

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
25 May 2004**

Present

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

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

Also

Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
Oleh Janusz, Janusz Woodwork and Construction Company
Hyman Myers, Vitetta Group
Allan Donitucci, Campbell Thomas & Company
James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Company
Marvin Gerstein, Temple University
Alan Goldstein, 929 Clinton Street
Nicole Morris, Vitetta Group
Eric Lautzenheiser, Vitetta Group
Dianne Chambless, 929 Clinton Street
Tony Forte, Esq., 1800 Liacouras Walk
Mark Dumin, Cornerstone Consulting Architectural and Engineering Firm
Charles Datner, AIA
Greg Tribbe, Gilmore Group
Ryan Levasseur, Gilmore Group
Kevin Manion, Wachovia
Dan Griffith, Wachovia
John DiNuovo, Marshall Sabatini Architects
John Marshall, Marshall Sabatini Architects
John Grossi, 630 Pine Street
Steve Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Spence Kass, Kass & Associates
Lynn Blahusch, C.B. Development
Richard W. Thom, Old City Civic Association
Edward H. Watson, Jr., 114 Elfreth's Alley
Rick Cove, Elfreth's Alley Association
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
John Kolea, Beaumont Company
Heather Knott, Graboyes Commercial Window Company
Charles Jefferson
Richard DiMarco, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers, LLP
Jerry Roller, J. K. Roller Architects
Jonathan Broh, J. K. Roller Architects

Irvin J. Borowsky, National Liberty Museum
 Sandra Kelly, National Liberty Museum
 Bob Hawk, National Liberty Museum
 Stephen Anderson, 103-107 Church Street
 Hugh Zimmers, 103-107 Church Street
 Anthony Citino, 1725 West Porter Street
 Lewis Manges, Elwyn Incorporation
 Hugh Zimmers, 1514 Waverly Street
 Liz Zimmers, Zimmers Associates
 Gersil Kay, Building Conservation International
 Joanne Phillips, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
 Matthew McClure, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
 James Rowe, Agoos/Lovera Architects
 Barry Ginder, Brandt & Ginder Architecture
 Robert Sommer, Ceebraid-Signal Corporation
 Janice Sulman, Esq., 1509 Pine Street
 Sam Ryan, owner, 1509 Pine Street
 David Matus, Matus Windows
 Charles E. Gaus, Jr., DeLaSalle In Towne
 Amy Johnston, Mural Arts Program
 Cathy Harris, Mural Arts Program
 Jane Golden, Mural Arts Program
 Donald Gensler, Mural Arts Program
 Pam Walker, DeLaSalle In Towne
 Richard D. Holst, Locust Real Estate
 Jay Eisner
 Janice Woodcock
 Neil Sklaroff, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
 Bill McMichael-Reaume, owner, 6118 Ardleigh Street
 Andrew Lengel, Blackney Hayes Architects
 Charles McGloughlin, Metcalfe Architect and Design
 Harvey Clark
 Ken Jacoby

Vincent Rivera, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:07.a.m.

114 Elfreth's Alley

Edward H. Watson, Jr., Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1751 and 1762 by Thomas Patterson, house carpenter, significant in district

PROPOSAL: Demolish 1-story rear addition, erect 2-story rear addition with deck

When the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documented the houses along Elfreth's Alley in 1931, this property had a rear ell that stretched to the rear property line. Since that time the rear ell was demolished and the building currently has a small, 1-story rear addition. Although this is the rear of the building, it is visible from Appletree Court.

The application calls for demolishing the non-historic rear addition and building a two-story rear addition. The addition has the same width as the original rear ell where it meets the main section of the house, but it is shorter than the original and has a bay window at the first floor that adds width to the addition. The grade change of the yard calls for the ell to be raised several feet above the grade of the main section, so, although it is only two stories, the addition will encase the historic cornice of the main section. The addition will have brick walls, cedar siding on the first-floor bay, with a metal pent eave, simulated-divided light windows, and multi-light doors at the second-floor

rear balcony.

The addition will also have a roof deck with access from the gambrel roof of the main section. The original dormer cannot be used as the access, owing to its location. The proposal calls for cutting an additional opening in the roof for a doorway leading to the deck. This would create a second dormer with a shed roof and multi-light door. Owing to the raised level of the rear addition, the proposed dormer sits higher than the original dormer and would be visible above the addition.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the proposal with two conditions: that the addition falls below the cornice line of the main building and the access to the deck be from the addition and not from the main section, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal and noted that an easement owned by Elfreth's Alley Association requires its approval for any alterations as well.

Ted Watson, the owner, said that the proposed addition would be set back from the rear of the lot. He said that the roof deck is in response to the desire to maximize the open space of the lot and he proposes a second dormer through the roof to access the deck, which will not be visible from Elfreth's Alley. Mr. Watson opined that an alternative option of a spiral staircase for access to the deck would impact the open space of the yard.

Mr. Tyler noted that a 1780s insurance survey references a rear two-story structure. Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant if he had considered dropping the floor height of the addition so that the cornice would not be impacted by the addition. Mr. Watson responded that this option is not feasible because this would require internal stairs, which would have a negative impact on the first floor. Ms. Spina commented that other options exist, which would not cut into the gambrel roof. Ms. Pentz asserted her willingness to consider the addition, owing to the possible existence of a two-story structure and the encasement of the eave; however, she does have an issue with the cutting of the roof. Mr. McCoubrey questioned the areas between the floors in the addition and noted that they could be designed closer together to make the addition shorter. Mr. D'Alessandro pointed out that where the two roofs met should be re-examined for water drainage.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asserted that Elfreth's Alley is an exceptionally historic street comprised of small and delicate houses. He believes that the proposed addition is the wrong size, character and scale for this house and historic fabric. Additionally, he said that the proposed alterations are inconsistent with the importance of this house and he concurred with the staff recommendation.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with two conditions: that the addition falls below the cornice line of the main building and the access to the deck be from the addition and not from the main section, 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 new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and Standard 10 [New additions and 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.]

110-112 South Front Street, NW corner of Ionic Street

John Kolea, Beaumont Corporation, Owner

Jonathan Broth, Applicant

DATE: c. 1835, all but the stone storefront demolished, 1994; stone columns and entablature dismantled, 1997

PROPOSAL: 15-story residential tower with parking

The Historical Commission designated the property in May 1974. The building suffered a fire in 1993 and the Department of Licenses and Inspections declared the upper two stories Imminently Dangerous. The owner at the time applied for complete demolition. In January 1994, after much deliberation, the Commission approved the demolition of the upper four floors, with L&I to inspect the integrity of the rest of the building. At the time, all but the stone columns and entablature were demolished.

In 1997, the owner returned to the Commission for permission to dismantle the remaining pieces of the building. At the time, he wanted to clean out the lot, and the stone pieces impeded the process. The Commission at the time approved the dismantling of the stone pieces with several conditions: the pieces were to be housed in a new structure for protection from the elements; they were to be re-erected in any new construction on the property when the property was redeveloped; the conditions of the inclusion of the historic material in any new construction was to be included in the property's deed so that any future owner would be aware of the requirement.

