

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

**30 MAY 2006
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
VINCENT RIVERA, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Robert Thomas, AIA
Rudy D'Alessandro

Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Erin McGinn-Cote, Historic Preservation Planner

ALSO PRESENT

Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Robert Powers, Powers and Co.
Bob Spear, Centra Associates
Harvey Spear, Centra Associates
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Marsha Bacal, Old City Civic Association
David Blumenfeld, Metro
Cecil Baker, CSA
Peter Roth
Joe Schiavo, Old City Civic Association
Janet Kalter, Old City Civic Association
Rich Roberts, Pennoni
Tim Duffy, Pennoni
Mark Wieand, BLTD
Jerry Fiore CVM Design Build
Vic Barr, VLJJR Architects
George Guzzie, VLBJR Architects
Dave Artman, Kise Straw Kolodner
Philip Scott, Kise Straw Kolodner
Brett Harman, Harman Deutsch
Rick Cole, Elfreths Alley Association
Christine Romano, Glen Foerd
Jack Convoy, Glen Foerd
Jennifer Bekwick, Glen Foerd
Katie Ramey, Glen Foerd
Tisch Edwards, Glen Foerd
Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission
Anthony Rapwanski, Glen Foerd
Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects
Charles R. Mottershead, Capital Programs Office

Laura Siena, West Mount Airy Neighbors
Martin Rosenblum
Nanzi Wang
Joe Pagano
Jane Glenn, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
Kevin Smith, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
Diana Bonesteel, Kaiserman Company
Jason Brown
Dave Waxman, Rector Street Associates
Jonathan Broth, J.K Roller Architects

CALL TO ORDER: Committee members Robert Thomas and Rudy D'Alessandro called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. The Committee lacked a quorum. Mr. Thomas assumed the role of Acting Chair.

2336 S. 21ST STREET

Owner/applicant: Rita Donatucci

History: built 1911, architect John Windrim, Contributing to Girard Estate District

Project: Enclose rear porch

OVERVIEW: The proposal calls for infilling the back porch of this corner house. The porch has a high degree of visibility. The documentation submitted with the application is a photomontage simulating the appearance of the porch after the alterations. The photomontage shows the porch infilled with a new brick base toothed into the existing brick piers and new six-over-six windows above the base. A door to match the front door with brick infill above would be placed at the side façade of the porch, which faces the street.

A design that sets the infill back a few inches from the existing piers without cutting into the existing bricks would better satisfy the Standards. The windows should have as few divisions as possible, perhaps single-light casements or one-over-one double-hung sash. The infill at the base of the windows should be a material other than matching brick, to reveal the alteration. On the side, the wood door should not replicate the historic front door. The area between the door and the porch roof should be infilled with the same material used beneath the windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of a revised design with single-pane casement windows, beaded board below the windows, and a simple glazed door with lower panel.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham announced that the Committee lacked a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Owing to a medical condition, the applicant was unable to attend the meeting. Mr. Baron presented a letter from the Girard Estate Area Residents, which is aiding the applicant with the project, stating that it supports the application with minor modifications as suggested by the staff.

Mr. Baron displayed photographs of the property indicating that the original porch had been modified with open cinder block to create a railing at the porch. The applicant's intention is to remove this cinder block. Mr. Baron noted that the neighboring porch at the other half of the twin is significantly altered.

Mr. Baron noted that the infill below the windows should be set in a reveal behind the face of the pier so that the original design of the pier remains visible. He also noted that the infill should be

of a different material such as beaded board or stucco to differentiate the new from the historic. Mr. Baron commented that the new door should not replicate the ornate historic front door. It should be a simple wood glazed door, perhaps with panel at the bottom.

Mr. Thomas inquired about the proposed windows. Mr. Baron replied the staff considered casements more appropriate than double-hung windows. He added that if double-hung windows were proposed, they should be one-over-ones, not an historic pane configuration.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee recommended approval of the enclosing of the porch with casement windows, set above a recessed base infill of beaded wood board or stucco, not brick, and a simple glazed wood door with lower panel, with the staff to review details.

36-46, 48, AND 50 S. FRONT, 103, 107, 111 CHESTNUT, 37-41 LETITIA STREETS

Owner: Centra Associates

Applicant: Cecil Baker

History: 36-46 S. Front Street, vacant lots at time of designation
48 & 50 S. Front, 103 and 107 Chestnut Street, built c.1835, individually
designated, contributing to Old City district
111 Chestnut Street, built 1951, non-contributing to district
37-41 Letitia Street, vacant lot at time of designation

Project: Demolish building and construct complex - in concept

OVERVIEW: This application in concept proposes combining many properties, some vacant and some with structures, into a mixed-use development. The plans show demolishing the non-contributing structure at 111 Chestnut Street as well as the majority of the individually-designated structure at 48 S. Front Street. There is no financial hardship or public interest argument provided to justify the demolition at 48 S. Front Street. The new building would combine several uses including parking for the residents below ground and the public on the first four floors, commercial at the ground floors, and residential units above the fourth floor. The structure would have a stone-clad first story and then three stories of brick on Front and Letitia Streets. Out of that base would rise a tower of metal and glass to a height of thirteen stories (144 feet) with a roof terrace and mechanical penthouse above that. This tower would sit on both the site of the vacant lots and the two demolished buildings. The façade of the new infill structure on Chestnut Street is proposed as an all glass curtain wall. A roof deck would cover much of 50 S. Front Street as well as 107 Chestnut Street.

The demolition of 48 S. Front Street satisfies neither the ordinance nor the Standards even if the façade is preserved. The new structure is greatly out of scale with the surrounding buildings of the district as well as the structures to which it is an addition. As the Commission has identified the existing Front Street buildings as an important face of the city, the roofs of 48 and 50 S. Front should not be demolished and covered with additions or decks. The Chestnut Street façade should better reflect the materials, rhythms, and scale of the existing streetscape. Four stories of windows on Front and Letitia Street would better compliment the streetscape than the vents and voids of the parking garage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 & 10 and §14-2007(7)(j).

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron noted that the Committee lacked a quorum. He asked if anyone among the applicants or the audience objected to proceeding without a quorum. The applicants did not object. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance and Marsha Bacall, who lives in Society Hill Towers, opined that this is a very important project that deserves a full review. Ms. Bacall stated that she did not want the Committee to render a final action without a quorum. Mr. Farnham informed Ms. Bacall that the Architectural Committee is a recommending body. It takes no action; the Commission itself renders the final decisions. Mr. Farnham stated that, owing to the Committee's extremely long agenda and, more importantly, to the fact that the Commission has sixty days in which to act on proposals before they are deemed approved, he suggested that the review proceed and that the objections be noted in the record. He assured Ms. Bacall that he would advise the Commission of her concerns. The Commission, he stated, could decide whether to value a recommendation formulated by the two Committee members. Mr. Farnham also informed everyone present that he was seeking the guidance of the Commission's attorneys, but that they were unavailable at the moment. Joseph Schiavo of the Old City Association registered his objection for the record as well. Those objecting stated that they did not seek to prevent the review from occurring, but only to record their disapproval of the lack of a quorum. Mr. Gallery asked that his objection be registered for every review conducted without a quorum today.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Architects Cecil Baker and Eric Leighton, preservation consultant Robert Powers, attorney Carl Primavera, and developers Harvey and Bob Spear represented the application.

