stated that she agreed with the staff recommendation. Ms. Gutterman noted that the porch was not original at the time of designation. Ms. Sell observed that the original porch probably survived under the siding that was in place at the time of designation. If the owner had contacted the Commission before undertaking the work, the staff may have been able to guide the owner to restore the original porch once the siding was removed. She noted that the neighbor will have a fully restored porch. Ms. Gutterman noted that the problem is not only the replacement material, but also the non-historic shapes and profiles.

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

1344-48 ARCH STREET

Applicant: Reverend Robin Hynicka

Owner: Arch Street United Methodist Church

History: c. 1865

Designation: individually designated, 11/24/1964

Project: Install signage

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of signage on the exterior of this church. Two title signs are proposed to be bolted to the sidewalk between masonry buttresses along Arch and Broad Streets. The signs would be 11' wide, 7'-7" tall, and made of aluminum with acrylic letters. In addition, two message boards are proposed to be installed on both sides of the corner spire. The message boards would be 5'-6" feet tall, 3' wide, and 9" deep. The applicant's description indicates that the message boards are non-illuminated; however, the drawings show that 6" of the cabinet depth is allotted for a lamp socket. Four holes will be utilized or created to anchor the message boards to the masonry.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of title signs and denial of message boards, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz and Mr. Evans recused, owing to their firms' involvement in other projects at the church. Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Landscape architect Susan Mattison represented the application.

Ms. Mattison introduced the project to the Committee. She stated that the message boards will not be illuminated; the detail of the sign in the application is incorrect. They will be attached, if possible, in existing holes. The church received a grant from Partners of Sacred Places for streetscape improvements including the signs. She indicated that they had looked at other church signage for guidance including those at St. George's Methodist and Arch Street Presbyterian.

Ms. Sell asked the applicant to clarify what the depth of the message boards would be if they are not illuminated. Ms. Mattison stated that they would not be illuminated, but she did not know how deep they would be. She offered to obtain that information from the sign company and provide it to the Commission during its review. She confirmed that the message board would have a transparent face.

Mr. D'Alessandro contended that the title signs would be too large. He noted that the open space between piers is 12'; he suggested a two-foot open space between each pier and the sign, allowing for an eight-foot wide sign. He also suggested limiting the height of the sign to one foot below the bottom of the window sill. The other Committee members agreed that the proposed signs would be too large. Ms. Mattison explained that the church staff park on the sidewalk because the church has no dedicated parking. Therefore, the signs must be tall enough to be visible above the automobiles parked along the church. The Committee members suggested that the illegal parking on the sidewalk should not determine the height of the signs. Ms. Mattison explained that there are already message boards and signs along Broad Street.

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

324 AND 326 S. 24TH STREET

Applicant: Carey Jackson Yonce

Owner of 324 S. 24th Street: Lilly Development LP

Owner of 326 S. 24th Street: Alan Razak and Jacqueline Buhn

History: c. 1890

Designation: Contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Construct masonry wall with gate and canopy

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of a masonry wall with gate and canopy between the buildings at 324 and 326 S. 24th Street. The structure would span the property line dividing 324 and 326 S. 24th Street. The owners of 326 S. 24th Street submitted the application and have presented evidence that the owner of 324 S. 24th Street has authorized the submission of the application.

The proposed structure would consist of a stepped cast stone and multi-colored brick wall, modern metal gate, and angled metal and glass canopy. The Historical Commission approved an application for a similar structure in September 2006. However, that design differed from the design currently proposed; the approved design proposed butter joint bricks to match the existing buildings, straight picket metal gate, wood and cedar shingle canopy, and a setback from the rusticated bases of the building facades.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Carey Jackson Yonce and the owners of 326 S. 24th Street, Alan Razak and Jacqueline Buhn, represented the application.

Mr. Yonce explained that he and his clients are seeking an approval of a modification of the gateway structure that was approved in 2006. He stated that he is now proposing a decorative gate rather than the simple picket gate previously approved. He has also modified the design of the masonry wall and the canopy. Rather than cedar, the canopy would now be metal and glass. Mr. Yonce explained that it would project out 4' from the wall. The wall would be set back 1' from the facades of the buildings. Ms. Gutterman noted that the canopy in the approved design projected 3', not 4'. Mr. Yonce explained that the gate would lead to an apartment. The canopy would shelter persons collecting mail, unlocking the gate, waiting at the gate.