In December 2003, the present owner, Beaumont Corporation, applied for and received a foundation permit for the property, without Historical Commission approval. When L&I realized that the permit was issued in error on 4 May 2004, the Department revoked the permit. The application before the Commission is for a building permit for the property.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal, which calls for a 15-story high-rise, residential building that has parking on the first floor. The pedestrian entrance will be on the Front Street façade with a recessed, double-leaf, fully-glazed door. Two vehicular entrances appear on the Ionic Street façade leading to the parking garage (the floor plan shown on A1.1 does not correlate with the elevation on A2.1). The garage entrances will have open, metal, roll-down gates. The first four stories have brick facing and a cast-stone cornice; the upper floors have a stucco-panel system. All of the floors have banks of fixed windows atop awning windows at the southeast corner of the building. At the center of the eastern and western façades and on the southern façade, the building has recessed balconies with metal railings. The top of the building has an askew, two-story penthouse with a roof deck at the southeast corner.

The building stands next to Ionic Street, which is a part of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. The proposal calls for retaining the historic granite block and resetting for new street grading; however, it is unclear where and for what purpose the re-grading is required.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The height of the proposed new construction is completely out of context with the rest of the block along Front Street. Although the design does try to recognize the cornice-line of the neighboring buildings with the change in materials, this change merely accentuates its height. Any new construction on the site should reuse the historic materials as required by the Commission in 1997 and, perhaps, recreate the structure over Ionic Street as the historic building once did.

Jonathan Broth and Jerry Roller, architects, John Kolea, the owner, and Richard DiMarco, counsel for the project, attended the meeting. Mr. DiMarco stated that a foundation permit was secured after the project received zoning approval. Mr. Roller contended that he did not know that the

property was historic owing to its being a vacant lot, but he is willing to work with the Commission to revise the design of the skin of the tower. He said that he had tried to research the property because he was curious that the property line went to the south side of Ionic Street, but he could not find any photographs of the original building. He is willing to incorporate the historic stone into the new design, but he did not think it was in very nice condition; he would prefer using new stone. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the simplicity and age of the historic stone added to its significance and were the reasons why the Historical Commission wanted it incorporated into any new construction on the site.

Ms. Spina asked about protective measures for 108 South Front Street. Mr. DiMarco acknowledged that the work on the property exceeded the foundation permit in order to stabilize the neighboring building. The applicants then submitted a report by McClaymont & Rak Geotechnical Engineers, saying that continuing construction was the best alternative. Ms. Pentz questioned their findings because the report did not explore any other method of stabilization, such as temporary shoring. She offered to visit the site to investigate other ways of stabilizing 108 Front Street.

When asked about Ionic Street, Mr. Kolea noted that a water main break in the street caused a sink hole. Most of the granite block was removed and is now secured on site. When the construction is finished the block will be reinstalled. The curbs will be made flush with the cartway to allow larger vehicles a better turning radius into the garage.

Discussion then turned to the design of the new building. Mr. McCoubrey thought the scale too overwhelming. Ms. Spina noted a letter from INHP, which through an agreement with the City has a right to comment on the design because the property abuts federal land, believes that the proposed construction is too tall for this area of the city. She also noted that Front Street is a long line of low-rise, 19th century industrial buildings that act as the gate to Old City from the river. This design interrupts that strong, cohesive streetscape. Mr. Roller remarked that he believes that this area of the city is not intended for low rise development and that the proposed materials for the new construction were chosen for compatibility with the neighboring buildings.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance noted his strong support of the staff's recommendation. He could not believe an architectural firm with such experience could make such an oversight, with construction proceeding well beyond the acquired permits. Mr. Gallery concluded that the design is completely out of character with the streetscape.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property]. Any new construction on the site should reuse the historic materials as required by the Commission in 1997.

321 Chestnut Street

National Liberty Museum, Owner

Irvin Borowsky, Applicant

DATE: 1901, Hewitt Bros., architects; 3rd floor added, c. 1910

PROPOSAL: Legalize signs and lights, add signs, bench

The owner, without a permit or Historical Commission approval, installed three signs in the front window openings, the flagpole on the corner and seven lights into the cornices of the building. The Liberty Museum now wishes to legalize the signs and lights. The museum is also applying for additional signage: a banner on the front, four signs along Orianna Street and one on the rear of the building overlooking Franklin Court. Other than location, the application does not include details

of the signage. The proposal also calls for a bench at the foot of the staircase on Chestnut Street.

In February 2000, the Historical Commission denied a signage application that included banners on the columns and a sign in a single bay on Orianna Street, stating that the signage overwhelmed the building. At that time the Commission suggested to the museum that it reopen some of the former windows along Orianna Street for the visibility that the museum was seeking.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 7, 9, and Signage Guideline.

Ms. Spina explained this application and noted the addition of a speaker on the portal of the door. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the Committee and Commission had previously denied the signage. Ms. Spina noted that parts of the proposal had been denied in the past, parts had never been reviewed. Committee members expressed concern about the attachment of the signs and especially the lights into the masonry.

Irvin Borowsky and Bob Hawk attended the meeting. Mr. Borowsky said that he received approval for two banners, now he is seeking approval for one additional banner as well as a flat sign positioned against the building for pedestrians. Mr. Borowsky contended that he merely replaced existing lights; however, he admitted that he installed additional fixtures. None of the photographs in the Commission files show lights on the building.

Committee members noted the 16 anchors into the marble for each sign as well as the numerous screws for the lights, which did not receive a permit. They asserted that the illegal work should be corrected before they consider new alterations and asked staff to review the file to see what signage had been approved previously.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.], Standard 7 [Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.], Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and Signage Guideline [Not Recommended: Using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy remaining character defining features of the historic building.].

103-107 Church Street

Zagara Management, Owner

Stephen Anderson, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1848 for Estate of Stephen Girard; alterations, 1930-31 by John Windrim, architect

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation and additions for residential conversion

The Committee and Commission previously approved a large addition to these three buildings in Old City with several setbacks at the roofline. Previously, the fenestration in the additions was symmetrical and related to the historic buildings.

Since the Commission reviewed the proposal, another developer has purchased the properties and redesigned the interior spaces. The rooftop addition has been reduced in size. However, the new developer wishes to maximize the light and views by enlarging the windows considerably. The new windows are still wood, true-divided light. The front façade is minimally visible from Front Street,

but the north façade is visible from Cuthbert Street.

Also, the proposal now calls for cutting 13 new, double-hung windows on the east façade. A new, flush metal door is also proposed as a second means of egress.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the reduced rooftop addition, but denial of the new fenestration patterns and new windows in the east façade, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

Ms. Spina explained the application which changes the fenestration pattern on the additions and requires an excessive loss of historic fabric.