Mr. Baker presented an overview of the project. Mr. Baker noted that he had come to the staff with plans for a 16-story building, and today's presentation is for a 14-story building, which would be 169 feet tall.

Mr. Schiavo of the Old City Civic association asked for more information on the north elevation. Mr. Baker responded that currently it is planned as a blank party wall, but that he is discussing the design with the owner of the neighboring property. He would like to fenestrate the façade.

Mr. Primavera stated that he had planned to seek a hardship waiver to allow for the demolition of the buildings, but had been encouraged by the Old City Civic Association to forego the demolition and save the buildings. He said that the two historic buildings at Front and Chestnut Street are in poor condition. He asked the Committee "to allow the site to realize its full potential as an assemblage." He concluded that his was "a mixed bag legal approach, a little Architectural Committee and a little hardship."

Mr. Baron asked Mr. Baker if the parking would extend from Front to Letitia Streets or if there was the possibility of a residential unit along either street to present windows rather than vents along the street faces. Mr. Baker stated that it would be parking all the way from street face to street face. He stated that there are about 100 parking spaces on the site now and they are proposing a total of 250 to 300 spaces.

Mr. Schiavo asked if the developers were aware of the deteriorated conditions of the historic buildings when they purchased them. Mr. Primavera responded that the previous owner had begun demolition in several areas, but did not complete his plan. He left the buildings in a poor state. He stated that the developers had known that the buildings were in bad shape, but they were unaware of the extent of the deterioration. Mr. Primavera asserted that the buildings might not survive another winter.

Mr. Gallery supported all aspects of the staff recommendation. He asserted that this level of demolition should require a hardship application. He asked why one had not been submitted. Mr. Gallery contended that this proposal was out of scale and inappropriate. He stated that parking was an inappropriate use for street facades. He stated that the applicants were proposing too much program for the site. He asserted that the proposed building was too tall; it should not be more than seven stories.

Mr. Schiavo read from a letter from his association stating they never support the demolition of designated buildings. The association supported the staff recommendation and warned that, if approved, the demolition might occur, and the project not be built.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he could not support the demolition. He also stated that important details were lacking in the application. He suggested that the applicant submit a true hardship application.

Mr. Thomas stated that the proposal does not satisfy the standards in scale or massing. He objected to the demolition. He suggested that the applicants design a complex that would better fit into the Chestnut Street streetscape.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 & 10 and §14-2007(7)(j).

718-724 S. 2ND STREET

Owner: Queens Mews South L.P.

Applicant: Katherine Bottom, architect

History: both constructed c. 1780, new façade on 718 c. 1940s and on 724 c.1990

Project: Demolish portions of the buildings and construct a residential complex with parking

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to demolish portions of two designated buildings and combine the remaining buildings with structures on two other lots into a residential complex. At 718 S. 2nd Street, the applicants propose the demolition of the later yellow-brick façade and the reconstruction of the historic red-brick façade. They also propose the demolition of the rear wall, rear ell, and rear roof slope. At 724 S. 2nd Street, the applicants propose the demolition of the rear ell. The houses will be joined through breaches in the party walls to a complex to be constructed on lots at 720 and 722 S. 2nd Street. The vacant lots are not designated. The Commission reviews conjoined additions to designated buildings. The plans show substantial demolition of the sides and rear of the historic houses which may be deemed to constitute demolition in significant part.

An application for these properties was presented to the Architectural Committee in April 2006. The Committee recommended denial owing to the significant demolition. The applicants withdrew that application and revised the plans to reduce the amount of demolition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to the amount of demolition, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron asked if anyone objected to the lack of a quorum. No new objections were registered. Mr. Gallery had already registered a standing objection.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Architects Philip Scott, David Artman, and Brett Harmon, developers James Francis and Ian Anderson, and engineer Richard Roberts represented the application.

Mr. Anderson stated that they planned to restore the façade at 718 and retain the façade at 724. He noted that Pennoni had been retained to develop an engineering plan. Mr. Thomas asked if the applicants had uncovered any documentation of the original building at 718. Mr. Scott stated that they had not discovered any photographs predating the reconstruction of the façade. Mr. Baron explained that he had worked with Mr. Scott's firm to refine the details for the façade.

Mr. Anderson explained to Mr. Thomas that they planned to develop the site as condominiums.

Mr. Baron noted that two buildings had been demolished on Monroe Street without the approval of the Historical Commission despite the Queen Village Demolition Moratorium because that ordinance makes an exemption for buildings labeled Imminently Dangerous. He said that the applicant included the drawings for that site and that that building seemed to fit into its streetscape. Mr. Anderson explained that the Monroe Street project was separate from this project and has different owners. Mr. Harmon explained that this complex will connect to the Monroe Street complex at the basement level. Mr. Farnham advised the Committee that it did not have jurisdiction over the Monroe Street project. He noted that the buildings had been declared imminently dangerous and therefore did not require a review by the Commission under the demolition moratorium ordinance.

Mr. Baron said that the gabled roof and dormers of 718 S. 2nd Street constituted original fabric as well as an important historic shape and spatial relationship. Mr. Baron asked for clarification on the amount of demolition of the side wall of the half gambrel of 724. One elevation shows a large cut but the new engineering drawing does not. Mr. Harmon stated the first plan was a no longer accurate and they would be keeping the entire gambrel section, without cutting into it.

Mr. Harmon spoke on several issues. He explained that at 718 S. 2nd Street they intend to preserve the front portion of the roof and a small portion of the rear roof slope by inserting a piece of steel to create a new ridge beam. He noted that the infill construction next door will hide this alteration from the street.

Mr. Roberts, the Pennoni engineer, explained that they would underpin the party walls of 718 and 724 S. 2nd Street to stabilize the buildings while the parking garage is added in the lots between them. He said that he would oversee and administer the construction.

Mr. James asked the Committee members what amount of demolition would be considered significant demolition? Mr. Thomas explained that the demolition of a volume such as a rear ell might be considered to much demolition. Mr. James suggested that they could retain the rear ell of 718. Mr. Baron opined it was a judgment that the members of the Commission would make and that the demolition of original fabric might be considered more significant. Mr. James asked if it would be an acceptable solution to maintain the rear ells, but demolish the rear roof slope. Mr. James contended that during his first meetings with the staff, he was told that the rear of a property was not considered significant. Mr. Thomas noted it was a matter of interpretation for each project. Mr. Thomas stated that, in general, the front façade is more important than the rear.