The Committee members asked about the location of the property line and the neighbor's authorization of this application. Mr. Yonce stated that the property line runs down the center of the alley between the buildings; the new gateway would span the property line. Mr. Yonce claimed that the neighboring owner has signed a letter authorizing Mr. Yonce to apply for a permit. However, Mr. Yonce did not have a copy of the letter to show to the Committee.

Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the gate would swing out into the public right-of-way. Mr. Yonce responded that the entrance steps on the two buildings project out further onto the sidewalk than the gate would, thereby creating an isolated area for the gate. Ms. Buhn stated that she purchased the metal gate at an auction.

Mr. Cluver stated that the proposed gateway is too decorative and different from the historic houses; it calls too much attention to itself. Mr. Yonce countered that it was intended to stand out and not just be infill. The houses are highly articulated. Ms. Buhn, who is a developer,

remarked that when building for the National Park Service, she tries to build structures that are as different as possible from the historic architecture. Mr. Evans responded that that is not what is stipulated by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The Standards stipulate that new construction should be differentiated, yet compatible. Mr. Evans stated that the proposed gateway is differentiated, but not compatible. Ms. Buhn asked why the Committee was not applying the Standards in this case, seeking a balance between differentiation and compatibility. Mr. Evans stated that the Committee was seeking a balance; this proposal emphasizes difference over compatibility. The Committee is suggesting a more compatible design. Mr. Yonce asserted that the design he is proposing is an improvement over the approved design. He stated that, if the current design is not approved, he will construct the earlier design, which already has been approved. Mr. Evans stated that he objected to the canopy, but not the remainder of the design.

Ms. Sell asked if the brick being proposed would match the brick of the historic houses. The earlier, approved design had called for a matching brick. Mr. Yonce answered that the brick would not match, but it would be compatible. Ms. Buhn stated that brick has been replaced on both houses. Ms. Gutterman stated that the brick should not stand out. She also noted that the canopy is not centered over the gate. She also objected to the proposed masonry coining, which she asserted would be "too strong."

Mr. Evans stated that the canopy was "too much." He also wondered which it was placed so high on the wall. Mr. Cluver asking why the coining had been included; he advocated for brick only. Mr. Razak explained that they considered brick only walls, but they looked "cheap." Ms. Sell reported to the Committee that the staff had agreed to approve the rear modifications at the staff level.

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

Mr. D'Alessandro excused himself from the meeting.

150 S. INDEPENDENCE MALL WEST, SUITE 102, PUBLIC LEDGER BUILDING

Applicant: Chris Reed, AIA, LEED, AP

Owner: CB Richard Ellis

History: 1924

Designation: Significant in the Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Replace canopy

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace an existing bronze clad, steel, and glass canopy with a curved, brushed metallic gray aluminum canopy with illuminated signage with acrylic letters. The new canopy will be eight feet from grade with a maximum height of eleven feet. It will extend six feet and four inches from the building. The solid massing of the new canopy will cover the entry door transom.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Chris Reed and Stephen Beecham and project manager Michael Williams represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked why the canopy is being replaced. The applicants explained that various organizations associated with heritage tourism under Historic Philadelphia, Inc. are being consolidated in this space. As part of that effort, the interior is being renovated. Also, the sponsorship is changing. The canopy is an exterior manifestation of the new interior. They stated that the Lights of Liberty is also being redone under Governor Rendell's direction. It is being funded by a Commonwealth Grant. Mr. Evans asked why this project for Historic Philadelphia is so ahistoric. The applicants explained that the interior space is very historic, but their new interior design is contemporary to contrast with the historic space. They stated that they are respecting the historic features of the interior without altering or attaching to them. The canopy is similarly designed. It is intended to contrast with the historic building; it brings the contemporary interior to the exterior. The inspiration for the canopy is a tri-cornered hat. The canopy has internal lighting that will shine up onto the building. Mr. Evans opined that the existing canopy is "tacky." The applicants explained that the extant canopy is difficult to maintain. The new canopy would be easier to maintain. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Evans asserted that the canopy is heavy and awkward. The applicants explained that it would be aluminum. It would have glowing lettering that would relate to the Lights of Liberty. Mr. Evans countered that most people will see the canopy during the day, not at night. Mr. Cluver noted that the current awning, even if "tacky," is light and unobtrusive and does not obscure the historic building. Ms. Gutterman stated that the awning has no relation to the exterior of the building. It contrasts too sharply. The applicants noted that they had explored executing the canopy in bronze. Most Committee members asserted that they did not think that the design could be revised to be compatible. Mr. Evans commented that the current design may be able to be improved sufficiently to warrant approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

