

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Room 578, City Hall
30 August 2005**

Present

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

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

Also

Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Janice Woodcock, Capital Programs Office
Mathew Moyer, Resident
James Moyer, Resident
Stephen Maffei, Architect
Jay Vartaslia, Owner
Tim Sawyer, Owner
Christine Bricker, Resident
Matt Deur, Resident
Wesley Wei, Architect
Janet Katter, Resident
Joe Schiavo, Resident
Richard Wesley, Architect
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Noele Parris Huie, John Wagner Architects
John Wagner, John Wagner Architects
M. J. Tackett, architect
Jill Klazner, Resident
Brian Klazner, Owner
Vivienne Ehret, Owner
Massimiliano Scarchilli, Architect
Becky Stolof, Society Hill Civic Association
John M. Sabatini, Architect
Kurt Baur, Ballinger
Craig Deutsch, Architect
Hugh Zimmers, Zimmers Associates
Ralph Hayen, Contractor
Harry Kane, Owner
Spence Kass, Kass & Associates, Architects
Tom Witt, Esq.

Ken Balin, Oner
Betsy Balin, Owner
Lanny Leibowitz, Architect
Jacek Zienkiewicz, H & M
Carolina Miller, TEK Architects
Joe Braun, Owner
Kristin Braun, Owner
Carl Massara
David Lerman

Robert Thomas, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

4250 Belmont Mansion Drive, Belmont Mansion

Owner: City of Philadelphia
Applicant: Janice Woodcock, Architect
History: 1742-50 by William Peters; stair tower added, c. 1765; 3rd floor added, c. 1850; repairs from fire, 1905
Project: Restoration and rehabilitation of mansion – final approval

The Commission reviewed and approved this project in concept. It returns for the final approval of the building's rehabilitation and restoration to the period before a fire in 1905. The substantiation for the restoration can be found in photographs that date to 1871 and the turn of the twentieth century. The most visible elements to be reconstructed include a widow's walk platform at the peak of the house, with a picket railing and flag pole, and a first-floor porch that wraps around three sides of the house. The porch will have a terne-coated stainless-steel roof, wood posts with scroll brackets and a herringbone-patterned brick floor.

The remainder of the rehabilitation includes the restoration of the windows, reconstruction of the shutters on all of the floors, reconstruction of the brick chimneys and restoration of the façade, including the quoins, jack arches, and scored stucco on the rear wing.

The mechanicals for the building will be completely upgraded. The new HVAC system includes four condensers situated at the rear of the property, separated from the house and surrounded by landscaping. Two vents through the attic space will provide necessary ventilation. The proposed railing for the widow's walk will hide these projections. The other vents in the basement will not prove visible owing to the porch or their rear locations.

When the Commission approved the application in concept it asked for all of the structural details to be included in this submission. Those details have been included.

Staff recommendation: Approval, with the staff to review window and door shop drawings, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 6, and 9.

Mr. D'Alessandro recused. Mr. Baron asked the applicants and audience if they were willing to proceed without a quorum, with only two voting members on the Committee. They agreed to proceed.

Janice Woodcock from the Capitol Program Office and Theresa Stuhlman from the Fairmount Park Commission attended the meeting.

Ms. Spina presented the application, explaining that the building is now being restored to its pre-fire 1905-condition, based on a photo from 1871. She also said that Suzanne Pentz looked at the construction drawings to comment on the engineering.

Ms. Pentz explained that she looked at the drawings and submitted some questions to Ms. Woodcock regarding the plans and that she was satisfied with the answers. She expressed concern, however, that a great deal of responsibility has been placed on the contractors. She noted that the Historic Structures Report evaluated that there could be no live load on the upper floors and she was concerned about how the contractors were going to be able to work. Ms. Woodcock explained that some shoring had been done so that the floors can carry some load. Ms. Pentz suggested that items such as lag-bolting should be mocked up before the workers drill through the existing beams. If possible, the connections of steel to wood should be done by the carpenters rather than by the steel workers. She said that it was important to discuss these items at the pre-bid meeting.

Ms. Woodcock briefly explained the new structural system for supporting the third floor and new widow's walk platform. She described that the live loads will be transferred to steel beams installed above the third floor. The weight of the roof will be carried by posts extending up from these beams and the summer beam will be supported by hangers. The goal of the work is not to correct the existing deflection but rather to prevent further deflection. She said that they are accounting for eccentric loading in the sizing of the members using steel joists. She said that the Park Commission has received a variance for the use of the second floor because it cannot take the normal code-mandated live load. This was possible because, as a museum, the number of people allowed on that floor will be controlled.

The members of the Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend final approval, with the staff to review details including window and door shop drawings, 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 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and 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] Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]

704 North 5th Street

Owner: Anthony Casey

Applicant: Liz Zimmers

History: c. 1870

Project: One-story addition on rear ell, new rear deck, new windows

Last month the Commission approved the fourth-story, rear-ell addition in concept, but noted the Committee's comments about refining the addition and its connection to the historic mansard. The Commission denied the deck proposed for the roof of the addition.

The project returns for review without the deck on the fourth-story addition, but little else has changed. The deck at the end has been expanded by two feet, but otherwise the massing, materials and overall design have not been refined as the Committee and Commission required.