Mr. Thomas praised several aspects of the project. He said that the façade work complies with the Standards. He praised the replacement of the yellow brick facade and the scale and

materials of the infill buildings. He noted that the garage entrance has been improved following the Committee's recommendations. He rejected the demolition of the rear dormer to increase square footage.

Mr. Anderson and Mr. James commented that they thought that reconstructing the historic façade at 718 was a requirement, which would, in turn, allow them to demolish areas not in the public view.

Mr. Baron responded that when he first met with the applicants, the project was presented as a restoration of 718 S. 2nd Street without any mention of the other parts of the project including the demolition or new construction. Mr. Baron said that in subsequent meetings after the presentation of the full project he explained that he thought it might well constitute demolition in significant part. He suggested that if more historic fabric could be retained the project might be viewed as alteration rather than demolition perhaps avoiding the issue of hardship or public interest.

Mr. Thomas opined that there is likely a solution which preserves more historic fabric and achieves the reuse of the property. He suggested that the developer meet with the staff to work out the details. Mr. Farnham suggested that the Committee should attempt to find a compromise with the applicants during the review. He stated that the rear ells at both 718 and 724 had been significantly altered. He questioned what, if any, historic fabric had survived at the rear of 718. He noted that the rear roof and rear section of the main block at 718 were unlike any he had seen. He also stated that the demolition of the front façade of 718 should not be counted against the application; instead, it should be counted as a positive aspect of the application. The applicants were proposing to replace the 1940s front façade with an appropriate reconstruction of the eighteenth-century façade. He suggested that the Committee craft a compromise to allow the project to move forward.

Mr. Gallery raised two concerns. He compared this application to that seen last month on the Gaskill Street; he noted the Commission's denial of similar amounts of demolition. He said that "tinkering" with this project without bringing it back to the Committee was not appropriate. He had concerns about the historicist nature of the infill design.

Mr. Scott quoted a memo from the Commission's file of 1969 suggesting that the front façade of 718 be reconstructed using 318 and 320 Delancey Street as a model. Regarding the infill buildings, he stated that it matches the scale and rhythm of the streetscape, particularly those buildings across the street. He stated that his design for the new front facades was intended to fit sensitively into the neighborhood.

Messrs. Thomas and D'Alessandro agreed with the staff's recommendation, but encouraged the applicants to work with the staff to find a compromise before the Commission meeting. Messrs. Baron and Farnham agreed to meet with the applicants and ascertain the history and significance of the fabric at the sites.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee recommended denial, owing to the amount of demolition, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10.

20-30 N. FRONT STREET

Owner: 20-30 N. Front Street L.L.C.

Applicant: Mark Wieand, architect

History: built 1832 for Girard Estate, individually designated and Significant to Old City District

OVERVIEW: The application proposes the renovation of six Greek Revival warehouse structures into condominium units. The plans show the reconfiguration of the roof lines on 22-30 N. Front and the addition of decks, HVAC units and a 5-story addition on number 30. The main facades on Front and Church Streets will receive new windows and doors based on their original appearances. The Commission approved a similar application with demolition of rear ells and the construction of a rear addition on number 30 in February of 2006. They excluded roof decks, removal of painted signs, windows or storefronts at that time.

The proposed changes to the rear roof structures for the decks and the details of the windows do not comply with Standards. The plans show changes to the central windows of several storefronts and proposes applied muntins for the new windows and doors.

Some Commission members expressed concern about the removal of painted facade signage at their last review of the project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the decks and HVAC; denial of the demolition of the roof structures and dormers at the rear, and the aluminum windows with applied muntins, and removal of historic signage pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, with staff to review details.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Rivera arrived to join the Committee. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Architect Mark Weiland and developers Geoff Flourney and Alexander Taylor represented the application.

Mr. Weiland stated that he intended to restore the storefronts. He offered to work with Mr. Baron to develop the details. He then shifted the discussion to the rear gables of 28 and 30 N. Front Street. He stated that they could not develop an acceptable plan for the top-floor units in 28 and 30 N. Front without demolishing the rear gables. He stated that 30 was especially problematic because he needed to connect to the addition at the rear, which the Commission has already approved.

The Committee reviewed the drawings of the development approved by the Commission. They noted that the rear slopes of the roofs on 28 and 30 were altered as the applicants now propose in the approved drawings. Mr. Baron acknowledged that that was true, but he pointed the Committee to the Commission's approval, which mandated the preservation of the roof structures.

Ted Newbold, a neighbor, asked about the potential noise from HVAC equipment. Mr. Weiland stated that the noise would not be excessive because the equipment would be placed high on the buildings and would be screened.

Mr. Weiland returned to question of the rears of 28 and 30. He clarified that they planned no roof demolition at 22, 24, and 26. Mr. Baron suggested that he create a connecting corridor from the top floor of 30 to the rear addition at the north property line. He stated that this would allow the retention of the dormer. Mr. Weiland objected stating that he would lose a room and would be left with a dormer that looked out onto a blank wall. Mr. Thomas stated that he could accept large dormers on the rear of 28 and 30 like those approved for the fronts. Mr. Baron directed the

Committee to a photograph showing that the historic rear dormers are minimally visible from 2nd Street across a parking lot and above some intervening buildings.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance suggested that the Committee recommend approval of the change to 30 as shown on the plans approved earlier and the retention of the historic rear dormer at 28. Mr. Newbold agreed with Mr. Gallery's suggestion.

The applicants requested that the Committee approve their non-historic windows, which will block noise from the highway. Mr. Thomas stated that the windows do not satisfy the Standards. He noted that he would vote to recommend denial. The applicants asked if they could install them on the rear façade. Mr. Thomas stated that the rear façade was visible from Church Street. He stated that they should install historically appropriate windows in the front and rear.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the alteration of the rear gable at 30 N. Front, provided the original roofline is expressed on the north party wall; denial of the proposed alteration of the rear gable at 28 N. Front but approval of a large rear dormer; approval of the decks and HVAC equipment; denial of the non-historic windows; denial of the storefronts as submitted but approval of the restoration of the storefronts; denial of the removal of the historic painted signs; with the staff to review details.