2131 ST. JAMES STREET

Owner: Douglas Ross

Applicant: Timothy Kerner

History: 1923, Spencer Roberts, architect

Designation: Significant to the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Install aluminum-clad windows, door, and patio paving

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace jalousie windows, which have non-historic frames, with aluminum-clad windows with extruded frames that resemble the historic frames. The house is in the English Village. The Commission approved a similar application for 2137 St. James Street in the English Village in October 2009. In that instance, the historic openings were altered and the historic windows and frames no longer existed. This application also proposes to remove a fiberglass canopy over the front door, railings along the edge of the garden, and raised window well coverings. This application also proposes to pave portions of the front yard. The original granite curb would be reset flush with the new paving, but the curb line would be maintained. Lastly, this application proposes to install fiberglass casements in six non-historic openings at the rear of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the fiberglass casements are an appropriate color, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Timothy Kerner and property owner Douglas Ross represented the application.

Ms. Cote explained that the Commission had approved similar windows for another house in this development.

Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants why they are proposing fiberglass windows for the rear of the property. Mr. Kerner stated that they are proposing fiberglass because one of the windows will be located in a shower and subject to high levels of moisture. He also noted that the rear is a non-historic addition. Ms. Cote confirmed that the rear windows have non-historic openings and minimal public visibility. The Committee members agreed that the windows were acceptable.

Mr. Kerner explained that he would like to remove some paving and add other paving to create a seating area. He would retain the existing granite curb, but set it flush with the new paving to remove the tripping hazard. Mr. Evans suggested that the new paving should not match the existing paving, to differentiate it. Mr. Cluver expressed concern that the installation of the paving would adversely impact a tree root. Mr. Ross stated that the new paving would solve a drainage problem and create a seating area. Mr. Cluver stated that this paving would have a minimal impact, but, if everyone paved their lawns, then the character of the development would change. Mr. Ross stated that the area is not currently lawn; it is plastic sheeting covered with gravel. Mr. Kerner stated that they are adding plantings, which would work to maintain the suburban feel of the area. The Committee members discussed the additional paving and decided that they could not recommend approval without having more information about the planted and paved areas at the neighboring properties and throughout the development. They agreed that the other alterations were acceptable, but that they should recommend denial of the paving until provided additional information about the greenery to allow them to judge the impact of the paving on the development.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the paving, but approval of all other aspects of the application, with the staff to review details.

1315 PINE STREET

Owner: Caroline and Peter Wyspianski

Applicant: Caroline Wyspianski

History: c. 1835

Designation: individually designated, 3/28/1961

Project: Construct two-story rear addition, relocate rear windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to a two-story rear addition that would be clad in brick and stucco and have a metal roof. This application also proposes the relocation of the third-floor rear windows. The rear of the building has an odd assortment of window openings, most or all of which are not original. Although not called out on the architectural drawings, it appears that the rear fire escape would be removed. If the fire escape is removed and the rear dormer had been altered for its installation, the dormer should be restored.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the rear dormer is restored if it had been altered for the fire escape, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Caroline Wyspianski and architect Edwin Jazlowski represented the application.

