

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Room 578, City Hall
29 November 2005**

Present

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

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Officer
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Also

Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Larry Link, PennDOT
Harry Laspee, Pennoni Associates
Walt Zaman, Pennoni Associates
John Gallery, Ppreservation Alliance
David Yurky, Office of Councilwoman Donna Reed Miller
Tina LeCoff, Penn-Knox Neighbors
John Friedman, Germantown Friends
William Gural, Philadelphia Streets Department
Catherine Franklin, PHNC
Pamela Bracey, Southwest Germantown
Andrew Maginnis, Historic Northwest
Mihoko Samejima, 601 Fulton Street
Stephen Maffei, Landmark Design
Heather Winett, 600-block of Fulton Street
Don Ventresca, 238 Christian Street
Tom Bello, 238 Christian Street
James Bishop, 118 W. Coulter Street
Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects
Alan Metcalfe, MAD
Kelly Dunphy, MAD
David Callan
Jay Tackett, Tackett & Co.
A. Fritch, Tackett & Co.
Ed Bell, EBA
Tim Jones, 112 Queen Street
Tania Rorke, 311-321 Delancey Street
Anna Henderson, 116 Kenilworth Street
Harold Lichtman, GLP Architects

Gregg Golin, Cingular Wireless
Marcea Driscoll, 38 Summit Street
Kip Kaller, Russell Roofing
Roger Kaller, Russell Roofing
Constantine Tsikos, 1915 Green Street
Charles Rudalavage, Ewing Cole
Walter Rich, 413 S. 9th Street
Charles Capaldi, 413 S. 19th Street
Dominic Ward, 32-34 N. Front Street
Ursinio Nunez, 1700 Diamond Street
Karen Weldon, 130 Queen Street
Rick Donaghy, 130 Queen Street
Glenn Werner, J.K. Roller Architects

Vincent Riviera called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

5200 – 5400 blocks of Germantown Avenue

Owner: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Larry Link, PennDOT

Project: Replace granite block paving in tracks with concrete

This application proposes to reconstruct these blocks of Germantown Avenue, a street in the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. The street currently has granite block from curb to curb and two sets of tracks for the Route 23 Trolley line, which occasionally runs. The reconstruction will consist of relaying the granite block on the sides of the cartway, but installing concrete in the area along the tracks. The concrete will be colored and stamped to simulate the granite block. New 7-inch T-rails will be laid to keep the trolley line continuous. The project also includes new lighting, sidewalks and other street improvements; however, these alterations fall outside of the Commission's jurisdiction since the Street Paving Thematic District pertained to the cartways of the streets only.

The Historical Commission reviewed the reconstruction of the 3700-4000 blocks of Germantown Avenue in 2000. At that time the Commission created an Ad-hoc Committee to explore the possibility of reusing the granite block within the track area. At that time, the Committee agreed that the use of the new T-rail precluded the use of granite block. The Committee also discussed the treatment of the concrete in the track area. It was agreed that raw concrete proved to be the most maintenance-free and consistent along Germantown Avenue. The Commission, when it adopted the Committee's recommendations at the time, specifically said that the decision would not set a precedent for Germantown Avenue, but that it would review alterations on the Avenue on a case-by-case basis in the event that new technologies allowed for the tracks to be integrated with the granite block.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, on the condition that the concrete is left raw between the tracks, rather than made to mimic the granite block, pursuant to Standard 3 and Standard 9. Staff would like more information on the printed concrete before recommending approval of that system as an alternative.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. She noted that only the lack of a quorum with only

two Committee members present. The applicants included Larry Link of PennDOT, Elizabeth Amisson of A.D. Marble Environmental Consultants and Wali Zaman and Harry Laspee of Penoni Associates. The applicants agreed to proceed without a quorum and Ms. Pentz arrived mid-discussion creating a quorum.

Mr. Laspee explained that the new standard rail being used by SEPTA for the street car is a T-rail with a seven-inch depth whereas the old rail being removed is nine inches in depth. This does not leave room to reinstall the granite block in the track area. In addition to relaying the street paving and track, PennDOT proposes to install new traffic signals, trees, and gas and electric lines. They hope to have all of their approvals to begin work in 2007.

Ms. Amisson described the historically designated resources that may be impacted, including The Philadelphia Register Thematic Street Paving District, the National Register Germantown Avenue District and the Route 23 trolley line and the Penn Knox District, which the State has declared eligible for the National Register.

Mr. Laspee showed the proposed street section with seven-foot-wide parking lanes where they propose to reinstall the granite block and eleven-foot-wide travel lanes in each direction where they propose a new stamped and tinted concrete to mimic the granite block. He showed a digitally enhanced photograph to demonstrate the look of the two materials in one picture. He said that this material was safer than the block as it is more skid resistant. He noted that the cross walks would be smooth to meet ADA requirements and that the lines would be an applied epoxy paint.

Tina LeCoff of the Penn Knox Neighbors had concerns about the applicants meeting again with the neighbors. She had questions about the sidewalks, street trees and other issues outside the scope of the Commission's present review.

Mr. Levy said that he prefers the look of the un-tinted and un-stamped concrete, noting that other blocks on Germantown Avenue have plain concrete in the track area. He opined that consistency along the Avenue would be preferable.

Mr. Gallery spoke in favor of continuing what the Commission had approved for an earlier reconstruction of Germantown Avenue, using raw concrete in the middle and granite block on the parking lanes.

Catherine Franklin, a member of the neighborhood organization, said that these few blocks of Germantown Avenue are a National Historic Landmark District and especially significant since they contain colonial landmarks such as Grumblethorpe, the Friends School, the Deschler-Morris House and the old market. She thought that these blocks should have the blocks preserved on the full width of the street.

Andrew McGuinness of the Northwest Coalition spoke about the possibility of installing smaller blocks set in mastic which he said is quite durable.

Two members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the removal of the granite block from the center area surrounding the rails and the installation of un-tinted, un-patterned concrete to match the concrete approved in the earlier, referenced application for Germantown Avenue. Suzanne Pentz abstained.