Stephen Anderson and Hugh Zimmers, architects, and Joanne Phillips, counsel for the developer, attended the meeting. Mr. Anderson concurred that the addition would have visibility from the north façade at the fifth floor level. The applicant wishes to gain as much light as possible for the penthouse. Ms. Phillips noted that the reduced height of the penthouse is required by the new zoning overlay in Old City. She pointed out that the windows on the east façade are located on an open alley with the closest building three feet away and that the neighboring building will help obscure the east wall. Mr. Anderson said that the wall is in poor condition and has been stuccoed, so the historic fabric has already been compromised. Ms. Pentz asked if engineer is in agreement with the penetrations in the wall and Ms. Phillips responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Spina inquired if the existing metal gate at the end of the alley would remain. Mr. Zimmers responded that it is his intention to preserve gate and it must remain open according to fire safety regulations since the second means of egress is from that doorway. Mr. McCoubrey commented that he believes the larger windows in the penthouse are appropriate since they are in new construction; however, the color of the penthouse area should be a recessive color, such as a dark putty. He also concluded that the nature of the cornice should remain simple, with the vocabulary of the penthouse windows replicated on the lower floors of the rear façade.

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

1725 West Porter Street

Anthony J. Citino, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1906, James & John Windrim, architects

PROPOSAL: Erect carport and shed, install gates

The owner wishes to install a carport with shed for storage. The structure would have a flat, asphalt roof, T – 1-11 sides and white trim. The whole structure would measure eighteen feet by fifteen feet and have a shed to one side. The chainlink fence would be replaced with a wrought-iron one.

Ms. Spina presented this application, which also calls for legalizing a metal gate that the owner installed on the front façade between his house and the neighbor's at 1723 Porter Street.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the carport, but approval of the fences at the front and rear, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Anthony Citino, the owner, said that he could consider the project, with or without the shed.

Ms. Pentz informed the applicant that similar proposals have been denied by the Committee. Mr. McCoubrey emphasized that the proposed alteration would be a fundamental change to the rear

yard, which is counter to the open space and suburban-like quality of this district.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the carport, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] Approval of the gate and fence, pursuant to Standard 9 and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

826 South Front Street

Wandz Costanzo, Owner

Oleh Janusz, Contractor

DATE: 1817; storefront added, c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Replace storefront, add shutters, alter dormer, add lighting

The Commission approved alterations to the storefront in 1974, but they were not built according to plan. T – 1-11 siding and inappropriate windows were installed instead of the approved materials. The proposal calls for removing the siding and installing wood panels that would replicate the look of the historic transoms. Wood panels would also be installed below the existing windows. New single-leaf, four-panel doors will be installed in each opening and the marble stairs repaired and reset. The owner also wishes to install two-panel wood shutters on the upper floors, replace the light, install metal railings, remove the brick infill at the second doorway, and remove the tar paper at the dormer. Although not a true restoration of the historic storefront, the work will undo many of the unsympathetic changes that have happened to the building over the years.

Staff recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 4 and 9.

Oleh Janusz, the contractor, attended the meeting to explain the proposal. He noted that the door to the right would be the main entrance, while the alternate doors would be non-operable. He said that storefront would have flat panels and raised panels for the doors and the shutters.

Committee members reviewed the proposal and thought that the proposed alterations would be an improvement.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.] and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]

5218 Germantown Avenue

Elwyn Incorporated, Owner

James C. Campbell, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1795

PROPOSAL: Replace roof, gutters, repair cast iron porch

Ms. Spina explained this application. The house originally had cedar shake roofing, but it was replaced with a standing-seam metal roof almost a century ago. The proposal calls for replacing the metal roof with a new standing-seam aluminum roof. On all façades but the front, the pole gutters would be replaced with hanging aluminum gutters. This would obscure the decorative ogee

cornices. The work also includes lightning rods.

Staff recommendation: Approval on the condition that the gutters are painted to match the fascia, pursuant to Standard 4.

James Campbell and Allan Antonucci, architects and Lewis C. Manges attended the meeting. Mr. Campbell showed the Committee two types of roofing systems, one with a taller standing seam and one that had a better interlocking system of panels. Committee members concurred that a smaller seam profile for the roof is more appropriate.

Mr. Campbell stated that the pole gutter will be restored at the front façade, but noted that there is the possibility of a need to get ventilation under the roof, which would require the installation of soffit vents with caps. He said that a further determination would occur once the roof has been removed. The Committee recognized the necessity for ventilation, even if it means soffit vents in the ornate cornice.

Mr. Campbell asked the Committee about repairs to the cast iron railings and brackets on the rear porch. Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro thought that the railings should be replicated, especially since the railings had many repetitive elements. Mr. Campbell inquired if a similar design could be installed instead, if replication proved too expensive. Mr. McCoubrey suggested installing a simple railing behind the existing rather than introducing a different design. The Committee asked Mr. Campbell to do further research.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal, including the ridge vents and soffit vents on the condition that they and the hanging gutters are painted to match the cornice, with staff to review details, subject to a determination of need, pursuant to Standard 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.].

929 Clinton Street

Alan Goldstein, Owner

Alexander Rice, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840; roof destroyed by fire, mid-20th c.

PROPOSAL: Construct addition, add rear balconies

The Commission previously approved major renovations to this property, including the rebuilding of the gable roof. At the rear the gable roof led out to a rear deck that was built on an extended elevator tower. Now the application calls for building an addition off of the gable roof and infilling the historic piazza even more to extend the roof deck another five feet.

The second part of the application calls for new decks on the rear façade of the rear ell. The one on the third floor spans the width of the rear ell and extends five feet; the one on the second floor extends the full depth of the lot.

Although on the rear, all of these alterations are highly visible from 10th Street.

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

Alan Goldstein and Dianne Chambless, the owners, attended the meeting. Mr. Goldstein disclosed that the driving force for the additional deck is to render the property more desirable with an enhancement to the rear. He said that the proposed alterations would infill the existing stairtower to create a terrace and extend the kitchen and dining area.

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

1800-1818 Park Avenue

Temple University, Owner

Hyman Myers, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1872, David A. Woelpper, builder

PROPOSAL: Significant demolition, reconstruction of mansards

This application seeks final approval of demolition, stabilization, and some restoration at 1800-1818 Park Mall. The overall project includes the rehabilitation of 1800 Park Avenue; substantial demolition at 1802-1818 Park Avenue; the retention of the historic facades of 1802-1818 Park Avenue; and the construction of a 5-story building set back behind front facades of 1802-1818 Park Avenue. At its meeting on 13 February 2004, the Commission found that the adaptive reuse of the historic buildings would constitute a financial hardship and approved in concept the demolition of the rears of 1802-1818, but not the mansards, and the new construction provided the design was improved.

The current application seeks final approval of the demolition of the rears of 1802-1818 Park Mall (Phase 1). A façade stabilization plan has been submitted with the demolition plans. The design for the new building to be constructed behind the historic facades has not been completed; a preliminary design of the new construction has been included to provide a context for the demolition, but not for formal review (Phase 2).

The current application also seeks final approval of the demolition of the mansards with dormers and their reconstruction to match originals. The new mansard structure would be constructed in steel; the dormers would be recreated to match the surviving originals; the mansards and dormers would be roofed with a slate substitute. The Commission's earlier finding of financial hardship and in-concept approval of the demolition and new construction did not include the demolition of the mansards and dormers. The applicant claims that further investigation has revealed that it is infeasible to preserve the mansards, which are extremely deteriorated. The applicant requests that the staff review the details of the mansard reconstruction.