Mr. Jazlowski distributed new plans and photographs. He explained that he is proposing to clad the addition either in brick or in brick and stucco. He stated that he will remove the fire escape and will restore the dormer if necessary. Ms. Wyspianski stated that they will remove the plastic trellis. The applicants explained that they will be removing the rear façade at the first and second floors. They will support the third-floor façade and retain it in place. Ms. Wyspianski explained that she would like the stucco to match the neighbors' addition. Mr. Cluver suggested that they choose brick or stucco, but not both. He asked how they would build to the property line when the neighbors' addition is set back about 18" from the line. It would create a space that would be impossible to maintain. Mr. Jazlowski stated that they will build a one-hour rated fire wall on the property line as the code requires. He noted that the neighboring addition does not comply with the code. The applicants stated that they would repoint the brick at the third floor. Mr. Evans stated that the proposed third-floor windows are appropriate. Ms. Wyspianski noted that few would ever see them. Ms. Gutterman stated that the staff should review the window and other details.

Mr. Baron noted that the dormers were illegally altered in the past by a former owner. He asserted that the dormers should be restored.

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

13-17 S. 7TH STREET

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: C. Erickson & Sons, Inc

History: c. 1827-29, John Haviland, architect

Designation: individually designated, 6/25/1956; National Historic Landmark

Project: Create new door opening in rear façade

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the rear façade of the Atwater Kent Museum, adding a door that would provide a second means of egress. The Philadelphia Historical Commission approved an application for the complete renovation of the Atwater Kent Museum in April 2009. The rehabilitation application included a second means of egress doorway in the side of the building that opened onto a neighboring property, but the museum was unable to reach an agreement with the neighboring property owner. Therefore, the museum cannot locate the egress door as originally planned. The new doorway would be located at the rear of the building at an infilled window. The infill would be removed and the opening cut down to the ground. The proposed single-leaf door would match a double-leaf door already approved by the Commission for this same facade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz recused, owing to her firm's involvement in the project. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Museum director Viki Sand and architect David Virgil represented the application.

Mr. Virgil explained that the approved plans calls for an egress door exits out the north façade to sidewalk that runs between this building and the building to the north. However, the owner of the neighboring property would not agree to the egress to the north. Mr. Virgil explained that, therefore, he is reworking the plans during construction and has few options. He reported that he can relocate the fire exit to the east façade, where it would open out onto the museum's property. There is an infilled window opening in that location. He would remove the infill, cut the window sill down, and install a door to match the extant double-leaf door on the same façade. Ms. Sand stated that this plan is driven by a need to limit the changes and cost increases to the current rehabilitation scheme.

Mr. Evans noted that the application includes a proposal for digital signage. Ms. Sand stated that that part of the application has been withdrawn.

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

1518 NORTH STREET

Owner: 1518 North Street LLC

Applicant: Alex Fiksmen

History: Undeveloped site at the time of designation

Project: Construct a three-story building with roof deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story building with a roof deck on an undeveloped site in the Spring Garden Historic District. The lot was undeveloped at the time of the designation of the district. Therefore, the Commission's jurisdiction is review-and-comment jurisdiction, meaning that the Commission may review and comment on the application at a public meeting, but it may not approve or deny it.

Historically, a narrow alley ran along the east side of this property, separating the building that stood on this site at 1518 North from the building that stood at 1516 North. The building at 1516 North has a large Italianate cornice that returns along the west side of the building. It also has a finished brick west façade. The Commission should ensure that this new construction does not extend across this alley and impact the cornice return or wall. Some in the community claim that this new building would block the alley and require the demolition of the cornice return and the covering of the brick side wall at 1516 North. The staff measured the opening between the buildings at 1516 and 1520 North Street and determined it to be approximately 22'-3". If the 20-foot wide building is built according to the plans, it will not encroach on the alley and will not require alterations to 1516 North.

The massing of the proposed new construction is compatible with the district and would respect the cornice line of the row. The building would be clad in brick to blend with its neighbors.