700 block of Sansom Street, 600 block of Fulton Street and 5300 block of Hedge Street

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: William Gural, Street Department

History: Sansom Street: paved in brick, c. 1915; Fulton Street: paved in brick, 1914;

Hedge Street: opened and paved in brick, 1917

Project: Replace brick paving with imprinted resin paving

The Streets Department proposes to replace the historic vitrified brick paving on the three streets with a resin paving material that will be colored and stamped to look like the existing brick pattern. The Department will salvage the historic bricks and stockpile them to use in the patching and repair of the remaining brick streets as needed. The Department says the cost of this type of paving proves much cheaper (about half) than reconstructing the streets using the historic brick.

The resin composite material is color-integrated and laid in 5/8-inch-thick layer over a bituminous binder course. The material is hot when laid and then quickly imprinted with the desired pattern. A range of colors can be created for the material, and a red match would mimic the vitrified brick. An example of this material exists in the crosswalk at the intersection of Walnut and 15th Streets.

Only 41 blocks in the entire city have the red brick paving as the primary paving material (several blocks of Erie Avenue have brick paving between trolley tracks). Most are concentrated in Manayunk, Germantown and Center City. At the time of designation, Sansom and Fulton had high integrity and Hedge moderate integrity. The Streets Department applied to the Historical Commission in 1999 to remove the brick in Hedge Street and pave it with asphalt. The Historical Commission denied the application.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. William Gural of the Streets Department explained that the Streets Department had reorganized and that he represented the Traffic Planning Division. He said that he has sensitivity to the need to preserve historic resources but that they have very little money to devote to these historic streets. He said that they do not have a stock of historic bricks, that roads are being subjected to more and heavier traffic and that they do not have workers with the skills to relay the brick streets. He said that the cost of street improvement has gone up by 60% and the amount the City will put into all street improvement is decreasing from a high of \$17.5 million in 2000 to a projected \$ 8 million by 2007. He said that, in general, one of the historic blocks can be completely repaved for \$ 400,000, but that the Department can only allocate \$200,000 per year. This allows them to repave one street every two years. He said that Fulton Street was being reviewed at the request of Councilman DiCicco.

The Department proposes to remove the bricks from these three blocks and stockpile them to be used to repair other streets. The Department would then repave these streets using a pressed and colored brick pattern. He said that they are trying to find a long term solution and welcome suggestions.

Mr. Levy suggested that they should repair damaged pieces of streets rather than the entire block at once. He said that they should develop a set of specifications for contractors doing utility repairs and that the Department should make sure that people

follow them. He said that the crosswalks could be taken up and repaired in an alternate material and those bricks used to repair areas of missing brick.

Ms. Pentz thought that the skills to do the work correctly could be taught in a one-day class. She noted that the brick itself is not usually the part that fails, rather it is the street bed beneath it. She said many of these streets have lasted more than a hundred years and the bricks are much more durable than a pressed-asphalt material.

Committee members believed that the stamped asphalt not only does not look like brick, but also wears badly. They suggested that any replacement material should be tested in a different location first before tearing up any original streets.

John Gallery spoke in opposition to the application and said that any demolition of the historic streets to create a stockpile should come after a complete survey of the existing brick streets. He opined that the 700 block of Sansom Street, known as Jewelers Row, was quite intact and very significant.

Heather Winett, a neighbor on Fulton Street said that she had contacted Councilman DiCicco's office not to have the historic street paving removed, but rather to have it protected. She wants to have the numerous patches correctly repaired. Instead, the bricks have been removed or stolen and never put back.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend 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].

2320 Madison Square

Owner: Danforth Builders and Developers

Applicant: Stephen Maffei, architect

History: c. 1870s; demolished 1983

Project: New construction – plenary jurisdiction

The applicant proposes to construct a two-story brick house on the vacant lot that will repair the gap-tooth in this otherwise intact historic row. The design replicates the historic fenestration pattern of a central, arched entrance with two windows on the first floor and three windows on the upper floor. The contemporary nature of the construction shows in the proposed details: the patterning of the door and the two-over-one windows. The proposed denticulated cornice replicates the historic ones on the block and could have a more contemporary profile.

On the rear, the house has a contemporary design with a recessed section at the first floor with a patio. A roof deck is proposed at the rear section of the roof, with access through a central roof hatch.

The drawings do not identify materials for the windows and door nor details of the roof deck.

Staff Recommendation: Approval in concept, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Steven Maffei of Landmark Design appeared on behalf of the developer. He said that they had worked with the community and that the design was well received. He described the red-brick design, which fits into the pattern of the other buildings in the row. It has windows that are somewhat larger and have a two-over-one design to distinguish them from the neighboring houses. He said the deck would be accessed by a spiral stair and a hatch. The owner very much wanted the deck because the building has so little out door space.

John Gallery questioned the idea of the deck, saying it would be a shame if this was the precedent that allowed for decks on the whole row. He emphasized the neighbor's petition which cited the deck on this property as a precedent for the others on the block.

The Committee members did not object to the idea of a deck on this building and questioned whether it would set a precedent for the existing buildings. Mr. Levy suggested that the deck should sit slightly away from the rear façade and that the hatch be incorporated into the space of the deck.

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

900 Bodine Street aka 238 Christian Street

Owner: Green Park Properties

Applicant: Don Ventresca

History: Lot subdivided from 238 Christian Street

Proposal: New construction

This application is the third submission to the Commission for new construction on a lot that will be subdivided from a designated property, 238 Christian Street. The lot is bounded by the 900-block of Bodine Street on the east and the 200-block of Montrose Street on the south. The 900-block of S. 3rd Street is nearby and to the west of the lot; the 200-block of Christian Street is nearby and to the north. The 900-block of Bodine Street is listed on the Register as part of the Historic Street Paving District, but none of the properties on the block is listed. Thirty-two properties on the 200-block of Montrose Street are listed. Three properties on the 900-block of S. 3rd Street are listed. Twenty-two properties on the 200-block of Christian Street are listed.

In March 2005, the Historical Commission approved a single-family house with parking for this site. The owner later abandoned that approved proposal. In October 2005, the applicant submitted a proposal for a four-unit development on the site with no parking. After the Architectural Committee recommended denial of that proposal, the applicant withdrew it before it was reviewed by the Commission.

The current proposal is very similar to the withdrawn proposal of October 2005. At the

time it recommended denial of the October proposal, the Committee suggested that the applicant delete the mansard, reduce the size of the dormers, and give each of the four residences a door on Bodine Street. It made these suggestions to reduce the scale of the building, in part by breaking it into four smaller units.