The current application also includes a series of staff-level review items such as replications of historic doors and windows.

One aspect of this portion of the application, the basement window infill, requires Committee and Commission review. Mr. Tyler informed the applicant that he would approve the basement window and grille replacement proposal if the applicant installed windows between the grilles and infill. The applicant wishes instead to install grilles and infill without windows.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the demolition and the mansard reconstruction with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2 [*The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*]; Standard 5 [*Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*]; and Standard 6 [*Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*]. Denial of the basement infill without windows, pursuant to Standard 2.

Mr. D'Alessandro recused himself. Mr. Tyler announced the absence of a quorum. The applicants and public agreed to proceed without a quorum. Mr. Farnham presented the application.

Tony Forte, counsel for the applicant, architects Hyman Myers and Eric Loutzenheiser, and Marvin Gerstein of Temple University attended the meeting. Mr. Myers disclosed that the preservation of the mansards is not feasible. He pointed out that the problem with the existing mansard is water infiltration. He stated that the mansards would be replicated and asked that the staff review the details to guarantee accuracy. He said that original slate exists only on one of the buildings; the others are roofed with replacement materials including asphalt shingles. Mr. Myers asked the Committee for a recommendation of final approval for the demolition even though the final plans are not completed for the new construction. Mr. Forte noted that the historic facades would be stabilized during the demolition.

Mr. Tyler contended that the principal issue is the mansard demolition, but asserted that the applicant would faithfully reconstruct the historic roofs. Mr. Myers emphasized faithful replication. He stated that he would remove an entire dormer to ensure accuracy. Additionally, he will meet with staff on the site to discuss and address any concerns.

With respect to the infilling of the basement windows, Mr. Myers remarked that there is no need for the insertion of a window between the infill and grate. The grates cover a large portion of the openings and the window will have very little visibility. Mr. McCoubrey thought that the addition of a basement window between the grill and infill would be unnecessary. He suggested that a recessive color will accomplish the same goal.

Mr. Myers gave the Committee an overview of the new construction. Committee members concurred with the direction of the new design.

The Architectural Committee recommended final approval of the demolition including the mansards, replication of the mansards, roofing of the mansards with a slate substitute matching the shape and color of the original slate, and infilling the basement windows provided the historic basement window grates are replicated in a durable material, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; and 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.].

327 Race Street

Aris Kartoutsdis, Owner

Charles Datner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Legalize basement steps and doorway

This application proposes the modification and legalization of a basement entrance added to the building at 327 Race Street. The entrance was added without a building permit or Commission approval, despite the Commission's denial of a proposal for a basement entrance in May 2003. On

5 September 2003, members of the Commission's staff happened upon a contractor completing the basement entrance work. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation on 23 September 2003. A subsequent investigation revealed that the work was not undertaken defiantly, but because of a misunderstanding resulting from a language barrier.

The Greek Revival building was constructed about 1830 as a residence. Before the Civil War, probably in the 1840s, a 3-bay storefront with doors in the outer bays was added to the building. This storefront, which is documented in a 1908 photograph, included bulkhead doors below the window in the center bay. The old storefront was replaced with a new storefront about 1920. The new storefront, which survived intact until September 2003, included industrial windows over brick spandrels in the two west bays and doors in the east bay. It did not include basement access. The current application proposes to legalize an inaccurate replication of the 1840s basement doors in the 1920s storefront.

The May 2003 application proposed an open stairway to the basement that would have run parallel to the front façade. The Commission denied that application because it would have required the removal of an historic stone step. The current application proposes an open stairway running perpendicular to the front façade into the center bay of the storefront. According to the application, a brick spandrel in the center bay would be removed and paneled doors added in its place. Matching wood panels would be added in place of the brick spandrel in the west bay. Although not shown, metal pipe railings flanking the opening would be added. The drawing is inconsistent. In section, the top of the basement door approximately aligns with the sidewalk level. In elevation, the door or doors rise about two feet above the sidewalk, filling the spandrel below the window. The proposed plan will not work and should be revised.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, owing to inconsistencies in the plans.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Charles Datner, the architect, attended the meeting. He explained that, owing to a recent renovation of the adjacent building to the east, access to a basement entranceway was barred. Therefore, the owner needed a new means to access the basement space, which is rented. Mr. Datner added that an internal stair to the basement would intrude on the interior space.

Committee members reviewed the drawings and concluded that there are irregularities in the plans. They also noted that the alterations appearing to be infringing on the sidewalk. Ms. Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey contended that, even if corrected to rectify the inconsistencies, the proposed plan would not work. Committee members concluded that the plans needed revision as well as more detail, but also advised that, even if corrected, the proposed plan would be unacceptable. Ms. Pentz opined that the exterior basement stair may not meet code and thought that an internal stair would be more appropriate.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, owing to inconsistencies in the plans.

123 S. Broad Street

Owner: Wachovia Bank

Applicant: Dan G. Griffith, Wachovia Bank

History: 1928, Simon & Simon

Project: In concept – canopies and lighting

This application for review in concept proposes canopies, signage, and lighting for the bank building at 123 S. Broad Street. Architect Grant Simon, a former chair of the Historical

Commission, and his brother designed the grand building in 1925. The proposed additions are not compatible with the grand, dignified, classical building. Most significant, the canopies would obscure the important sculptural metalwork above the three Broad Street entranceways. Also, the proposed canopies extend beyond the arched openings, breaking the verticality of the soaring spaces.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Greg Tribbe and Ryan Levasseur of the Gilmore Group and Kevin Manion and Dan Griffith of Wachovia represented the application. Mr. Tribbe explained that this is the largest Wachovia office in the area. It is the flagship office and needs a strong street presence. He further explained that he has been retained by Wachovia to improve their branding. He distributed a revised design that proposes canopies with lighting at the three arched entranceways on Broad Street, two additional flag poles on Broad Street, six banners on Sansom Street, and six banners on Walnut Street. He stated that the smaller canopies between the three large arched openings seen in some renderings have been deleted from the most current design.

The applicants and Committee members discussed the canopies at length. Mr. McCoubrey objected to the several design features of the canopies. He noted that the canopies extend beyond the arched openings onto the façade, breaking the strong vertical lines of the openings. They also obscure the ornamental bronze details above the doors. Mr. Levy agreed with Mr. McCoubrey. Both concluded that any canopy should be limited to the width of the arched opening. Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the width of the central canopy. The applicants explained that the arched opening is 18 feet wide and the central canopy would be more than 37 feet wide.

Mr. Tyler contended that the canopies would not be sympathetic to the character of the building. He added that the design would need Art Commission and Streets Department approvals in addition to Historical Commission approval. He suggested that the designers consider using light in the windows to accomplish their signage goals. Mr. Tribbe noted that the building has few windows and that the banking business has become very competitive recently. Mr. Levy stated that he deemed the lighting of the archway acceptable.