As presented to the Architectural Committee, the proposed design for the upper floors of this building would have disrupted the historic rhythm of the facades on the street. The upper floors would have included sliding doors with railings and flanking multi-light fixed windows instead of

traditional double-hung windows. Also, the door and basement windows originally proposed were inappropriate. Since the Architectural Committee meeting, the applicant has revised the design of the front façade to comply with the Architectural Committee's recommendation. The second and third floors are now shown as fenestrated with double-hung windows that maintain the rhythm of the historic facades and row.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff comments that:

1. the second- and third-floor windows should be two-over-two double-hung windows;
2. the basement windows should match those at 1520 North Street; and,
3. the entry door should be scaled like those on the adjacent historic buildings.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Michael Kuldiner represented the application. He stated that the owner is on vacation in Florida. He noted that the owner just informed him of this review.

Mr. Kuldiner stated that the historic alley will be maintained. The new building will not be attached to the neighboring property at 1516 North. It will not necessitate the alteration or demolition of the cornice on 1516. Ms. Gutterman stated that the plans stipulate that the new building would be built from adjacent building to adjacent building. Mr. Kuldiner stated that he would discuss the potential inconsistency in the plans with his client. He asserted, however, that the building would not be constructed in the alley.

Justin Navarro of the Spring Garden Civic Association stated that the construction will encroach on the three-foot alley and require the demolition of the cornice return and the covering of the brick side facade at the neighboring property. He stated that the Commission should assert full jurisdiction over this application and deny it.

The Committee members concluded that the applicant must clarify whether the alley would be maintained. The applicant should submit new documentation clearly specifying the site, its dimensions, and the new building's location on it, especially in relation to the existing alley and the building at 1516 North Street. The Committee members agreed that the Commission should assert full jurisdiction, not review and comment jurisdiction, if the project would necessitate alterations to 1516 North Street.

The Committee members agreed that, if the alley would be maintained, then it would concur with the staff's comments and suggest revisions to the designs of the windows and door at the front façade to better correspond to the historic buildings in the area.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial if the new building would be built in the alley and against the building at 1516 North Street, necessitating alterations to the building at 1516 North Street. The Architectural Committee voted to comment that, if the alley is maintained, then:

1. the second- and third-floor windows should be two-over-two double-hung windows;
2. the basement windows should match those at 1520 North Street; and,
3. the entry door should be scaled like those on the adjacent historic buildings.

1723 PORTER STREET

Owner/ Applicant: Louis Acciavatti

History: c. 1915, John Windrim, architect

Designation: Contributing to the Girard Estate Historic District, 11/10/1999

Project: Stucco side wall, infill window

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to stucco the side wall of this property. The wall faces a breeze-way. The neighboring property's wall within the breeze-way was stuccoed prior to designation. The wall in question is not pristine; most of the original windows have been moved or bricked-up. These changes either predate designation or were approved by the Commission as part of the rehabilitation of this property. The wall is currently pointed with a hard cement-based mortar and the brick shows signs of deterioration. The owner claims that water has seeped in and has caused damage to the interior. The Commission approved stucco for a rear addition on this property. The owner proposes to match the texture and color of the stucco in the rear addition. The applicant also proposes to block up a window in the same side wall. It is the last historic window opening and window in this façade. This infilled area would be concealed underneath the stucco.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Louis Acciavatti represented the application.

Ms. Pentz asked the applicant why he is seeking to infill the last historic window on the façade. Mr. Acciavatti explained that he has already covered over the window in the interior. He explained that most of the altered and infilled openings predate designation and his ownership. He stated that the Commission approved other alterations to already-altered openings. He described the water infiltration problems that he is facing. He noted that he fully restored the front façade of the house with the Commission's approval. He explained that he restore the bay, which was covered with aluminum siding. He installed the historically appropriate windows in the front. He reported that Mr. Danta of the staff oversaw all of the work.

Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Acciavatti why the brick is failing on the side façade. Ms. Gutterman interjected that wall was repointed with mortar that is too hard. The bricks are spalling because they cannot expand and contract. Mr. Baron suggested cutting out the mortar. Ms. Gutterman stated that cutting out may cause even more damage Mr. Acciavatti noted that he is a bricklayer by profession and contended that the mortar joints could not be cut out without doing more damage. He also noted that the wall was pointed incorrectly before he purchased the property. Ms. Gutterman stated that, since the pointing cannot be repaired and the façade across the side yard is already stuccoed, she would recommend approval of the stucco, provided the cornice and coining are not covered. She stated that she would like to see the window retained. Opaque glass could be installed in the window, which could be blocked in the inside. Mr. Cluver agreed, stating that someone may want to reopen the window in the future. Blocking it in the inside rather than infilling it would allow for an easier restoration.