In the current design, the mansard has been deleted. The dormers have been reduced to windows. The single-leaf front door has been converted to a double-leaf door. Nonetheless, the design retains its original massing and scale as well as its appearance as a single large building rather than three or four smaller ones.

Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.4) states that, "in making its determination as to the appropriateness of proposed alterations, demolition or construction, the Commission shall consider ... The compatibility of the proposed work with the character of the historic district or with the character of its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape." The proposed building would not be compatible with the neighboring structure, surroundings, and streetscape. In massing and scale, it would be unlike the surrounding buildings. It would be much too large for the neighborhood. Moreover, its random conglomeration of historical motifs and contemporary suburban details would detract from the truly historic buildings around it.

Judged solely on its own, without taking the context into account, the design is fundamentally flawed. The ostensibly grand doorway appears diminutive and anti-climactic, especially because it is squeezed into a narrow slot and weighed down by the Dryvit inset above. The placement, proportioning, and scale of the windows are clearly driven by interior demands with no regard for the exterior. The rhythm of the openings is awkward and inharmonious. The broad, blank wall at the top floor seems to crush the lower front facade under its weight. The details—jack arches, bays, quoins, watertables, belt courses, balconies, and cornices—are pasted on the exterior in a disjointed manner. The design, especially for the front façade, defies the rules of both classical and contemporary architecture.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9, the Building Site Guidelines, and the Setting Guidelines.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Committee. Don Ventresca, the developer, and Tom Bello, the architect, represented the application.

Mr. Levy expressed concern that the proposed building would overwhelm the small street. It is inappropriately scaled and massed. He asked about the size of the sidewalk. Mr. Ventresca explained that it will be two feet wide.

Ms. Pentz said that the bay windows were too large and the door too high and grand. Several committee members suggested that the entranceway should be deleted and the buildings divided to look more like individual rowhouses.

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

property and its environment.]; the Building Site Guidelines [Recommended: Designing ... adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site...]; and the Setting Guidelines [Not Recommended: Introducing a new building or landscape feature that is out of scale or otherwise inappropriate to the setting's historic character.].

3428 Sansom Street

Owner: Judy Wicks

Applicant: Arlene Matzkin, architect

History: c. 1870

Proposal: Build two-story addition on rear

This proposal entails a two-story addition on the rear of this Second Empire rowhouse. The Moravian Street façades 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. Almost all of these additions have large amounts of glazing, giving them a very open, airy quality. 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 drawings do not show materials or other details.

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

Ms. Spina presented the project. Arlene Matzkin, the architect, attended the meeting.

Committee members commented on the variety of approaches to the additions on the backs of these Sansom Street buildings. Ms. Matzkin said that the area functions as a loading dock. She said that the building addition has solid walls because the area will have shelving.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval in concept.

1230 Pine Street

Owner: David Callan

Applicant: Alan Metcalfe, architect

History: c. 1830

Proposal: Revised proposal to legalize windows and skylights

This project has been seen and approved by the Commission in the past; however, the contractor did not follow the approved plans in several ways. This application seeks to legalize that work and modify certain other aspects of the previously approved plans. On the front façade, the applicant planned to retain the windows and frames at the second floor and construct new matching frames on the reconstructed first floor and add true- divided-light sash in all four windows. Instead the contractor demolished the window frames, pulling out the shutter hardware and original brick with them. The new windows which have been installed, have applied muntins and an overly wide frame. The removed brick was replaced. In exchange for the legalization of the windows, the applicant will reset them to the correct positions in the opening and install a clamshell

brick mold and shutter hardware. At the doorway, the applicant found that the steel beams that hold up the façade above the storefront, require the reconstruction of the façade somewhat differently than formerly approved. Specifically the transom needs to be located further forward in the brick opening and the door way must be located ten inches to the right of the original opening.

On the roof, the applicant had intended to retain the existing roof and dormer, but ended up recovering the roof with weathered wood-colored asphalt shingles. The dormers that were damaged in the process will be reconstructed to match the original designs. On the visible rear slope of the roof, the applicant added two skylights and a series of vent pipes.

On the rear façade, the applicant had proposed French doors at the first floor, but now proposes a slider. At the second floor, the original plans showed retaining the original window and installing a multi-pane wood door in the second window opening by cutting the opening down. Instead, the contractor bought a single-pane door that does not fill the height of the opening. The rear window was removed and the opening cut downward. The applicant now proposes to retain the window and door infilling the top of the original openings with brick.

Staff recommendation: Approval of all work, except the infilling the rear window and door openings with brick and installing a short door, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Mr. David Callan and Mr. Allan Metcalfe attended the meeting. Mr. Callan inquired whether a transom window over the door would be an acceptable solution. Mr. Baron mentioned that the glass panes in such a transom would be out of proportion, since the lights would be wider than they are tall. Mr. Baron noted that although visibility of this rear had diminished, the second floor was still quite visible.

Ms. Voith inquired if the front windows had an applied muntin. Mr. Metcalf answered that the windows were wood simulated light with thermal panes. Mr. Pentz noted that she disagreed with the approval of simulated divided light on the front façade. Mr. Levy seconded Ms. Pentz's comment and added that the Historical Commission had previously approved wood true divided for this project and that the owner had installed simulated instead. He argued that this was not owing to a site condition found during the process, but stemmed from a deliberate decision against the ruling of the Historical Commission. Mr. Metcalf noted that he did not disagree with the comments made by the Committee members, but stated that his client was spending a considerable amount of money on this property and that the contractor had made mistakes which needed to be addressed in order for the project to move forward.

Mr. Metcalf noted that they were closely working with the staff to design an appropriate molding for the window frames, given that the previous approval did not specify these. Mr. Baron clarified that the previous approval did not go into those details because the window frames were supposed to stay in place with just the sash to be replaced. He also mentioned that work to the dormer had proceeded even after he had gone to the site and advised the contractor not to alter the dormer without a permit.

Ms. Voith inquired on the height of the gap above the door on the rear. Mr. Callan answered it was roughly a foot. Ms. Voith suggested that the owner could do an interior

step if he wanted to keep the shorter door or just purchase a new wood taller door that would fit within the historic height of the opening.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, conditional upon the installation of wood true-divided-light sash in the existing new Marvin window frames on the front and a new wood door and window at the rear to fit within the height of the historic openings, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of distinctive features, 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.].