Mr. McCoubrey returned the discussion to the canopies. He asserted that the canopy should be limited to the arch opening and should be more recessive. He stated that the basic idea was acceptable, but that the scale and proportion was not. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with his fellow Committee members, but also opined that the canopies should not obscure the important bronze detailing over the doors. Mr. Tribbe pointed to the section in the plans and asked if a canopy within the outer recesses but outside the arch opening itself would be acceptable. The Committee members replied that the canopies should be limited to the openings and should not extend out onto the face of the building including the pilasters supporting the arches. They stated that vertical lines up to the arches should not be broken by horizontal elements.

The Committee and applicants then discussed the flags and banners. The applicants would like to add two flag poles on the Broad Street façade to accompany the two extant flag poles. The two center flags would advertise Wachovia; the outer flags would advertise the office tower and a large tenant. The Committee concluded that the new flags would clutter and obscure the important façade. The Committee also concluded that the design proposed too many banners for the side façades and that those banners were inappropriately positioned and scaled.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval in concept of the canopies, provided they are limited in width to the arched openings and reduced in scale;

approval in concept of the banners on Sansom and Walnut Streets, provided they are limited to one per façade, positioned near the corner, and scaled to the nearby windows; approval in concept of the lighting; and denial of the additional flag poles; pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

1 S. Broad Street

Owner: Wachovia Bank

Applicant: Dan G. Griffith, Wachovia Bank

History: bell, 1926, Gillett & Johnstone Foundry; belfry, 1931, John Windrim, architect

Project: In concept - alterations to belfry

This application for review in concept proposes signage and lighting for the bell and belfry at the building at 1 S. Broad Street. The signage would consist of a very large steel spiral sculpture with LED lights wrapping the belfry and a very large internally illuminated Wachovia sign at the base of the belfry. Blue and green lights would illuminate the bell and belfry.

The bell was installed in 1926 on the Wanamaker Department Store at 13th and Market Streets. It was moved in 1931 to a higher location at the new Wanamaker's Men's Store and Office Tower, the building at 1 S. Broad Street now known as the PNB Building. Architect John Windrim designed the building including the belfry, which was planned specifically to house the 15-ton Wanamaker Bell.

The Historical Commission designated the John Wanamaker Memorial Founder's Bell as an object in June 2000; it did not nor has it subsequently designated the entire building. Therefore, the Commission must consider both jurisdictional and design questions.

The Ordinance defines "Object" as "A material thing of functional, aesthetic, cultural, historic or scientific value that may be, by nature or design, movable yet related to a specific setting or environment." The proposed signage and lighting would significantly alter the setting or environment of the bell.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Greg Tribbe and Ryan Levasseur of the Gilmore Group and Kevin Manion and Dan Griffith of Wachovia represented the application. Committee members agreed that the Committee should concentrate its review on architectural and preservation issues, leaving the jurisdictional question to the Commission.

Mr. Tribbe introduced the project with large color renderings. Mr. Levy reminisced about the Wanamaker Men's Store. He noted that the lights on the belfry would forecast the weather. He asked the applicants if they intended to reinstate the forecasts as part of their lighting scheme. Mr. Manion replied that the lighting in blue and green was intended to reinforce Wachovia's corporate identity. Forecasting with colored lighting was not compatible with their new branding program.

Mr. Tribbe stated that he did not like the extant PNB sign. Responding to the design of the signage to replace the PNB sign, Ms. Pentz stated that she liked the lettering around the base of the belfry, but not the lighted structure, which she aptly labeled a "crown." Mr. Tyler stated that the geometry of the "crown" conflicts with the geometry of the tower. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed and concluded

that the Wachovia lettering is acceptable, but the “crown” masks the belfry architecture. Mr. McCoubrey concurred with his colleagues. The Committee suggested that the applicants revise the “crown” design to correspond to the architecture of the belfry; it also suggested that the applicants employ lighting rather than adding to the belfry.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval in concept of the lettering at the base of the belfry, provided structural information is submitted as part of the final review; approval in concept of the lighting of the belfry; and denial of the spiral sculpture called the “crown”; pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]

630 Pine Street, aka 629 Addison Street

Owner: John Grossi

Applicant: John Sabatini, architect

History: c. 1840; new façade c. 1910

Project: Alter front façade, demolish original rear ell and build rear addition; erect new row house on Addison Street

This application proposes alterations and new construction at 630 Pine Street, a property that extends from Pine Street south to Addison Street. The owner has received zoning approval to subdivide the lot into two lots, one facing Pine, the other facing Addison. The lot has not yet been subdivided, but will be soon. For the Pine Street property, the applicant proposes alterations to the front façade and the demolition and construction of an addition at the rear. This building was constructed about 1840; a new Colonial Revival front façade was added about 1910. The applicant also proposes an entirely new house at the rear of the lot, facing Addison Street.

For the front façade of the historic building, the applicant proposes a denticulated wood cornice, but not the historic cornice. Most significantly, the proposed cornice ignores the extant, large, decorative, brick corbels at the party walls. The historic Colonial Revival cornice, which stood on the corbels, could be replicated from a photograph in the Commission’s collection. The applicant also proposes to rebuild the door surround with engaged columns. The original door surround, much of which has survived, could be replicated as well. Note that a ghost of the pediment section of the 1910 door surround can be seen on the façade; the extant, smaller pediment is a later addition. Finally, the applicant proposes paneled shutters for the second and third-story windows. This 1910 Colonial Revival building did not have shutters. The proposed one-over-one windows and roofing are appropriate. In general, the applicant proposes to remake this 1910 façade as a falsely historic 1780 façade. The documentary and physical evidence exists to restore this facade to its historic 1910 state. The 1910 façade, with its bold cornice and door surround, was a harmonious and coherent composition.

At the rear of the historic building, the applicant proposes to demolish an historic, 2-story ell and construct a smaller, 2-story rear addition. A small deck would be added atop the addition. The rear ell appears to be entirely original; it maintains its original half-gable roofline. The rear of this building is currently visible from Waverly Street across a vacant lot. The applicant is applying to build a house on Addison Street as part of this application. The new house would completely block the view of the rear of 630 Pine Street.

At the rear, facing Addison Street, the application proposes a new house with garage. The façade

would be ornamented in the Colonial Revival style. It would be an admixture or mélange of Colonial features gathered arbitrarily from surrounding historic buildings and combined in a random manner.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the front façade alterations; denial of the rear demolition and addition; denial of the new construction, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, and 6. The staff does not object to the concept of the new house with garage, but to its falsely historic ornamentation.

Jon Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner John Grossi and architects John DiNuovo and John Marshall represented the project, which was originally designed by architect John Sabatini. Owing to the impending subdivision, Mr. Farnham suggested that the Committee make two separate recommendations, one for the historic building and one for the new construction.

Mr. DiNuovo explained the proposal to the Committee. He noted that the zoning approval for the subdivision of the lots, which was supported by the Society Hill Civic Association, mandates that the rear ell of 630 Pine Street be demolished to meet the 30% open space requirement. Mr. Farnham noted that the rear ell is original, but is in poor condition. Mr. Grossi contended that the rear ell detracts from the house. Ms. Pentz of the Committee stated that she would accept the demolition of the ell, which will be removed from public view with the construction of the new row house at the rear. She also stated that she approved of the new construction. Mr. Farnham pointed out that the Commission has protected significant historic resources that are not visible from public rights-of-way. He noted that some, but not all, staff members consider this ell to be significant enough to warrant such protection. Mr. Levy of the Committee inquired about the details of the new construction that would replace the rear ell. The applicants acknowledged that there were discrepancies between the plans and elevation at the rear.