Mr. Acciavatti stated that the stucco would be a light ash color with a smooth finish. Mr. Acciavatti contended that his work on the front facade shows his intention correctly restore his historic property.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the stucco, provided the remaining historic window is not removed, with the staff to review the stucco color and texture.

219-29 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: Parc Rittenhouse Condominium

Applicant: Richard Stokes

History: 1923-25, Zantzinger, Borie & Medary Architects

Designation: Contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Alter storefront

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the storefronts in two openings along Locust Street in this large, mixed use building. The storefront space is being rehabilitated for a new restaurant. The existing storefronts are very inappropriate replacements. The Commission recently approved new storefronts for Parc, the restaurant that occupies the adjacent space in the building. Those storefronts are compatible with the historic building, but not replicas of the original storefronts.

A fixed window and air-intake panel is proposed for the eastern storefront bay. The air-intake is an existing condition and cannot be relocated owing to internal floor plan restrictions. The applicant only proposes to replace the exterior grill on the air-intake with a more compatible grill. The entrance door and two flanking single-hung sash are proposed for the western bay. The sash would look like plate glass windows when closed. The storefronts would be made of wood. The application also proposes to install awnings for both bays. The proposed awnings would be of the same size and shape as the adjacent awnings at Parc. The awning fabric would be striped.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Richard Stokes, attorney Ron Patterson, and restaurateur Michael Palermo represented the application.

Mr. Patterson displayed photographs of the existing storefronts.

Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Baron asked about the air-intake grill. Mr. Stokes stated that it is the air inlet for the entire building. He cannot move it. He must work around it. Ms. Gutterman asked if it needed to be as large as it is proposed. Mr. Stokes stated that he would replace the existing louver cover with a more appropriate cover. The louver would be located behind the cover. Mr. Stokes stated that he could remove the louver and replace it with a screen to reduce the visibility of the mechanical equipment from the street.

Mr. Cluver asked about the relationship of the window to the screen. He asked if the size of the screen could be reduced and the window enlarged.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asked the Committee to recommend several changes to the design. He reminded the Committee of the Commission's lengthy review of the Parc storefronts in this building to the west and around the corner on 18th Street. Mr. Gallery insisted

that these storefronts should be more similar to the storefronts approved for Parc; all storefronts in the building should be the same to give the building a unified, consistent appearance. He suggested introducing vertical mullions in the storefront windows to give them the verticality of the Parc storefronts. Mr. Gallery also objected to the “candy striped” awnings. He asserted that striped awnings were not appropriate for the building. He concluded that this design does not reflect the “excellence” of the Parc storefronts.

Mr. Palermo noted that there is another storefront bay to the east of these two bays, which will be developed by someone else. Mr. Stokes stated that the storefronts on the 18th Street façade are not consistent either. The storefronts of the Devon restaurant including the awnings differ significantly from those of Parc. He stated that the pizza restaurant should be differentiated from the French restaurant. He explained that the awnings will have the same shape and dimensions of the Parc awnings, but will differ in color.

Ms. Pentz asked about signage. Mr. Stokes stated that the only signage would be painted on the glass of the door.

The Committee members asked if the interior could be rearranged to allow for a reduction in the size of the grills on the façade. They made many suggestions for rearranging the space. Mr. Stokes explained why each suggestion would not work. He remarked that the pizza making is comprised of a series of well-defined steps, each of which requires specific space and equipment. The interior is laid out very carefully to accommodate steps. Mr. Baron asked if the western of the two grills was used for air intake or to hide the pizza oven behind it. Mr. Stokes stated that it was not part of the air intake system, but was intended to hide the view of the pizza oven. Mr. Baron suggested that that grill be removed and the window enlarged. He observed that, if the window was enlarged and it and the windows in the other storefront divided with vertical muntins or mullions, then Mr. Gallery’s goal of verticality could be achieved. Mr. Evans stated that the Commission should not require that this storefront match the Parc storefronts because the Parc storefronts are entirely non-historic; they have no relation to the historic storefronts. Mr. Stokes sketched on an elevation drawing and decided that he could implement Mr. Baron’s suggested revisions, including removing the western grill, enlarging the window, and adding vertical muntins in line with transom divisions. Ms. Gutterman proposed that the revised storefront design was acceptable; she noted that the staff could review the details.