2047-49 Walnut Street

Owner: Sholom Hockman

Applicant: Allison Fritch, architect

History: c. 1855; 2049: first floor altered to storefront, c. 1930

Proposal: Alter façade, add roof decks, install garages

This proposal calls for the restoration of the front facades of two row houses including rebuilding the first floor, watertable and window openings on 2049 and restoring windows and window hoods on all openings. The rears of the buildings facing Moravian Street will receive decks and new openings for garages. The rear of 2049 will receive a new bay to match that at 2047 Walnut Street.

The staff had some concerns with the design of the front door not matching the transom in the doorway. A multi-light door would be more in character with the opening. Staff members also thought the storefront should be documented to determine its age. An early twentieth-century storefront may have achieved its own significance and warrant preservation. On the rear, the staff thought that the new bay on 2049 should be distinguished from the historic bay on 2047 Walnut Street.

Staff recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Allison Fritch and Jay Tackett, the architects, attended the meeting.

Ms. Voith agreed with the staff's recommendation that the new rear bay window should be differentiated from the historic bay. Ms. Voith also inquired in the historic basis for the proposed light configuration. Mr. Baron answered that it had bases on surviving historic windows on this row, he added, however, that the rear windows needed more research and that it was something that the applicant could work with the staff during the staff to review details process. Mr. Tackett noted that the rear would be re-stucco with a new sand finish stucco.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of distinctive features, 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.]

329 South Street

Owner: 329 South Street, LLC

Applicant: Nurit Nachum

History: c. 1900; storefront installed c. 1930

Proposal: Alter storefront

This proposal calls for alterations to a rare double vestibule storefront. The applicant proposes to remove the signage that had been installed by a former tenant and restore the marble surround and stained glass transoms. The applicant wishes to remove a portion of the central show window, turning it into an island. The rear half of the right hand display window would be demolished and turned into a wider vestibule for access to upstairs apartments. The building currently has a doorway to the upper floors in this location. The plans show the construction of a new glass wall and door at the inner end of the storefront.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the removal of storefront fabric, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Nurit Nachum, the architect, attended the meeting.

Ms. Nachum noted that the store space would be leased by a children's store and that the reason to reconfigure the vestibule was to allow customers with strollers to have easier access to the store as well as to afford the merchandise inside the store more visibility. She also mentioned that currently the entrance to the upper rental units is slightly bigger than three feet and that it proves very impractical to move large pieces of furniture.

Ms. Voith expressed her strong opposition to this proposal. She noted that it would be a terribly detrimental change and that it would alter the way in which the façade and the entrance space reads. She also added that this storefront was a rare survivor of a period in commercial design history that lasted a short time.

Ms. Nachum mentioned that they had no possibility of connecting the rear of the building, facing Gaskill Street, to the front entrance. The upper rental units only had one entrance from South Street. She also noted that the owner had signed a restrictive covenant with Queen Village Neighborhood Association which clearly prohibited the connection of the commercial and rental unit's space.

Mr. Levy suggested widening the vestibule to the upper floors at the interior of the store.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the widening of

the vestibule to the upper floors on the exterior and the removal of one of the doors to the store. The Committee split on the alteration to the center portion of the storefront. Ms. Voith and Ms. Pentz voted to recommend denial of the change to the center storefront while Mr. Rivera and Mr. Levy voted to recommend approval of the cutting of the center storefront to create an island pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.], Standard 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.] 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.]

112 Queen Street

Owner: Von Hee Properties, LLC

Applicant: Edward Bell, architect

History: c. 1820

Proposal: Add three-story rear addition

This proposal involves alterations to the rear of a property seen and approved last month for façade alterations. Because the house sits one house in from the corner of Queen and Howard Streets, the back is highly visible. The owner proposes to demolish the entire rear brick wall to make a ten-foot-five inch-deep addition at the first and second floors and a three-foot addition at the third floor. A deck would then be added to the third floor as well.

The staff thought that the addition should be made to the house without demolishing the back wall and that the third floor addition should be deleted.

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

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Edward Bell, the architect, and Tim Jones, the owner, attended the meeting.

Mr. Baron explained that after reviewing the floor plans submitted, the staff believed that changes in the floor plan could be accommodated to save the historic rear wall. Mr. Jones explained that changes to the floor plan could not be done owing to the square footage requirements of the 2 zoned HVAC system that he wanted to install. He also mentioned that the mechanical closet, which would be the only area that could be reduced in size, was currently at its smallest possible in order to fit the size of the unit.

Ms. Pentz asked about the changes that would be required on the roof line for the extension of the rear. Mr. Bell mentioned that the pitch of the roof will change from a shallow pitch, to a gradual flat roof over the new extension. He also mentioned that Zoning had already given approval to infill the rear yard.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval as submitted, pursuant to

Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportions, 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.].

311-21 Delancey Street, Three Bears Park

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Tania Rorke

History: c. 1960

Proposal: Rehabilitate park

This proposal calls for rehabilitating the west end of Three Bears Park. This will involve removing existing play equipment and play surface and installing new. The soft play surface will be expanded to allow code compliant distance between the swing-set and the other equipment. New benches will be installed and several trees will be replaced. The slate and brick pattern will be retained and reset at a consistent level.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 6, 9, and 10.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Tania Rorke, president of Friends of Three Bears Park, attended the meeting.

Ms. Rorke mentioned that the green canopy over the park would not be affected by the removal of the two proposed trees and that they were planning on replacing a third tree, owing to its overgrown root system, which was damaging the brick paving around it. Ms. Rorke also added that the three bears sculptural group would be surrounded by a rubber play surface and that it was needed, not so much for safety around the sculptures, but because of the eight-foot fall zone required around all play equipments.

Ms. Voith inquired about the design and size of the new play equipment. Ms. Rorke mentioned that the existing play equipment does not meet Federal regulations and that in order for the City to approve the project they must expand the protected play area and the equipment. She clarified that the increase of the protected play zone was owing to the Federal eight-foot fall zone regulations. However, she noted that the size of the equipment would remain the same.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval as submitted pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of distinctive features, 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.]

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.]