1906-8 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: 1906 Spruce Street L.P., Wayne Spilove

Applicant: Robert Thomas, architect

History: built c. 1865 façade, altered c.1955, Contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District

Project: Restore front facade

OVERVIEW: This application calls for the partial restoration of the façade of this former townhouse. When the building was converted to apartments the first floor was lowered and an elevator installed and the first floor was clad in red granite. The upper-floor windows were also altered. The applicants propose to remove the granite and restore the windows and their brownstone surrounds. The doorway, however, will remain lowered. Its surround and transom will be restored.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron asked if anyone objected to the lack of a quorum. No new objections were registered. Mr. Baron presented the application to the members of the Architectural Committee, Messrs. D'Alessandro and Rivera. Architect Robert Thomas represented the application.

Mr. Thomas stated that he intended to restore the front façade to its original appearance in all but one regard. He stated that the ground-floor level had been dropped to grade and an elevator installed many years ago. Therefore, he could not recreate the grand entrance stair. He noted the brownstone repair at the first floor and new windows based on historic photographs. Mr. Thomas agreed to work with the staff on the design of the new front door and transom. Mr. Rivera questioned the single-pane transom and asked if it should be divided. Mr. Thomas offered a picture from the archives showing that it was a single large pane. Mr. Baron explained that staff would review the brick match, masonry restoration, and transom. Messrs. D'Alessandro and Rivera agreed that the proposal met the Standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee recommended approval, pursuant to Standard 6, with the staff to review details.

138 N. FRONT STREET, QUARRY STREET

Owner: 138 Front Street L.P.

Applicant: George Guzzie

History: vacant lot and non-contributing building, wall on Bladen's Court

Project: Demolish non-contributing structure, build townhouses

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the demolition of a non-contributing structure and construction of a new residential building on that site and on the adjacent vacant lot. A similar application was approved in concept by the Commission in January 2006. The approval in concept specifically did not sanction the height of the building or the design facing Bladen's Court. The structure has been completely redesigned.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the design is revised with fenestration on the ground floor of the Front Street façade and more vertical windows facing Bladen's Court.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Architect Jerry Fiore and developers Vic Barr and George Guzzie represented the application.

Mr. Fiore began by acknowledging the feedback from the Elfreth's Alley Association and the Historical Commission. He stated that he had responded to the suggestions. The Elfreth's Alley Association had requested fewer and smaller windows facing Bladen's Court. He also moved the balconies away from the Court. Otherwise, the design is very similar to that presented previously.

Mr. Rivera asked about the rooms behind the larger windows on the front façade. He voiced his concern about the window treatments, which would change the look of the façade. He felt that the bedrooms had too much glass; the resident would want more privacy. Mr. Fiore noted that, because this is a condominium, they could write rules regarding window treatments into the regulations. Mr. Thomas suggested that the Committee concentrate on exterior features.

Mr. Baron inquired about the materials of the garage doors. Mr. Fiore stated it was glass and metal. Mr. Baron asked if there was a way to give more glazing or articulation to the Front Street ground floor. Mr. Fiore responded this was going to be trash storage area, but it will have a louver for ventilation that will blend into the brick color.

Richard Cole of the Elfreth's Alley Association thanked the applicants for working with the association and addressing their concerns. He questioned what appeared to be a lighter area on the Bladen's Court elevation and inquired if they had changed the plans since they were shown to the community. Mr. Fiore stated that the light area was to be a silver-finish corrugated metal panel. Mr. Cole and Mr. Rivera asked if the corrugated metal could have a darker finish to recede above and behind Bladen's Court.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the metal panels along Bladen's Court are a darker color, with the staff to review details.

Mr. D'Alessandro excused himself from the meeting.

2229 SPRUCE STREET

Owner/Applicant: George Mortelliti

History: built c. 1840, contributing to Rittenhouse/Fitler Historic District

Project: Legalize sidewalk

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to legalize the removal of a brick sidewalk from the 23rd Street side of the building. The owner received a letter from his insurance company asking him to patch and repair his sidewalk, where there were some uneven bricks. Instead, he removed the brick walk and installed a concrete walk without a permit or Historical Commission review.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: No new objections were raised to the lack of a quorum. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. No one represented the application. Mr. Baron began the presentation by noting a letter from the owner's insurance company asking for the owner to repair though not necessarily remove the sidewalk. The Rittenhouse/Fitler Historic District Statement of Significance states that the bluestone and brick sidewalks and granite curbs contribute to the significance of the district. Although the specific date of this brick sidewalk is unknown, Mr. Baron posited that it was a survivor and not part of a recent rehabilitation effort.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Commission recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

111 SOUTH 15TH STREET (A.K.A. 1428-1432 CHESTNUT STREET)

111 South 15th Street Associates, LP, Owner

David Blumenfeld, Applicant

Project: Install temporary signage

History: Designated 8/2/1973. Built 1922 by Ritter & Shay

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install temporary signage at the northwest corner of the building. Two 40' by 5' vinyl banners with reinforced nylon hems would be secured into the mortar joints of the building using 3/16" Tapcon Concrete Screw Anchors. One banner would hang from the seventh-story level and span four stories on the Chestnut Street façade. The other would hang from the seventh-story level and span four stories on the 15th Street façade. Upon the removal of the banners, the anchors would be removed and the mortar joints would be patched with color tinted non-shrink grout.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant Standard 9, provided the banners are a canvas-like material and that they hang for a period not to exceed 12 months.

DISCUSSION: No new objections were raised to the lack of a quorum. Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee members. Eric Blumenfeld represented the applicant.

The applicant agreed with the staff recommendation, provided a Sunbrella material was acceptable. Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission routinely approves Sunbrella for awnings and banners because it looks like canvas.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided the banners are a canvas-like material and hang for a period not to exceed 12 months, pursuant to Standard 9.

1225 WAVERLY STREET

Julia L. Scott and Jason M. Rekulak, Owner

Julia L. Scott, Applicant

Project: Construct third-floor rear addition

History: Designation on 11/28/1961. Building constructed c. 1830

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the roof of the rear ell to provide more interior room in the third-floor bedroom. This alteration would require changing the traditional half gable roof line of the rear ell with a flat roof. The applicant proposes to stucco both sides of the new exterior walls created by altering the roofline. The rear wall of the ell is currently stuccoed. The side of the rear ell, which is visible along Waverly Street, is currently exposed brick.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as submitted, pursuant Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: No new objections were raised to the lack of a quorum. Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee members. Julia Scott, the owner and architect, represented the application. She explained that the addition would give added height to the top floor, making more of that room usable. Also, it would allow for an easier entrance into the space. She showed photographs of the roofline showing a scar along the back of the main block of the house as well as an area covered with roofing paper. Mr. Thomas explained that the roofing paper indicates an area constructed of wood to avoid placing too much weight on the roof structure. Mr. Baron explained that this rear ell was probably at one time a separate small house in the rear court that was later consolidated into the front house.