Ms. Pentz asked the Committee members to offer its opinion of the striped awnings. Ms. Gutterman stated that she would be opposed to a graphic overlaid on the striped awning. Mr. Stokes said that they had no intention of placing graphics of the awnings. He added that the only signage will be the name painted on the door. The Committee members remarked about the limited nature of the signage. Applicants always want more, not less, signage. The Committee members stated that they were not opposed to the striped awnings. Mr. Evans asserted that the Commission should not regulate the colors of awnings; it is aesthetic, not a preservation, matter.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised design that includes the removal of the western grill, enlargement of the window into the area where the western grill would have stood, and addition of vertical muntins in line with transom divisions, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

341 PINE STREET

Owner: Bryan & Marci Seder

Applicant: Kevin C. Rasmussen AIA

History: 1968-69, Joseph Praissman, architect

Designation: Contributing to the Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Construct rear addition, infill rear arcade openings, widen opening in garden wall and add gate

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-floor rear addition on this Redevelopment-Era corner building. The application does not propose any alterations to the front of the property. The existing rear ell is two stories tall and has a flat roof. The application proposes to construct a third-floor addition that would sit on the rear ell and connect to the rear slope of the roof over the main block of the house. The existing house is red brick. The addition would be clad in composite panel siding. A sample of the siding should be reviewed for color and texture. The second-floor rear façade has an open porch with arcade that overlooks the garden of the property. The application proposes to remove the porch railings and fill the openings with arched-top casement windows. The window units should be installed deep within the masonry openings to retain the essence of the original arcade. In addition, the application proposes to enlarge an existing opening in the garden wall facing S. 4th Street to create a parking space. The enlarged opening would be enclosed with a wood rolling door. Ironically, when the building was proposed in 1968, it received a zoning refusal and then a variance because it did not have on-site parking.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the addition siding is compatible and the arched-top casement windows are installed deep within the masonry openings, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Marci Seder and architect Kevin Rasmussen represented the application.

Mr. Rasmussen introduced the project to the Committee. The Committee members asked about the height of the addition relative to the neighboring buildings. Mr. Rasmussen stated that the buildings to the north and east of this corner property have blank party walls facing this property. His addition would not be taller than those buildings.

Mr. Cluver asked if the project had been presented to the Society Hill Civic Association. Mr. Rasmussen said that it had not yet because he just received the zoning refusal. He stated that they will present the project to the neighborhood group as they seek a zoning variance.

Mr. Cluver asked why this building is classified as contributing to the district. He noted that it has a very different character than other buildings in the district. Mr. Baron explained that the statement of significance in the Society Hill Historic District nomination contended that the redevelopment of Society Hill in the 1950s, 60s, and 70s was an historically significant event. This building and the others of that era exemplify that period of this neighborhood's history. Mr. Cluver asked how the building is described in the district inventory. Mr. Baron stated that it is listed as contributing, dated to 1968-69, and designed by architect Joseph Praissman.

Mr. Cluver stated that the arcade is one of the most important features of this building. He opined that the Commission would not approve its alteration if this was an Italianate building. Mr. Baron noted that the Commission has been more flexible regarding alterations to

Redevelopment-Era buildings. He also noted, however, that a contributing building should be treated as a contributing building, regardless of its age. Mr. Rasmussen asserted that the character of the arcade would not be lost with his proposed alteration. The windows would be set back in the masonry openings of the arches, which would retain their original character. He said that the windows would be set back to the new interior wall, entirely within the masonry openings. Mr. Rasmussen said that the porch behind the arches “almost wants to be interior space.”