Mr. Rivera arrived at the meeting.

Turning its attention to the front façade of the Pine Street building, the Committee reviewed historic and current photographs of the building. Mr. Grossi stated that he wanted the shutters to draw attention away from the brick color, which was not “the best.” Mr. Farnham explained that the color of the Roman-style bricks corresponded exactly with the remainder of the 1910 façade. The orange brick color was typical of the era. He noted that the color was not that of the brick of the surrounding early nineteenth-century houses, but that it was appropriate for the 1910 façade. Committee members reviewed the photographs and concluded that the proposed alterations were not appropriate. They agreed with the staff that the façade should be restored to its original 1910 appearance using the 1950s photograph. They asserted that the historic 1910 cornice should be reconstructed in place of the proposed cornice, which ignores the corbelled brick brackets. They also stated that the door surround should be replicated from the photo and surviving fabric. They agreed that shutters were not appropriate. They acknowledged that the original 1910 window configurations were unknown, but maintained that one-over-one wood double-hung windows would be acceptable. Mr. Baron added that a six-over-one configuration was also a possibility. The Committee agreed and suggested that the architects update the design and return for another review.

For the historic building at 630 Pine Street, the Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the front façade alterations, but approval of the rear demolition and new construction, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 3 [Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of

historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.]; Standard 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.]; and 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.]. It suggested that the applicant restore the front façade based on the Commission's 1950s photograph and surviving physical evidence.

The Committee then considered the new construction at the rear of the property, which will be known as 629 Addison Street after the subdivision. The Committee agreed that the pseudo-historical façade should be simplified. It asked the applicant to redesign it to be more contemporary. It requested that the architects remove the shutters and simplify the lintels and other overtly historical details. Steven Wexler of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that his organization had approved the subdivision. He added that it conditioned its approval on the renovation of the Pine Street building prior to the construction of the Addison Street building.

For the new construction at 629 Addison Street, the Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval in concept of the massing, height, opening rhythm, and garage, but denial of the details of the new construction, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

1601 Locust Street aka 226 South 16th Street

Owner: Alan Domb

Applicant: Lynn Blahusch, C.B. Development Services, Inc.

History: 1929, Grant Simon, architect

Project: Legalize canopy

This application proposes the legalization of a large metal canopy on the University Club building at 1601 Locust Street. It was erected without the Commission's approval or a building permit. The canopy is appropriate for this building.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the legalization, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Lynn Blahusch of C.B. Development Services, Inc. and Spence Kass, the architect, represented the project. Mr. Farnham noted that the illegal work resulted from a misunderstanding between the many consultants on the project and a misinterpretation of the Commission's approval in concept for the overall project. Committee members agreed that the canopy was appropriate for the building.

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

2031 Walnut Street

Owner: Blac Holding Co.

Applicant: Patricia Perlstein

History: c. 1860

Project: Erect 1-story rear addition

This application proposes a 1-story addition and fencing at the rear of 2031 Walnut Street. The addition would be faced with brick and would include a flush metal door as well as a basement access. Although the application is not explicit, the fencing appears to be of the cyclone or chain-link type. Mid nineteenth-century rear fences were typically wood.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided a wood fence is substituted for the metal fence, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application. Richard DeMarco, Esq. represented the application. Mr. Levy stated that the drawings were confusing. His fellow Committee members agreed. Lenore Milholland of the Center City Residents Association and Preservation Alliance inquired about changes to the front façade. Mr. DeMarco stated that no front-façade alterations were proposed at this time. Committee member concluded that the addition was acceptable, but that the chain-link fence should be supplemented with webbing inserts to obscure the view of the trash containers. Mr. Rivera stated that the webbing should be dark green in color.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal, provided dark green webbing is inserted in the chain-link fence, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

1514 Waverly Street

Owner: Eleanor Zimmers

Applicant: Liz Zimmers

History: c. 1880

Project: Demolish 1-story stair tower, erect rooftop addition, reopen infilled windows

This application proposes the rehabilitation of a 2-story carriage house for two apartments and an architect's office. A small stair tower would be demolished at the southeast corner of the property and a 2nd-story deck added in its place. A large 1-story addition with three decks would be added to create a 3rd story. The addition would be faced with stucco, fenestrated with clad wood windows, and roofed with metal. Several infilled openings would be reopened. Lighting and a wrought-iron gate would be added.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the addition, pursuant to Standard 9. The proposed addition is much too large for the historic building; it would overwhelm it.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Hugh and Liz Zimmers represented the application. Mr. Zimmers explained that his architectural firm's office and an apartment are located in the building currently. His practice is expanding and he needs more space. He would therefore like to add one story on the building. He noted that the first floor of the carriage house is currently used for parking and that he would like to maintain that parking rather than move his office into that space. He showed numerous photographs of the property and

explained that it is bounded by three streets, Waverly, Sydenham, and Addison. He added that the main façade faces Waverly Street and that the other two streets are very narrow.

Mr. Levy asked for clarification on the carriage house doors, which would be retained.

Ms. Pentz inquired about the setback on Waverly Street. Mr. Zimmers stated that the addition would be set back 4'-6" from the front façade on Waverly. He added that the addition would not be visible from Waverly. Ms. Pentz asserted that she would like to see a mock-up of the addition to verify his visibility claim. Mr. Zimmers stated that he would be happy to stage a mock-up.

Mr. Levy asserted that the windows on the Waverly Street façade of the addition were inappropriate. Ms. Zimmers replied that they were intended to echo the carriage doors below.

Mr. Rivera stated that the addition should be more sympathetic to the historic building. He thought that it should look like an extension of the historic building in this case. He added that the current proposal is not appropriate for the urban setting. He counseled the applicants to withdraw and resubmit a revised plan. Mr. McCoubrey agreed and stated that the addition should either closely resemble the historic building or appear very different. He suggested that they add a glass house on the roof of the historic building.

Ms. Pentz recommended that the applicants maintain the 2-story carriage house character of the Waverly Street façade.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval in concept of a 3rd-story addition, provided the Waverly Street façade is not impacted, but denial of the proposal as submitted.