Mr. Thomas said that adding directly on top of the existing wall in masonry would destroy the sense of the original half gable roofline. He suggested a dormer could provide the space and still retain part of the old roof. The design and material was discussed and agreed upon by the applicant and the Committee members. It would include a double window and be clad with painted clapboard. It was also agreed that the dormer should set back one foot from the front and rear wall of the ell but that it could connect the full width of the dormer on its south end to the main block of the house.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application as submitted, but approval of a revised design consisting of a clapboard-faced dormer and double window, with the staff to review details.

5001 GRANT AVENUE

Owner: Fairmount Park Commission, City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Letitia Edwards, Glen Foerd Conservation Corporation

History: c. 1850 for Charles Macalester

Project: Legalize addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of the construction of a large addition to Glen Foerd, a mid nineteenth-century mansion on the banks of the Delaware River. The site is

owned by the Fairmount Park Commission and managed by the Glen Foerd Conservation Corporation. The Corporation, in turn, has an arrangement with Conroy Catering, which uses the site as a catering hall. Conroy Catering erected the addition with the approval of the Glen Foerd Conservation Corporation, but not the Fairmount Park Commission, the owner of the property. On 10 May 2006, Conroy Catering appeared before the Fairmount Park Commission seeking its belated approval of the addition. The Commission tabled the request and remanded the matter to a sub-committee. The Park Commission will not consider the matter until its September 2006 meeting.

A temporary, open, canvas tent stood where the new structure now stands. The applicant contends that the caterer replaced one tent with another. However, the new structure is very different from the old tent. The new structure looks permanent. It links to the historic house via an enclosed corridor that runs across the historic porch. Portions of a garden and the lawn were paved and combined with an existing patio to create a platform for the structure. Stone retaining walls were altered. A portion of the structure is solid, not glazed, and houses utility equipment. The structure is electrified and climate-controlled.

The structure stands to the east of the historic mansion, between the house and the Delaware River. It occupies a space that was once garden and lawn. It obscures views of the river from the house and of the house from the river.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and the Building Site Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: No new objections were raised to the lack of a quorum. Mr. Farnham presented the application. Letitia Edwards, the president of the Board of Directors for the Glen Foerd Conservation Trust, Katie Ramie, the executive director of the Glen Foerd Conservation Trust, and Jack Conroy, the contract caterer at Glen Foerd represented the application. Theresa Stuhlman of the Fairmount Park Commission also attended the meeting.

Ms. Edwards explained that Mr. Conroy has rented the building from them for the last ten years and he had the new tent erected. She said that the structure is “a necessary evil.” Mr. Conroy said that there had been a tent on the site, but that this new larger tent was of a very high quality and could be used in all weather conditions. The larger size allowed them to have more functions outside the house, reducing the wear and tear on the interior. He stated that it does not increase his total capacity. In addition, it allows the Trust to have community functions at the site. He said that the building is all soft materials except for three glass panic doors. The sides are a flexible, clear vinyl. The roof is inflatable. He said it could be taken down in four to eight days and is therefore temporary.

Ms. Stuhlman reported that the Park Commission formed a special sub-committee to review the matter. The Park Commission will not render a final decision until September 2006.

Mr. Rivera opined that it is twice the size of the earlier tent and looks very permanent. Mr. Conroy reported that all of the new paving was laid dry; it is not set in mortar. Mr. Conroy also stated that the structure was designed to allow the river to be seen from the porch. Mr. Thomas stated that he found the addition acceptable because it was temporary and transparent.

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

2526 S. COLORADO STREET

Janet DiMeo, Owner

Janet DiMeo, Applicant

Project: Replace roof

History: Designation in 11/10/1999 as a contributing property in the Girard Estate Historic District

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reroof this Bungalow/Mission style house with gray asphalt shingles. The roof was originally clad in red tile although currently the roof has gray asphalt shingles. The contractors work order notes repairs to roof deck but no details have been provided

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant Standard 6. The staff recommends that the roof be clad in red asphalt shingles reminiscent of the original red tile.

DISCUSSION: No new objections were raised to the lack of a quorum. Ms. Cote presented the project. The owner did not attend the meeting.

The Committee members stated that red asphalt shingles should be installed to replicate the original red tile roof.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6

3428 SANSOM STREET

Judy Wicks, Owner

Arlene Matzkin, Applicant

Project: Construct rear addition

History: Designation on 12/6/1979. Building constructed in 1869-71, attributed to James Cochran, architect

OVERVIEW: A similar application was approved in concept on December 9, 2005. The current application seeks final approval.

The proposal entails a two-story addition on the rear of this Second Empire rowhouse. The Moravian Street facades of these houses sit at a lower grade, exposing the basement level. The rears of many houses in the row have been altered with terraces and additions at this lower level. Moravian Street has become a heavily utilized pedestrian area, with outdoor seating for neighboring restaurants.

This house has an intact rear ell; a glass enclosed stair tower had been added at the rear of the main section. The proposal calls for adding a two-story addition at the basement and first floors. The addition would sit under the bay on the rear ell. The portion that sits in front of the stair tower would have a gate at the street level and a double-casement on the floor above with a pedimented roofline that breaks into the second floor. The section in front of the rear ell would have three fixed-light windows at the basement level and two double-hung windows at the first floor.

The current proposal is consistent with the proposal approved in concept.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to the Commission's approval in concept.

DISCUSSION: No new objections were raised to the lack of a quorum. Ms. Cote presented the application. Architect Arlene Matzkin represented the project.

Mr. Thomas stated that the proposal meets the Standards and complies with the earlier approval in concept.

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

PHILADELPHIA MUSEUM OF ART

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Michael Schade, Atkin Olshin Lawson-Bell Architects

History: Designated 6/29/1971; Horace Trumbauer and Borie, Medary & Zantzing, architects, constructed 1927.

Project: Final approval of parking garage.

OVERVIEW: The Commission reviewed and approved in concept an application for this garage on 10 February 2006. The applicant has now submitted for final approval.

As previously presented, the application proposes to construct an underground parking garage. The garage would be located on the northwest side of Fairmount hill. Currently this area is landscaped with rocky outcrops along its slope and matured plantings. The garage would be four levels and would be mostly underground. The garage would be entered from the Italian Fountain and Museum Drive; an elevator house would provide access for pedestrians. This elevator house will be completely clad in glass. A terrace is proposed over the northwestern end of the garage and a sculpture garden is proposed for this area. The landscape design would include the reconstruction of the rocky outcrops as well as curtains of trees and shrubbery along the perimeter of the garage, making the garage minimally visible from Kelly Drive and reducing the visibility along the axial view corridor between the Italian fountain and the west façade of the museum. In addition, the existing parking lot between the grounds of the museum and the Azalea Gardens would be eliminated and landscaped.