Ms. Pentz stated that she approved of the application. Mr. Cluver agreed. However, he noted that he might not approve of a similar treatment to an older building. Ms. Pentz pointed out that the Committee exists to make those sorts of value judgments.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance urged the Committee to recommend denial. He contended that the Committee should apply the Standards in the same way to every building, whether it was constructed in 1775, 1825, 1875, or 1975. He stated that the Commission has the discretionary authority to take into account the historic value of buildings when making its decisions, but the Committee does not. He insisted that the Committee must apply the Standards equally to all contributing buildings. He objected to the enclosing of the arcade. He contended that the addition is not in scale or character with the building. The materials are inappropriate. And the curb cut is not appropriate.

Mr. Rasmussen disagreed with Mr. Gallery's assessment. He contended that the addition of windows at the backs of the arched openings would not substantially change their character from the street. He also asserted that the proposed addition was appropriately scaled and clad for the building and district.

Mses. Gutterman and Pentz asked if the district nomination provided any additional information about the house or architect or why the house was deemed as contributing to the district. Mr. Baron stated that the inventory provided no information other than the architect, date, and classification. The Committee members asked about the significance of architect Joseph Praissman. The staff responded that it knew nothing about him.

Mr. Cluver objected to the privatization of parking. He claimed that this application proposes swapping one public, on-street space for one private, off-street space. Mr. Rasmussen observed that that is not a historic preservation issue, but is a zoning issue. He stated that he is seeking an approval of the parking before the Zoning Board. The community will have an opportunity to comment at that review.

Mr. Cluver stated that, from an architectural perspective, he approves of the proposal. However, he does not think that the Committee should recommend approval because it is a contributing building. Mr. Evans stated that he agrees with Mr. Gallery. He does believe that the project meets the Standards.

Mr. Farnham rejected Mr. Gallery's contention that a recommendation of approval inherently indicates that the significance of this Redevelopment-Era building has been discounted or the Standards have not been applied. He stated that he has a great appreciation of the Modern buildings in Society Hill. He stated that the staff had applied the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to the proposal when it developed its recommendation of approval. He also noted that the Commission regularly approves additions on rear ell's as well as alterations to rear

window openings. The staff's recommendation of approval is not a break from practice. Mr. Evans responded that the façades behind the wall could be considered the front of the house.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that the proposal satisfies the Standards. No historic fabric will be removed. The addition will be compatible with the existing building. Mr. Cluver and Ms. Gutterman objected to the addition. Ms. Gutterman said windows in the arches were acceptable as long as they were set back in the openings as proposed. She objected to the curb cut. Ms. Pentz advocated for a recommendation of approval. She contended that no historic fabric would be removed, the infill would be reversible, and the addition would be compatible.

Mr. Rasmussen objected to Mr. Gallery's claim that a significant portion of the roof structure would be removed for the addition. He stated that only a small section would be removed for the connection from the main block to addition. He added that the rear ell currently has a flat roof that is without character. Mr. Evans asked if the only roof framing to be removed is indicated in the area labeled the "bridge" on the plans. Mr. Rasmussen stated that that was true; only a small section of roof would be removed to create a passageway.

Mr. Rasmussen asked the Committee to provide him with guidance if it could not recommend approval. Mr. Cluver stated that the corner location makes it difficult to alter this building. Mr. Rasmussen again stated that he considers that his addition is compatible and therefore complies with the Standards. Ms. Gutterman stated that there are some properties that one simply cannot add to because of its location and visibility; this is one of those properties. Mr. Evans stated that he was deeply troubled by that statement. He asserted that, although contributing, this building is certainly not a landmark. Mr. Evans stated that he found the design of the addition very handsome. He stated that he liked the addition, but does not believe that it meets the Standards. Mr. Evans stated that he liked the cladding material of the addition; he suggested that the massing could be revised to satisfy the Standards. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the applicants provide photographs to the Commission showing how the addition would relate to the neighboring buildings. She said that it was not clear whether it would relate well to the other buildings. More documentation would clarify that issue and might show that it related well.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use.
Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be 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.

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.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.