116 Kenilworth Street

Owner/Applicant: Anna Henderson

History: mid to late-eighteenth century based on deeds and insurance survey

Proposal: Remove and reinstall Perma-brick front

This house was covered in brick-faced stucco before designation. The owner claims that the house is suffering from water infiltration because the stucco is failing. She proposes to have Garden State Brick Face recover the building.

The staff contends that the water infiltration likely derives from sources such as faulty downspouts or even the trapping of moisture by the stucco. The staff suggests that the existing stucco be removed and the brickwork below assessed by the staff and a Committee member. Judging from the protruding belt courses, the building probably has an eighteenth-century front that should be exposed if its condition warrants.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. McCoubrey joined the Committee. Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Josephine Henderson, the owner, attended the meeting.

Ms. Henderson explained that the stucco is in bad condition and that it has allowed water to penetrate the interior. She noted that this stucco had been done in the 1960s and that currently Garden State Brickface and Stucco holds her \$2,500 deposit.

Ms. Pentz inquired into the technique proposed for the new layer and if it would require removing the existing stucco layer. Ms. Henderson stated that Garden State proposed to place the new layer on top of the existing stucco using new galvanized lath. Mr. Baron noted that if done this way the façade would stick out from the identical neighboring property at 118 Kenilworth. Ms. Henderson mentioned that she did not know what the owners of 118 Kenilworth were planning to do.

Ms. Voith noted that it was very unlikely that the water penetration was caused by the stucco. She asserted that it probably derived from failing gutters or failing flashing around the cornice. Ms. Henderson replied that they had checked both and they were in good working condition. Mr. Rivera mentioned that it could then be the aluminum cladding over the sills.

Ms. Henderson noted that she had lived in the house for thirty-six years and that she had no idea the house was a designated historic property. Furthermore, she mentioned that her heating bill was too high and that this intervention would help her keep the cost of heating down.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that stucco would not significantly insulate the house and it would not lower the cost of heating. He also added that in order to do the work correctly the existing stucco layer had to come down. He urged her to rethink this proposal and do the work correctly.

Mr. Rivera seconded Mr. McCoubrey's comments and added that the new layer would make the façade even less breathable, increasing the humidity problem in the interior. He added it would be a short term aesthetic solution that would lead to bigger problems. Mr. Rivera also added that Garden State should advise its clients better.

Ms. Henderson mentioned that if the Historical Commission did not approve this proposal she might lose her deposit. Mr. Levy noted that a Garden State representative should come and explain how this intervention will not ultimately cause more damage.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the proposal, 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.].

112 Market Street

Owner: Jung Wha Ahn

Applicant: Harold Lichtman

History: c. 1830; top two stories demolished c. 1910; storefront installed 1988

Project: Add three stories, rebuild façade

In July and August 2005, the Architectural Committee and the Commission reviewed earlier versions of this application. The first was withdrawn before reaching the Commission; the second was denied without prejudice because the applicant was not present at the Commission meeting to accept the compromise proposed by the Committee. The current proposal retains aspects of the two earlier proposals while endeavoring to incorporate suggestions offered by the staff, Committee, and Commission during the earlier reviews.

The extant building is two stories in height. It was originally four stories tall, but was cut down, probably about 1910. The brick at the second-story front façade and the third-story stone window sills survive from the original nineteenth-century building, but nothing else on the exterior is original. The important metal cornice added in 1910, which completed the new two-story building, has been lost. The second-story window openings have been enlarged and the second-story sills are non-historic. The extant storefront, which is in poor condition, was installed in 1988.

The application proposes demolishing the storefront and second-story brick façade, rebuilding the lost third and fourth stories, adding a penthouse, and constructing a cast-stone storefront and brick façade. The penthouse would be set back 15 feet from the front façade and clad in cast stone. A roof deck would be located between the front façade and penthouse and would be hidden behind a tall front parapet. The rear of the building is completely hidden from any public view.

Staff Recommendation: The staff recommends that the height of the front parapet be reduced from 5'-1" to the minimum mandated by code and that the parapet and cornice line be merged to allow this building to better align with its neighbors to the east; and

that the height of the penthouse be reduced from 13' to the minimum necessary to reduce its visibility; pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Jung Wha Ahn and architect Harold Lichtman represented the application. Mr. Lichtman accepted the staff recommendation and stated that he could reduce the height of the parapet to 42 inches and the height of the penthouse to 11 or 11.5 feet. He offered to work with the staff on revising the design.

Ms. Voith suggested that several other details also needed revision. She stated that the proposed construction details would not work. The proposed parapet would not be able to be built, for example. She asserted that actual structural details may or may not alter the appearance of the façade. Mr. Rivera agreed. He pointed to several proposed structural details that were unrealistic. He claimed that the resolution of the structural issues may or may not impact the exterior appearance of the building. Mr. Lichtman conceded that the drawings showed wood framing, but that he now planned to use metal stud framing. Ms. Voith stated that the architect should engage a competent structural engineer to review the design. Ms. Pentz, the structural engineer on the Committee, agreed. She inquired into the construction on the party wall. Mr. Rivera suggested that, owing to the many flawed and missing structural details for the front façade, that the application be reviewed in concept, not for final approval. Mr. Lichtman asked for an explanation of the implications of a review in concept. Mr. Farnham explained that he could not seek a building permit with an approval in concept, but that he would need to return for an additional round of reviews by the Committee and Commission once the structural questions were resolved. Mr. Lichtman agreed to amend his application to request a review in concept only. Mr. Rivera asserted that the finalization of the structural details would alter the exterior appearance of the building. Ms. Voith suggested that the applicant also clarify and verify his design for the windows. She posited that the façade could not be built as drawn; the mullions would not support it. She added that the windows had not been drawn correctly.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval in concept, provided that the height of the front parapet is reduced to 42 inches and that the height of the penthouse is reduced to 11.5 feet or less and provided that the structural deficiencies are corrected; 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].

100 Market Street

Owner: ESK Ventures

Applicant: Allison Fitch, architect

History: 1882 by George and Albert Ulrich as a cigar factory and store

Proposal: Add handicap access ramp

This application proposes to construct a new concrete handicap access ramp along the Market Street façade of this Queen Anne commercial building. The ramp would lead to an existing historic opening and the railings would attach to a historic wood storefront. The ramp would seal an existing flush basement opening. The ramp would have a simple metal handrail. The historic doors would remain and the upper panels, currently boarded up with plywood, would be re-glazed.