The current application for final approval shows some minor changes. The garage has been reduced by twelve spaces, all located at the western corner facing the Italian Fountain. The corner of the ventilation shaft facing the central axis between the museum and the fountain has been chamfered and the exterior stair previously shown on this corner has been eliminated. In addition, the façade along this axis is shown heavily planted to further shield the view of the garage from the west. Otherwise, the proposal is largely unchanged.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to the Commission's approval in concept of February 2006.

DISCUSSION: No new objections were raised to the lack of a quorum. Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee members. Architect Michael Schade represented the application.

Mr. Schade provided an overview of the changes made to respond to the Commissioners' comments. He noted that the garage had been reduced in size at the northwest corner and that more grading had been added to reduce the height of the vertical walls.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that although the changes were relatively minor, their visual impact is large. He commended the museum and the architect and supported the improved project.

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

7048 GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Owner/Applicant: John Capoferri

History: Designated on 1/13/06. C.1850 Italianate expansion of an earlier Greek Revival country villa designed by Thomas U. Walter

Project: Construction of fifteen residential units and restoration of villa and barn.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct fifteen townhouses on a large parcel facing Germantown Avenue. The townhouses would be clustered towards the southern and western ends of the parcel. They would be placed in a fan shape, which would preserve the main axis between the villa, the barn and the open space behind the barn. The perimeter of the parcel will retain its vegetation and a green buffer between the Acme Supermarket lot and the subject parcel will also be preserved as backyards for the new units. A new curb cut would be created along Germantown Avenue to allow for a one-way traffic flow. This curb cut would require a break in the historic schist stone garden retaining wall. Parking would be created along the southeastern edge of the parcel, between the villa and the barn, diagonally to the barn, and in front of the new townhouses. The parking spaces closest to Germantown Avenue would be shielded from view by vegetation and the parking spaces behind the villa would be paved with open-grid blocks to allow grass to grow.

Two similar townhouse types are proposed; Types A and B. The townhouses will be of contemporary design, three stories in height with roof decks. The main entrance would be recessed with a porch. The ground floor would be accentuated by a garage. The upper floors will have contemporary casement and fixed fenestration. Type A will have a deck railing in the main façade, while Type B will have the railing facing the rear elevation. The townhouses will be finished in stucco and will have aluminum siding and clad windows.

The application also proposes work to the villa and barn. Most of the proposed work would be a restoration. The applicant proposes to restore the exterior elements of the original Thomas U. Walter Greek Revival villa as well as the Italianate addition. The applicant proposes to demolish a rear addition of unknown date and demolish two wood sheds attached to the house. Selective demolition is also proposed for the barn. A side one-story addition and rear non-historic CMU block addition would be removed. The main façade of the barn, facing the villa will be restored. The rear façade will be treated with contemporary clad windows and a large clad door and window system at the location where the CMU block addition currently exists.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review the restoration details for the house and barn, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: No new objections were raised to the lack of a quorum. Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Developer John Capoferri and architect Larry McEwan represented the application.

Mr. McEwan presented an overview of the project using a 3-D model. He noted that the project now entails fourteen units as opposed to fifteen. He stated that when they restore the villa they will restore the shutters of the original windows. Shutters would not be applied to all non-original windows.

Mr. Rivera commented that the relationship between villa and lot is being lost in this proposal. He suggested that Mr. McEwan address the loss of that relationship, particularly with the first townhouse unit viewed from Germantown Avenue. Mr. Capoferri responded that they tried to maintain the relationship between the barn and the villa and that is why they removed the fifteenth unit from the plan. Mr. Rivera observed that the lot should be more open. Mr. Capoferri remarked that the project is on the edge of economic viability. he cannot remove any additional units, but he is willing to modify the unit closest to Germantown Avenue.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance commended the plan. However, he stated that there is problem with the townhouse on the end closest to Germantown Avenue. He suggested that Mr. McEwan design the major visual façade of that building to be the “main entrance” elevation, to create a relationship between the new construction and the villa.

Laura Siena of the West Mount Airy Neighbors commended the applicant and the architect for working with the community group. She stated that the lot is surrounded by a dense urban neighborhood. She stated that he proposal is consistent with the urban feel of the neighborhood. The design is successful in balancing all the aspects that the applicant had to consider.

Mr. Rivera asked why there were additional parking spaces at the front of the lot. Mr. McEwan stated that they were there for overflow parking. He added that there was discussion of removing the parking spaces. Mr. Gallery suggested that they be removed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The member of the Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided the design of the front façade of the unit closest to Germantown Avenue and the design of the front parking area are improved, with the staff to review the restoration details of the house and barn, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

2046 SANSOM STREET

Owner: Feng Xia Ge

Applicant: Sherry Yang

History: Designated 2/8/1995, contributing in the Rittenhouse/Fitler district. Constructed c. 1850.

Project: Second floor rear addition and front window enlargement.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a second-story addition on an existing one-story rear ell. The addition would measure 13’6” in width by 8’6” in height. The second-story rear wall of the main block would be preserved as an interior wall. The addition would be clad in stucco; the entire house is stuccoed currently. The adjacent properties have two story rear ells.

The application also proposes to enlarge a small non-historic window in the front façade at the ground floor. The window is not a historic opening. The applicant proposes to install a 5’ by 5’ fixed wood frame picture window. The ground floor of the property is used as a commercial space.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the rear addition, approval of enlarging the front display window, provided that the window is divided to be compatible with other ground-floor commercial windows on this block of Sansom Street, pursuant Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: No new objections were raised to the lack of a quorum. Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. The property owner's son, Man Zi Wang, represented the application.

Mr. Wang asked if the roof deck was included in the review. Mr. Danta replied that the roof deck was not included in the drawings. However, given the lack of visibility and the fact that the deck would be located on new construction, the staff would recommend approval of it.

Mr. Rivera suggested that the applicant change the drawings to show the roof deck.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The member of the Architectural Committee recommended approval of the rear addition and roof deck, approval of enlarging the front display window, provided that the window is divided to be compatible with other ground-floor commercial windows on this block of Sansom Street, with the staff to review details, pursuant Standard 9.

1508 PINE STREET

Owner: 1508 Pine Street Associates

Applicant: Martin J. Rosenblum

History: Lewi's Row, eighteen 4-story brownstone Italianate rowhouses designed by Thomas U. Walter, built in 1849. Individually designated in 09/28/1971; designated as a Significant resource within the Rittenhouse/Fitler Historic District in 02/08/1995.

Project: Rear additions and masonry openings alterations

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct two rear additions with a roof deck on an outstanding Thomas U. Walter brownstone Italianate rowhouse. The rear of the property has a two-story addition with a metal bay at the second floor built c. 1910. The original three-story rear ell, as seen on the house next door, was clad in wood clapboard. The subject property still retains its original clapboard at the third floor of the rear ell. Furthermore, the subject property and its adjacent twin are the only two that retain their original configurations at the third floor. All other rear ells have been altered by addition or replacement.