1612-1618 Locust Street

TC & KY Associates, Incorporated, Owners

Ceebraid-Signal Corporation, Applicant

DATE: Locust Club, built c.1960, Non-contributing

1618 Locust Street, built c. 1850, attributed to John Notman

PROPOSAL: Demolish 1612-1616 Locust Street, erect 8-story residential building, and rehab 1618 Locust Street

The Architectural Committee reviewed an application to redevelop the properties at 1612-1618 Locust Street at its February 2004 meeting. After the Committee and community registered its disapproval of the plan by Bower Lewis Thrower, the applicant withdrew the proposal, and hired the architectural firm of Agoos Lovera. Agoos Lovera has prepared a design that stipulates the demolition of the Non-contributing structure at 1612-1616 as well as a 1960 addition that wraps around the rear of 1618 Locust Street. The Significant brownstone house at 1618 Locust would be retained and restored on the exterior. The plans call for an 8-story residential building to be constructed on the site of the Locust Club. The new building will have multiple set backs from Locust Street as well as from the west side above the 6th Floor to honor the scale of Locust Street and minimize shadows on St. Marks Church. The building will be clad in yellow and pink Casota stone like that on the Art Museum and will include balconies as well as an entrance on the west end of the facade. On Latimer Street, the building will include a courtyard and a vehicular entrance to basement parking with a brick wall running along the sidewalk line. At its May 2004 meeting, the Commission approved in concept the Agoos Lovera plan. It now returns for a final review.

Staff recommendation: Approval, provided the trellis and roof deck at the front of 1618 Locust

Street are pulled back from the front façade so as not to be visible from Locust Street, pursuant to Standard 9 and Standard 10.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorneys Joanne Phillips and Matthew McClure of Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, architect James Rowe of Agoos/Lovera Architects, and Robert Sommer of Ceebraid-Signal Corporation represented the application. Ms. Phillips noted that her team had presented a massing model at the review in concept. The new model, which they displayed for the Committee and public, was a final model. She added that east and west elevations had been included in the Committee materials; they had not been presented for the review in concept. She also noted that the project will represent a \$25 million investment in the city.

Mr. Rowe presented an overview of the design. He stated that the facades had been revised based on the Committee and Commission's comments. He added that he had met with the Latimer Street residents to discuss their concerns.

Ms. Pentz stated that she liked the design very much. She agreed with the staff that the deck and trellis should be set back from the front façade of the historic building at 1618 Locust Street. Mr. Levy noted that he does not like the trellises on the Locust Street façade. Mr. Rowe replied that it softens the transition to the setback section. Other Committee members stated that they deemed the trellis on the front façade acceptable, but would like to see the trellis on the west façade over the historic building pulled back from the front façade. Mr. Baron asked about the railing on the roof deck on 1618 Locust, the historic building. Mr. Rowe stated that it would not be visible. Mr. Rivera agreed that the west facing trellis should be reduced in size to preclude its visibility from Locust Street. Committee members decided that the staff should visit the site and determine with the applicants the appropriate location of the trellis and deck. Mr. McCoubrey congratulated the architect on a skillful design.

Gersil Kay asked the applicants why they had chosen a light stone when other buildings on the block are brownstone. Ms. Phillips responded: "That's exactly why." Mr. Rowe clarified, explaining that there are a broad range of colors on the block including brownstone, red brick, light brick, and brick painted white. The new building, he stated, would join in the eclectic mix. Ms. Kay asked about the shadows cast by the new building. The applicants again presented the results of their shadow studies. She inquired about the parking entrance. The applicants restated their plans for parking.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval with staff to review details, provided the trellis and roof deck at the front of 1618 Locust Street are pulled back from the front façade so as not to be visible from Locust Street, with staff to verify the lack of visibility at the site, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and 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.].

1509 Pine Street

Sam Ryan, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Legalize door and transom

This application calls for legalization of a door and transom that were installed and do not match the proportions of the drawing that was approved. The contractor said he made an assumption that the door was a seven foot door and noted that on the drawing which was approved. He did not, however, measure, follow the instructions of the architect's drawing to match the neighbor, or follow the dimensions of the transom, or even the proportions of the door as shown on his own drawing.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented this application and pointed out that staff reviews many shop drawings for approval and it is important to have be able to have confidence in their measurements.

Sam Ryan, the owner, Janice Sulman, counsel for the owner, and David Matus, the contractor, attended the meeting. Mr. Matus remarked that he thought the neighboring door's height was 7 feet and made the transom to fit the remainder of the opening. He did not measure the opening. He said that he didn't remember communicating with the architect.

Mr. Rivera commented that the responsibility lies with the contractor to look at the drawings and to measure, especially since the owner had the door drawn by an architect. Ms. Pentz concurred; she also noted that the door panel proportions as built do not match Mr. Matus's own drawing and are incorrect.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial 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.].

25 South Van Pelt Street

Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Owner

Cathy Harris, Applicant

DATE: 1894; addition 1939 L. Magaziner for Evening Home and Library Association

PROPOSAL: Mural

Mr. Baron presented the proposal, which calls for painting a mural on two walls of the building, the north and somewhat on the east wall. These are finished brick walls that were never party walls. A metal mesh screen will also be attached at the lower part of the north west corner of the building.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 9. The Commission has not approved murals on finished exposed brick walls.

Cathy Harris, Jane Golden, Amy Johnston, Donald Gensler and Paz Gutierrez of the Mural Arts Program, and Pam Walker and Charles Gaus attended the meeting. Mr. Gensler said that he met with the Department of Human Services and an Intensive delinquency program. He noted that students created small symbols to depict the positive changes in their life. He said that the proposed location gives a presence, the mural would have a layering mesh screen with layering designs, and history incorporated with the symbols of change by the students. He stressed that consideration was given to the building's architecture and its relationship to history. Mr. Gensler cited the mural at 2nd and Arch Streets on a brick wall and he said that so many children are

dealing with truancy, that the mural is a way to give that community a voice. Ms. Gutierrez believes that the wall responds to the conditions of the city with positive exposure. She informed the Committee that consideration of lighting the mural is being proposed. Ms. Harris thought that the proposed location is a very visible wall with the mural enhancing the unattractive site.

Mr. McCoubrey said that owing to the conditions and circumstances and that the wall was originally obscured, he has been swayed for its consideration. Mr. Baron pointed out that the Committee last month suggested a removable type of mural painted on a framed canvas. Mr. Rivera said that the subject screen made a huge impact on his decision. Ms. Pentz stressed the importance of not establishing a precedent, but that the dialogue between the brick and the mural has an architectural presence. Mr. Rivera thought that it should be noted the mural is a good integration of the existing building, the mural and the architectural screen component.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

236 South 20th Street

Susan Ryszka and Stephen Hulme, Owners

Susan Brandt, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Erect 3rd-story addition, brick parapet wall, two roof decks, trellis

This proposal calls for alterations to this highly visible rear façade of a property. The rear ell has visibility from Locust, Woodstock, St. James and Chancellor Streets. The proposal calls for constructing a rear addition, two decks, pergola, winding stair and brick wall at 236 S. 20th Street. The deck, which sits on the rear ell, would be much more solid than most decks for it will be constructed with masonry units.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 9. Approval of the rear addition and a light wood deck on the rear ell with simple picket rail.

Barry Ginder, the architect, said that his clients wanted a more substantial deck, with pre-cast concrete pavers and a rail of brick. He proposes to situate the deck away from the chimney to eliminate any modification to the chimney. Owing to no access to the upper deck, he proposes to enlarge the existing door and add a spiral staircase. On the north façade the masonry wall would be built up with brick.