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

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one representing the project attended the meeting. The Committee members agreed that a ramp was acceptable in this position, but asserted that the materials for the ramp should mirror the high quality materials that it would cover. The proposed material, concrete, was the cheapest possible. They stated that the face of the ramp should be clad in marble or granite to reflect the granite base and marble step. Mr. Levy suggested that the historic marble step be left in place and protected. The ramp could be built over the step with a felt separator sheet protecting it. The Committee also suggested that the ramp itself be paved with brick or some other code-compliant, but historically appropriate material.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, provided the ramp is paved with brick or granite and faced with marble or granite (a thick veneer, not a thin tile) and provided that the historic marble step is preserved in place, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new 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.].

301 Market Street

Owner: Jeffrey Wolfson

Applicant: Gregg Golin

History: c. 1796 for Richard Wistar

Proposal: Legalize internally-illuminated box signs and awnings

This application proposes to legalize two internally illuminated box signs and related awnings along the Market Street and Third Street facades of this building. The new tenant in the building, Cingular Wireless, replaced the facings on the existing plastic box signs and the fabric portions of the awnings without the Commission's approval or permits. The signs boxes and awnings frames were extant, but illegal. The illegal signs and awnings had been installed by the previous tenant with the Commission's approval

or permits. Neither the signs nor the awnings are the types that the Commission typically approves. The Old City Civic Association opposes the legalization.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Gregg Golin, the tenant and owner of the Cingular franchise, represented the application. Mr. Golin explained that he had refaced the sign and replaced the awnings. He had assumed that he could replace the signs and awnings without permits because they were extant.

All Committee members objected to the signs and awnings, asserting that they were entirely inappropriate to the extremely important, albeit unrestored, building. Mr. Rivera explained to Mr. Golin the importance of this eighteenth-century building. Ms. Pentz asserted that the signs and awnings must be removed and replaced with something more appropriate. Mr. Rivera suggested restoring the glassy transparency to the storefront. Mr. Golin explained that storefront restoration was not within his budget; he is only the tenant. Ms. Voith noted that the storefront is not original, but is from the nineteenth century and should be respected. She stated that the signage should not disrupt the view of it. She also acknowledged the Old City Civic Association's resolute opposition to the legalization. Mr. Golin asked if a foam sign would be appropriate. Ms. Voith replied that it would not be prudent to comment on a proposal without reviewing a plan. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission typically rejects plastic box signs, but typically accepts signage that does not interfere with views of the historic building or streetscape and that does not damage historic fabric.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial 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.]

38 Summit Avenue

Owner: Marcea and Jude Driscoll

Applicant: Roger Kaller, contractor

History: c. 1870, as an Italianate Villa; redesigned in the Colonial Revival style, 1925, for I. Wistar Morris by Brognard Okie, architect

Proposal: Replace cedar roof with simulated slate roof

This application proposes to install a slate-like dark charcoal shingle roof on this Colonial Revival house. The proposed shingle would have clipped corners. The roof currently has two layers, a shingle layer on top of wood shakes. Although originally an Italianate villa, this house was completely rebuilt in 1925 in the Colonial Revival style.

The proposed Victorian-style shingle is inappropriate for the style of this house. Photographs of the remodeled house published in 1925 and discovered after the Architectural Committee meeting clearly indicate that prominent architect Brognard Okie installed a wood shake roof on the building as part of his Colonial Revival rehabilitation.

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

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Marcea Driscoll and roofers Kip and Roger Kaller represented the application.

Kip Kaller, the president of Russell Roofing, questioned the Commission's jurisdiction over the property. He stated that it was private property and asserted that his client should be able to install the roof of her choice. Committee members explained that the Commission had designated the house as historic and had the authority to review proposals to alter its exterior. Mr. Kaller reported that Summit Street was used primarily by residents of the street, not the general public, and therefore this property should not be under the Commission's jurisdiction. He added that the house was set back a great distance from the street and the roofing choice would not be discernable to passers-by. Photographs contradicted this assertion and showed that the house and roof are clearly visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Kaller displayed a photograph of a nearby house which is roofed with a material similar to that which he is proposing. He claimed that he should be allowed to install his proposed shingle with clipped corners because this nearby house has a similar asphalt shingle. Committee members explained that the nearby house is of a different style, may or may not be designated, its roofing may or may not have been reviewed by the Commission, and the roof itself may or may not be appropriate to the building. Mr. Kaller continued to assert that its roofing offered a precedent for the current application. Several Committee members attempted to explain to Mr. Kaller why the staff had refused to approve his shingle even though it is a very expensive shingle. They explained that the clipped-corner slate-like shingle was not appropriate for a Colonial Revival house, which would have had cedar shakes originally. Mr. Kaller stated that the plank decking was evidence that the house had had a slate roof. When asked about other evidence of earlier roofs, Roger Kaller contradicted his colleague and stated that he had found one layer of asphalt shingles and some old cedar shakes, but nothing else. The Committee concluded that the original Colonial Revival roof must have been cedar shakes. Kip Kaller rejected the Committee's conclusion and asserted that he had much more experience in roofing than those on the Committee. Mr. Rivera suggested that Mr. Kaller limit his comments to constructive ones. Mr. Kaller again asserted that the Commission should not have the authority to review proposals for alterations to this property. He noted that his client had employed several consultants including an interior designer and a landscape architect to aid in the selection of an appropriate roofing material. He claimed that the proposed shingle looked best on the house. Mr. Farnham asked if a historic preservationist had been consulted. The applicants answered that one had not. Mr. Farnham stated that the question of the appropriate roofing was a preservation question, not a question of aesthetics. Mr. Kaller again rejected the authority and expertise of the Committee and staff and asserted that his proposal should be accepted. Mr. Rivera again warned Mr. Kaller that he was out of order.

Ms. Driscoll, the owner, stated that it was her intention to preserve the important historic building. She stated that she had followed Mr. Kaller's advice because she believed that he had correctly identified the appropriate roofing. She noted that she would install whatever roofing was deemed appropriate, but that she had a preference for the proposed shingle. She presented a letter from the Chestnut Hill Historical Society; she claimed that it supported her roofing choice. Committee members read the letter and concluded that it did not support any particular roofing.