A total of two additions are proposed for this property. The applicant proposes a one-story addition on the two-story portion of the rear ell dating from about 1910. This addition would mimic the scale and design of the original 1849 third floor. Instead of wood clapboard it would be clad in fire-rated "Hardi plank".

The second addition would be located at the rear of the main block. It would be two stories in height and would be clad in brick. This addition would require the infill of a fourth-floor window and relocating two others, all of them on the rear façade of the main block. The addition would also include a wood roof deck that would measure 23' by 15'. The deck would be located on the roof of the rear ell and an existing window would be enlarged into a door for access.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of third-and-fourth floor addition, provided it is finished in stucco and not brick; approval of the roof deck, pursuant Standards 9 and 10; denial of third-floor rear addition, pursuant Standards 2, 5, and 6.

DISCUSSION: No new objections were raised to the lack of a quorum. Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Architect Martin Rosenblum represented the application.

Mr. Rosenblum presented an overview of the project. He stressed that the income derived from the added space would be devoted to restoring the front façade. He stated that the front is very important, but that the rear of the building was poorly constructed originally and not worth preserving. He stated that the nearby ells on other buildings in the row had been altered. He showed photographs documenting the additions and aluminum siding nearby. Mr. Danta noted that this ell and its twin are nearly original. They are the only ells left in the row that document the original appearance.

Mr. Rivera asked Mr. Danta why the staff recommended denial. Mr. Danta replied that the staff recommended denial owing to the proposed loss of historic fabric and the original spatial relationships.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The member of the Architectural Committee recommended approval of third-and-fourth floor addition, provided it is finished in stucco and not brick; approval of the roof deck, pursuant Standards 9 and 10; denial of third-floor rear addition, pursuant Standards 2, 5, and 6.

2010 PINE STREET

Owner/Applicant: Douglas Mellor

History: Built c. 1865; new façade and major alterations c. 1910; contributing in the Rittenhouse/Fitler Historic District in 2/8/1995

Project: Replace rear windows, demolish roof, install “green roof” and stair enclosure.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the roof on this property. The current roof dates from the mid 19th-century. It has a gabled front, not visible from the street, and a flat roof on the rear ell. The house underwent major modifications around 1910 gaining a new façade that obscures the original roof line. The applicant proposes to replace the entire roof with a flat roof and raise the height of the roof at the rear ell by about a foot. However, no specific details have been provided. Two-thirds of the roof would have a roof deck, which will span the main block and parts of the rear ell. A green roof system is proposed for half of the rear ell. The roof deck would be accessed from an enclosed stair house with an attached trellis. The new roof would have several skylights illuminating the stair well and second-floor baths.

Additionally, the applicant proposes to replace the windows in a side bay and in three non-historic rear façade openings as well as replace French doors at the ground floor

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the “green roof, roof deck, and stair housing on the rear ell, pursuant Standard 9; denial of the demolition of the gabled roof and the installation of the roof deck on main block, pursuant Standards 2, 6, and the Commission’s policy on roof decks.

DISCUSSION: No new objections were raised to the lack of a quorum. Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Owner Douglas Mellor represented the application.

Mr. Danta began by explaining the staff's recommendation and the Commission’s policy on main-block roof decks.

Mr. Mellor reported the poor condition of the roof owing to termite infestation and structural defects. Mr. Mellor expressed his preference of making it a flat roof, and also noted that the roof also has at least seven layers of roofing on it. Both Messrs. Rivera and Danta mentioned to the applicant that he should present evidence of these problems to the Commission. Mr. Danta also commented that he should investigate the possibility of sistering the existing roof structure, which may be more economical than replacing the entire roof structure. Mr. Danta posited that Mr. Mellor may want to compose a letter outlining the details on the condition and steps necessary to correct the problems. Mr. Mellor noted an original interior gutter that has led to deterioration over the years.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The member of the Architectural Committee recommended approval of the retention of the front half of the gable, demolition of the rear half of the gable, and installation of the deck, skylight, stair housing, and green roof behind the ridge of the gable.

2236 MOUNT VERNON STREET

Owner/Applicant: Joseph A. Pagano

History: Individually designated in 12/05/1974; designated as a 10/11/2000; built c. 1859, contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District.

Project: Rear additions, alterations and deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a one-story addition to a two-story rear ell. Currently the rear ell is stuccoed and has a second-story deck. The new addition would be 13' by 14' and would be finished in stucco. A deck is proposed for the roof of the addition; the deck would cantilever past the plane of the rear façade. The applicant proposes alterations to openings at the ground floor of the rear ell. These changes include converting an existing window into a door and vice versa. Finally, the application proposes to replace the existing rear fence with a masonry wall. However, no details have been provided for this change.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: No new objections were raised to the lack of a quorum. Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Owner Joseph Pagano represented the application.

Mr. Rivera asked how far the deck would cantilever. Mr. Pagano responded that it would cantilever three feet.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The member of the Architectural Committee recommended approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

3 RECTOR STREET

Owner: David Waxman

Applicant: Tiffany Strother

History: c. 1876 as the office for Archibald Campbell & Co. textile mills

Project: Construct five-story addition on two-story building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the conversion of an industrial building to residential use. In the spring of 2005, the current applicants applied to the Commission to demolish the historic building and erect an entirely new residential building. The Commission denied the demolition

application in June 2005. The applicants appealed the denial to the Board of Building Standards, which upheld the Commission's decision. The applicants appealed to the Board of Building Standards decision to the Board of License & Inspection Review; at the appeal hearing, the applicant agreed to send a revised application to the Commission rather than pursue the appeal. The Commission reviewed a revised application in February 2006 and approved the proposal in concept with a four-story addition set back at least ten feet from the Rector Street facade and a garage opening no more than ten feet wide.

The current proposal differs significantly from the proposal that the Commission approved in concept. The addition is now five, not four, stories tall. It is no longer styled like an industrial building. The exterior materials have changed significantly from those shown in the photo-simulations submitted with the in-concept proposal. The parking design has been significantly altered. There are now two, not one, parking entrances and they are on the north facade. Parking now occupies most of the historic building; the earlier proposal limited parking to the basement; the current proposal shows parking at the basement and first-floor levels. Also, the addition now extends beyond the historic building's footprint, overlapping the wall of the historic building at the north.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to 704.2.3 and 704.2.7 of the Property Maintenance Code

DISCUSSION: No new objections were raised to the lack of a quorum. Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Committee. Architect Jonathan Broh and developer David Waxman represented the application.

Mr. Waxman provided a brief history of the project. Mr. Rivera asked if the applicant consulted the community. Mr. Waxman stated that they had met with the neighbors. Jane Glenn of the Manayunk Neighborhood Council noted that the community had not seen the new plans. Kevin Smith of the Manayunk Neighborhood Council stated that they had not seen a detailed plan. Mr. Waxman stated that they have been working with all interested parties.