Ms. Pentz thought the lower deck appropriate, but the Committee concurred that the upper deck is problematic as well as the extension of the masonry wall. They thought that masonry should be replaced with a paneled or solid fence. Mr. Ginder said that he proposes a stainless steel cable system for the fence. He emphasized that the upper deck with a setback would be hidden by the neighboring party wall.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the addition, pergola and deck with a paneled system with a skirt, with the staff to review details, but denial of the stair, upper deck and masonry wall.

1939 Pine Street

Jay Eisner, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1960 contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District

PROPOSAL: Infill openings, alter windows

Mr. Baron explained proposal A, which calls for closing down the masonry openings on the 2nd and 3rd floors, removing the sliding doors and installing asymmetrical casement windows.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 9.

Joanne Phillips, Esq., Janice Woodcock, the architect, and Jay Eisner, the owner attended the meeting. Ms. Phillips said that in reviewing the district designation, the proposed alterations, which would retain the brick piers, are consistent with residential uses and the reasons for the building's inclusion as a contributing structure. Ms. Woodcock noted that the owner has a concern with the existing condition at the third floor for security reasons. The owner wishes to install kitchen counters in front of the second floor windows and would like to raise them for that reason.

Mr. McCoubrey expressed his objection to masonry infill. Mr. Rivera commented that the aesthetics of the façade are important and suggested that the applicant use an opaque panel at the bottom instead of the proposed masonry.

The applicant pointed out that their alternate B, installs glass fixed panels at the bottom of the openings and operable windows above.

Committee members liked the alternate design.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of alternate A with masonry infill but approval of alternate B with the glazed lower panel, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

411 South Carlisle Street

Pearl Kimberg, Owner

Richard D. Holst, Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Legalize door

Mr. Baron presented this proposal that requests legalization of a flush door with applied moldings installed without a permit. The designation pictures of the building and historic photos show that the original door would have had five horizontal panels.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 6.

Richard Holst, the applicant, attended the meeting and said that the original door received damage and needed to be replaced.

Mr. McCoubrey thought the installed door inappropriate and the Committee agreed.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

1801-03, 1805-09, 1811-13 Walnut; 1812 Sansom Street; 126-32 South 18th Street

Philadelphia Rittenhouse Investors, Owner

David Polatnick, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1835 modified in 20th century

PROPOSAL: Architectural Committee review of 18th Street facades

This proposal returns to the Commission for staff review guided by Architectural Committee comments.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Commission Approval. The solid wall on the courtyard should be relieved with plantings, perhaps on trellises.

Neil Sklaroff, counsel for the project, Daniel Arbelaez, Breen M. Mahony, and Antoine Rotival attended the meeting.

Committee members thought that the planter with trees shown in the model along the granite fence and covering the base of the Rennslear Mansion should be eliminated. They recommended that the applicant could install plantings in low planters only along the courtyard façade of the new structure. Mr. Rivera commented that the courtyard didn't really need plantings.

Gersil Kay said that the 18th Street streetscape should be preserved with the retention of old buildings, which could be incorporated into the design.

Committee members explained that that issue had already been decided by the Commission.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, thought that owing to the small size of the urban space, small urns of foliage would better compliment the Van Rensselaer Mansion rather than the planters shown in the model. He inquired about the design of the canopies over the storefronts.

Neil Sklaroff was receptive to the removal of the planter with the addition of hardscaping. He noted that three retail stores are planned for the 18th Street facades.

The Committee members said that signage is not yet designed but asked that the owner be sensitive with regards to signage and come back with that element when it is designed.

The Architectural Committee agreed with the façade design, but recommended a revised design for the planters, which keeps them low and away from the historic fabric with staff to review details.

2123 Brandywine Street

Bob Heim and Eileen Kennedy

Andrew Lengel, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: 1-story rear addition

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which calls for a one and a half story rear addition on top of an existing one story addition. The rear of the house faces a street that contains only rears of properties. The adjacent structures are all modified and stuccoed. The rear has very limited visibility from 22nd Street.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standard 9 and Standard 10.

Committee members reviewed the drawings and concurred with the alterations.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

6118 Ardleigh Street

Bill McMichael-Reaume, Owner

Charles McGloughlin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850 as carriage house/barn for Cope House

PROPOSAL: 2-story addition

Mr. Baron explained this application, which calls for building a two-story addition on the north façade of this barn structure now renovated as a house. The new piece will be constructed with board and batten siding to mimic a nearby shed and an early one story addition on the east side of this structure.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standards 9 & 10; however, the new section should be pulled in from the sides to delineate the original structure. Several staff members suggested that the missing historic shed addition should be rebuilt to reestablish the symmetry of the structure.

Bill McMichael-Reaume, the owner, and Charles McGloughlin, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. McGloughlin said that the current residence is too small and the stairs are unsafe. He pointed out that the building is not visible from Ardleigh Street. Mr. McMichael-Reaume proposes to do historically correct alterations, with approval of the neighbors, with the restoration of a window to a door. He concurred with the staff about the setback of the addition. Mr. McMichael-Reaume concluded that the rebuilding of the shed would be problematic, owing to the need for a variance, because of the loss of light and space compliancy.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that as proposed, the cornice brackets at the corners would be lost. He asked if the applicant could pull the addition inward enough so that the brackets would be retained. The applicant concurred.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with the setback of the addition on both sides to allow for the retention of the brackets, with the staff to review details. Ms. Pentz abstained.

2212 Wallace Street

Harvey Clark and Anna Marie Vardaro, Owners

Harvey Clark, Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

Mr. Baron explained this proposal, which seeks to legalize work to the exterior of this rowhouse. The work includes removal of paint, cutting wide mortar joints, installation of hard Portland cement mortar, rebuilding a cornice using incorrect brackets that do not match the historic cornice and installation of a new front door that does not match the historic four panel door.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standards 6, 9 & 10. The pointing and paint removal could be accepted subject to the correct door and cornice being installed.

Harvey Clark, the owner, and Kenneth Jacobi, the contractor, attended the meeting. Mr. Clark said

that it was his intention to restore the property, but he was unaware that it was historical. He took pictures of doors in the neighborhood for replication of his door. He said that the block consists of varying cornices and that there is no real consistency with regards to doors and cornices. Mr. Clark asserted that neighbors have complimented his on his house's appearance.

Mr. Levy showed the owner the copy of the permit application which clearly says "no exterior alterations". Mr. Jacobi said that although he came to the Historical Commission for his interior approval, he never gave the historical status consideration. Mr. Levy pointed out that the mortar joints now differ from the neighboring house owing to the widening of the joints. Committee members acknowledged the expense of the door and suggested that the applicant might put the door on the interior vestibule. It was pointed out how different the original cornice is from what has now been built.

Mr. Harvey said that in his opinion the joints were not widened; the mahogany door was very expensive and that the least expensive element is the cornice. Brackets were purchased from an antique salvage store for this cornice.

Pictures were shown of the attached neighboring house which has its appropriate original door and cornice that should have been the model for this building.

Committee members concluded that the allowance of the inappropriate door and cornice would set a precedent and did not meet the Standards, but offered to compromise with the applicant.

Mr. Clark was not receptive to a compromise.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.], Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.], and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Farnham
Diane M. Hughes