Mr. Farnham stated that the staff's primary objection to the proposed roofing was its

clipped corners. He explained that regardless of the original roofing material, slate or shake, it would have had a rectangular shape. He added that the staff believed the original roofing material to be shakes, not slate. Committee members discussed whether the clipped shingle was appropriate; all agreed that it was not. Ms. Driscoll stated that she could substitute a rectangular shingle for the clipped shingle. The Committee then discussed whether slate or shakes were appropriate. Ms. Pentz asserted that she was certain that the Colonial Revival building would have had a shake roof. Mr. Rivera and Mr. Levy conceded that there may be evidence to support either type of roofing; they suggested that more information was needed. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he could not determine the original roofing material and was therefore willing recommend approval of the slate-like shingle, provided it did not have clipped corners. Ms. Voith excused herself from the meeting before the review was completed. The Committee could not concur on an appropriate shingle, but did concur that the proposed shingle was inappropriate.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposed shingle, pursuant to Standard 3 [Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.]; Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; and the Roof Guideline [Not Recommended: Altering the roof and roofing materials which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished].

1915 Green Street

Owner: Constantine Tsikos

Applicant: Stephen Higgins, contractor

History: c. 1866

Proposal: Legalize stucco on rear of building

This application proposes to legalize work done without a permit on the rear of this property, which is not visible from the public way. The applicant stuccoed the entirety of the rear in a rough stucco finish. The stucco covers the entire rear wall including the barge board and leaves no drip edge, making this rear elevation extremely vulnerable to water penetration and damage.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the legalization, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Masonry Preservation Guideline. The staff recommends the removal of the stucco owing to the conservation problems it will foster.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Constantine Tsikos represented the application. Mr. Tsikos explained that his contractor did not know that the building was historic and that he needed a building permit. Mr. Farnham informed Mr. Tsikos that the application of stucco requires a permit regardless of a building's historic status. He added that the contractor should have known that he needed a permit.

Committee members agreed that the stucco would not solve the water infiltration

problems and would, in fact, exacerbate them. Ms. Pentz, Mr. McCoubrey, and Mr. Levy all stated that this appeared to be one of the worst stuccoing jobs they had ever seen. They noted that the stucco covered the bargeboard at the roofline and that no flashing had been installed. They point to an appropriate stuccoing job on a neighboring house, which could be seen in the submitted photographs. They contended that the flawed stucco would act like a funnel, channeling water behind it, adding to the water infiltration problems, and eventually leading to the failures of the walls. They explained that water problems with brick walls are almost always due to failing roofing, gutters, downspouts, or flashing. Stucco never cures water problems and usually promotes them. The correct response would have been to repair the roofing, gutters, and other weatherizing features and point the brick if necessary.

The Committee decided that, owing to the invisibility of the rear from the public right-of-way, the stucco should be left in place but repaired. Removing it might further damage the wall. The Committee suggested that a competent contractor complete the stucco project. He or she should cut the stucco below the bargeboard, remove the old bargeboard, stucco the wall to the roofline, install a new bargeboard, and appropriately flash the bargeboard into the roof. It also suggested that equivalent measures be taken at the window sills, where the new stucco will also encourage water infiltration.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend legalization of the stucco at the rear, provided it is repaired and completed as outlined above, with the staff to review a detailed specification of the remedial work before it begins and to inspect it in the field once it is complete.

2000 Benjamin Franklin Parkway

Owner: Franklin Institute

Applicant: Charles Rudalovage, architect

History: 1929-31, John T. Windrim, architect

Proposal: Install HVAC on front roof

This application proposes new HVAC equipment on the flat roof over the main entrance to the museum facing Logan Circle. This area currently has two smaller units, which are not visible. The proposed location is also located directly adjacent of the main mechanical room. The proposed unit would be a 6' tall by 24.5' long and would be painted to match the Indiana Limestone of museum's facades. This unit would be a heat recovery unit, which would collect heated exhaust air and funnel it back into the heated air supply. The applicant proposes to run the duct work that would connect this unit to the rest of the mechanical system through two lower panels of a Diocletian window. Neither the duct work nor the lower panels of this window would be visible. The applicant has submitted a site line study. This study shows that the unit would not be visible from the park in front of the museum or the middle of Logan Circle, but would be visible from the Franklin Parkway along the side of the Four Seasons Hotel. The visibility of the unit from the Roman Catholic Cathedral is blocked by the trees of the Four Sister Cities Park.

Staff Recommendation: Tabling to allow time for the construction of a mock-up painted with the proposed shade to check visibility and the submission of a report on possible alternate locations. Also, if the unit is approved at the proposed location, the removed grill panels should be stored on site for later reinstallation.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Danta explained that a mock-up had been installed and that he had visited the site to review it. He explained that the unit was visible at the southeast corner of the circle, between about 750 and 1000 feet from the building. It was not visible when less than 750 feet from the building. He also noted the submission of a letter on alternate locations for the unit; it demonstrates that there are no feasible alternate locations. Charles Rudalovage of Ewing Cole represented the project. He noted that the paint on the mock-up was not entirely satisfactory. He offered to explore other colors.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the reasons for installing the unit. Mr. Rudalovage explained that it would lower both the humidity levels in the building and the heating costs. Mr. McCoubrey asked if smaller or shorter units were available. The architect explained that this was the smallest unit that would satisfy the requirements. He added that it would be field painted, allowing for the adjustment of the color after it was installed. Mr. McCoubrey congratulated him on the quality of the mock-up.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the removed stone grills are stored on site, with the staff to review paint colors in both sun and shade.

413 South 19th Street

Owner: Ellen Steiner

Applicant: Joseph Morrison, architect

History: c. 1840; refaced with Colonial Revival façade, 1915

Proposal: Add roof decks on visible rear ell

This application proposes to construct two roof decks on the rear of this corner property. The rear is visible from 19th and Addison Street. One roof deck would be located on the roof of the rear ell and would measure 10' by 20'. A rear window would be altered into a door to allow access to the deck. The second roof deck would be located over an existing one-story garage that fills the backyard area. This deck would measure 9' by 10'. Both decks would have painted wood planters, of a clapboard design, along the Addison Street façade. The rest of the deck would be finished with wood posts railings.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Charles Capaldi represented the application. He explained that the decks would tucked away on secondary blocks of the building and would be set against blank walls. He noted that the decks are colored blue in the renderings, but would not necessarily be painted blue. He explained that they were colored blue in the rendering to allow them to stand out against the background. The Committee agreed that the decks were appropriately located and detailed.