Mr. Broh stated that the design approved in concept was a simple rectilinear volume absent of any architectural features. Mr. Rivera asked to see the drawing that the Commission commented on. Mr. Farnham provided the drawing as well as two photo-renderings presented to the Architectural Committee during the in-concept review. Mr. Waxman stated that they had moved the parking entrance from Rector Street to the private street at the Commission's suggestion. Mr. Rivera stated that their current plan deviated significantly from the concept proposal. He suggested that they seek approval in concept because the new proposal is significantly different. He also suggested that they present their plan to the community again. Mr. Waxman stated that they are seeking final approval.

Mr. Gallery stated that, unfortunately, complete demolition is the best solution in this situation. The Manayunk ordinance has made this a difficult process. He observed that the applicant has made a sincere effort to accommodate the recommendations and work with the building. He stated that it is difficult to judge what is best for the building.

Ms. Glenn stated that the neighborhood was at extreme risk of being lost. The old architecture is important. She stated that the community does not want to lose an industrial building along the canal. Its presence along the towpath is important. Mr. Smith stated that he was concerned that the community was beginning to look entirely different from the I-76. He added that new

construction does not have to look old, but it should look compatible. He added that the zoning regulations have created a hardship.

Mr. Farnham pointed out that the plans include an extra story that was not included in the concept approval. Mr. Waxman replied that the Commission had an approved additional story beyond that represented in their in-concept plan. Mr. Farnham referred to the minute of the Commission's in-concept approval and noted that Mr. Wilds had commented that an additional story, from four to five, would be acceptable. However, it was not included in the motion and was therefore the opinion of one Commission member, not an official decision.

Mr. Waxman stated that they would not like to demolish the building. He stated that he was proud of what they have done for the building and he wanted to incorporate all the pieces to make a great building.

Mr. Farnham suggested that the Committee determine whether the proposal complies with the approval in concept. The new building is one story taller and extends beyond the footprint of the historic building. He stated that the staff's position was that the plans do not comply with the requirements of the Manayunk code; the addition is not appropriate in scale.

Mr. Broh stated that they would like a final approval. Mr. Smith asserted that the plans are not sufficient for a final approval. Mr. Farnham commented that the plans presented were detailed enough for a final approval.

Mr. Rivera stated that the plans differed too greatly from the approved concept. Mr. Waxman stated they added a costly automobile elevator for the parking to preserve the Rector and canal facades.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The member of the Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to 704.2.3 and 704.2.7 of the Property Maintenance Code

150 VINE STREET

Owner: 2PH Real Estate LLP

Applicant: Peter Monzo

History: Vacant lot at the time of designation

Project: Construct three new townhouses (45-day review and comment)

OVERVIEW: This parcel is an undeveloped site, and was at the time of designation. This application is presented for review and comment only.

The application proposes to construct three new townhouses on an empty parcel located at the corner of Vine and 2nd Streets. The townhouses would be four stories tall and include roof decks. They would be finished in brick and metal cladding.

The main facades would face Vine Street. The ground floor of each unit would include two garage doors, a pedestrian door, and large glass block accents. The upper stories would have strong registers of aluminum casement windows and balconies at the fourth floor.

The 2nd Street elevation would have a strong corner emphasis with a single register of casement windows. The rest of the facade will be accentuated by metal panel siding.

The south facades would have continuous balconies at the second floor, and various fixed and casement windows. The units would have individual backyards.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff contends that garages on front facades are inappropriate in historic districts. The plans should be revised, shifting the parking to a secondary façade.

DISCUSSION: No new objections were raised to the lack of a quorum. Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Messrs. Strombone and Brown represented the applicant.

Mr. Danta reminded Mr. Rivera that this proposal is for review and comment only. Mr. Strombone stated that the neighborhood association sought to preserve parking. Mr. Strombone presented samples of brick and metal. Mr. Rivera suggested that they revise the fenestration.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The member of the Architectural Committee commented that the parking should be relocated to a secondary façade and the fenestration should be revised.

219-229 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: Rittenhouse Regency Affiliates, David Marshall

Applicant: Robert Cook

History: Built 1925, Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects, as Penn Athletic Club

Major alterations 1957, Cronheim & Weger, architects

Project: Review final balcony details (Architectural Committee review only)

OVERVIEW: This application proposes window and balcony details for the conversion of the former Penn Athletic Club building at the northeast corner of 18th and Locust Streets to residential use. In April 2006, the Commission approved a proposal for the conversion, provided the Locust Street façade of the penthouse is redesigned to better correspond to the historic building and the details of the non-historic balconies are refined, with the Architectural Committee to review the penthouse and balconies. This application provides the details of the non-historic balconies, but not those for the penthouse. The applicants will submit the penthouse details at a later date.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: No new objections were raised to the lack of a quorum. Mr. Farnham presented the application to Mr. Rivera of the Committee. Architect James Garrison represented the application. Mr. Garrison presented the details of the balcony designs including the terra-cotta-like surrounds and the doors. Mr. Rivera reviewed the proposal carefully and agreed that it had been improved since the original submission. Most importantly, the dimensions of the surround had been reduced to the minimum. Mr. Rivera noted that, although the mock-up at one floor looks heavy, the column of surrounds will look graceful when completed. Mr. Rivera reviewed other restoration details, comparing the original 1920s drawings to the new drawings for replacement pieces. He approved of them, but asked that one detail be revised to prevent water infiltration problems.

Mr. Garrison presented drawings of proposed window changes at a lower floor. Mr. Farnham commented that the new window openings had already been approved by the Commission as part of the earlier overall submission, but that the cuts and balconies had not been reviewed. He advised Mr. Garrison that Mr. Rivera did not have the authority to approve them and suggested

that he prepare a submission to the Commission. Mr. Garrison agreed to finalize the plans and present them to the Commission for review during an upcoming review cycle.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: The member of the Architectural Committee approved the details for the balconies, surrounds, and doors.

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 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 work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportions, 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.

Property Maintenance Code 704.2.3: Original architectural features such as cornices and bays shall not be removed.

Property Maintenance Code 704.2.7: Additions, alterations, and new construction shall be designed so as to be compatible in scale, building materials, and texture, with contributing buildings in the historic district.

§14-2007 (7) (j): No permit shall be issued for the demolition ... of a building ... within an historic district which contributes, in the Commission's opinion, unless the Commission finds that issuance of the permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

Building Site Guidelines: Recommended: Designing ... adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserves the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.

ADJOURNMENT: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Randal Baron, Jorge Danta, Jonathan E. Farnham, Karen Gonski, Erin McGinn Cote