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

32-34 North Front Street

Owner/Applicant: Domenic Ward

History: Girard Estate warehouses, built between 1828 and 1836

Proposal: Install railings at cellar entrances

This application proposes to install galvanized steel railings at two locations on the Front Street façade of this building. The proposed locations are basement entrances. The railings would extend three feet eight inches out onto the sidewalk. The railings would attach at the three locations. Two posts would be imbedded within the historic granite steps surround. The handrail would attach to the granite Doric pilasters.

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

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Domenic Ward, the developer, represented the application. Mr. Ward displayed photographs the basement entrances. He noted that some mounting holes already exist and that he would reuse them. He also noted that the post detail in the architectural drawings that shows the posts set in concrete is incorrect. He will reuse existing holes with new stainless steel liners. Committee members deemed the proposal appropriate, but noted that there were some surveying errors in the drawings and suggested that the staff review the details.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new 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.].

1700 Diamond Street

Owner/Applicant: Ursinio S. Nunez

History: 1887; storefront window added c. 1910

Project: Add ADA ramp, install aluminum windows and door

This application proposes the addition of an ADA ramp on the side façade along 17th Street and the installation of aluminum windows and a door at the front and side. The historic rowhouse building will be converted to a laundromat. No openings would be altered, but two historic wood window systems would be removed and replaced with

aluminum units that do not replicate the historic dimensions or profiles. Although the drawing states that a new front door and transom would be installed, the owner has clarified that the existing door and transom would be retained, but the non-historic siding over them would be removed.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the ramp, pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline [*Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the disabled person to the highest degree practicable, while preserving significant historic features.*]. Denial of the window and door replacement, 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.*]. The staff would approve repairing or replacing the wood windows in kind. The staff would recommend approval of a fully-glazed wood door that fits the original opening at the top of the proposed ramp. It would also recommend approval of replacing the wood windows in a substitute material that replicates the historic dimensions and profiles.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Owner Ursinio Nunez attended the meeting.

Mr. Farnham clarified that the staff opposed the material proposed for the door, but not the fully-glazed design of the door. Mr. Farnham added that most likely the door and the opening were not original. Mr. Nunez mentioned his dissatisfaction with the staff's decision to recommend denial for the door and window changes. He noted that Diamond Street is a high crime area and that it is a liability to have an enclosed commercial space. He prefers to have as much visibility as possible for this reason. Mr. Farnham clarified that the staff is not opposed to a fully-glazed door, but instead to an aluminum door.

Mr. Nunez presented the Committee Members with a revised drawing that showed the retention of the wood window on the 17th Street side.

Mr. Levy mentioned that since all the windows on the building were wood, the new door and windows should match this material and furthermore, it would be easier to attach a new door wood to the frame at the 17th Street opening. Mr. Nunez stated that he did not know where to purchase wood doors and windows. The Committee suggested that the staff assist Mr. Nunez by identifying suppliers of wood doors and windows.

Mr. McCoubrey mentioned that the railing along 17th Street should be more open, based on code requirements, which would also help with the visibility factor that Mr. Nunez mentioned earlier.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the ramp (without pickets if code compliant, but with pickets if required), pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline [Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the disabled person to the highest degree practicable, while preserving significant historic features.]; and approval of a fully-glazed wood door with transom at the top of the ramp, with the staff to review details, but denial of the proposed aluminum door and windows, 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.].

130 Queen Street

Owner: Richard Donaghy and Karen Weldon

Applicant: Glenn Werner

History: c. 1810

Project: Add two rear decks

This application proposes the addition of two rear decks on this corner building. The lower deck would be located on the small rear ell. The double-leaf French door that would lead to the proposed deck is extant. The upper deck would stand above the proposed lower deck. The railing for the upper deck would stand at about the same height as the roofline of the main block of the building. It would be accessed by a ladder from the lower deck. Both decks would be highly visible from the public right-of-way. The upper deck would be visible from Queen Street.

The rear of this building underwent significant alterations in the very recent past. The rear ell originally had a half gambrel roof. The gambrel was an especially unique and significant example of historic architecture. Few, if any, survive in the city. The gambrel was removed and the third story of the rear ell was expanded. Furthermore, windows, French doors, and a balcony were added at the rear. The roofline of a small side shed addition at the rear was also raised. A photograph dated 3 May 2004 shows the work to the shed addition underway. The Commission has no record that any proposal for these rear alterations was ever reviewed or approved. Furthermore, the Department of Licenses & Inspections has no record that it issued a building permit for the rear alterations. The current owners purchased the building recently. They should provide evidence that the alterations were appropriately permitted or seek legalization before the Commission reviews the deck application.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the application pending an analysis of the permitting of the rear alterations.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Rick Donaghy and Karen Weldon, the owners, and Glenn Werner, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Farnham showed a Pictometry photograph to the Committee that verified that much of the rear work had not been undertaken as of December 2004.

Mr. Donaghy explained that he and his wife had just purchased the property in the fall of 2005 and that they had not done any of the work. Ms. Weldon noted that the seller had promised to install the now-proposed deck prior to the sale. It was not installed before the sale, but their purchase price was reduced to allow for their installation of the deck. They purchased the property believing that the rear work was permitted and that they would be able to install the deck. She noted that the door to the deck is already in place.

Ms. Pentz inquired into the materials of the proposed decks. Mr. Werner answered that they were proposing a composite decking with wood railing and that no pressure treated wood would be used. The applicants asked about the Committee's position on the upper deck, which would provide a view of the Ben Franklin Bridge. Mr. Farnham noted that the deck with removable ladder probably did not comply with the building code. Mr. Levy

and Ms. Pentz stated that the upper deck was not appropriate for visibility reasons and should be denied. They also noted that they could not recommend approval of the lower deck until the permitting issues were clarified and corrected.

Mr. Farnham explained to the applicants that they should investigate the permitting of the rear alterations. If not permitted, they should submit a legalization application to the Commission.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial owing to the outstanding permitting issue.

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan E. Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Officer