The proposal also includes changes to the back elevation of the rear ell. Currently there is a non-historic double-leaf door with sidelights and transom that opens onto a deck. The applicant proposes to change this door to an arched transom double-leaf door design, retaining the existing deck.

Last, all of the original wood, six-over-six and two-over-two windows in the rear ell had been replaced with aluminum one-over-one and single-pane windows by the previous owner. The plans call for replacing the first floor single-pane windows with new one-over-one windows.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the addition, pursuant to Standards 2, 9 and 10. Approval of the window alterations on the back of the rear ell, but denial of the windows on the side, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. The windows on the side elevation should match the historic configuration. The house at 706 North 5th Street has the original windows to use as a guide.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. No one appeared to represent the applicant.

Committee members discussed ways to lessen the impact of the addition on the mansard and dormer. They said that by moving a walk-in closet, it was possible to link the fourth-floor addition to the room in the mansard through the new stair hall. This would allow the preservation of most of the rear of the mansard and one dormer window.

They also agreed that the new rear windows on the side of the rear ell should follow the historic design found on the building next door.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the addition, 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 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.]. Approval of the window alterations on the back of the rear ell, but denial of the windows on the side, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement

of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]

2320 Madison Square

Owner: Danforth Builders and Developers

Applicant: Stephen Maffei, Architect

History: c. 1870, demolished 1983

Project: New construction on vacant lot – plenary review

This building sits in a row along a unique garden street in South Philadelphia. In 1983, the building suffered a severe fire and the Department of Licenses & Inspections declared it Imminently Dangerous. As a result, the house was demolished; however, the property remains on the Philadelphia Register. All of the houses along this street have a symmetrical design with central, arched entrances and segmentally-arched one-over-one windows. Except for four houses across the garden from this property, which have mansards added later, the houses on this block stand at two stories.

The proposed three-story brick house has an asymmetrical design with a large, two-story, projecting bay to the east with six-over-six windows topped by a coupled, segmentally-arched six-over-six window. The western bay has an arched entrance with a canopy at the first floor and coupled four-over-four on the upper floors. All other window openings have four-light, fixed windows.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and Setting Guidelines. The new construction should be more compatible with this highly intact streetscape. It should be two stories, have a symmetrical design, and its openings should follow the rhythm of those of the other houses on the block.

Ms. Spina presented the project. The application was represented by the architect, Stephen Maffei, and the owners, Tony Tartaglia and Tim Sawyer.

Mr. Maffei explained that they have a lot that is 25' by 25'. They proposed a three-story design to achieve a third bedroom and a deck because there is no yard. He presented the interior design. He said that there is a three-story mansarded building across the street and that they could set back the third floor and create a mansard. He said that they would stucco the rear and use brick on the front with stone lintels.

Mr. Thomas expressed his opposition to the three-story design. He said that the applicant has made the most of the basement level, since the building sits up high. He opined that perhaps the Commission would approve a roof deck set at the back of the roof since the house would not have a rear ell.

Mr. Tartaglia explained that they were trying to maximize their profit on the development of the lot.

Many neighbors attended the meeting. Madeleine Shikomba of 2304 Madison Square presented a petition of neighbors opposed to this design. She said that the neighbors

had fought many battles to preserve the character of their street. She cited cases where the Commission had required compliance with the historic design of the block. She said that the neighbors oppose a three-story design and want the new façade to match the existing design on the block. She said that the variations that do occur on the block predated the zoning and the historic designation. She thought that to allow this design to go forward would reduce the value of her house and all the others on the block. She also opposes a roof deck.

Jim and Matt Moyer, neighbors from 2318 Madison Square, also opposed the design and spoke against a third story. They stressed the importance of respecting the historical integrity of the block. Jim Moyer noted that the applicant did not attend the community meeting where they were to present their proposal to the neighbors. Matt Moyer said that the fourth-floor protrusion across the street is monstrosity and that he would be opposed to any rooftop addition above two-story design that would create that effect.

Christine Bricker, a neighbor at 2327 Madison Square, made three points. She said that she opposes a three-story design. She contended that the new design should match the existing historic buildings on the block. And she claimed that these are very desirable and valuable houses in their current configuration without a third floor. She understood the owner's desire for a greater profit, but reported that the developer bought the lot knowing the constraints.

Matt Beavers of 2327 Madison Square said that he opposed the three-story design and the idea of a bay projecting into the walkway. He said that the original developer Charles Leslie's stated intent for his development was that the views down the street should be open and uniform.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance said that he concurs with the neighbors and opposes the three stories, the bay, and the asymmetry of the design. He suggested that the applicant withdraw the application and redesign the building.

Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro both expressed their opposition to the three stories and asymmetrical design.

Mr. Maffei apologized for missing the neighborhood meeting. He had a zoning meeting the same night and arrived late for their meeting. He would send a letter withdrawing this design and would resubmit a revised design after meeting with the neighbors.

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend denial, 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 the Setting Guidelines [Not Recommended: Introducing a new building that is out of scale or otherwise inappropriate to the setting's historic character.] and [Not Recommended: Introducing new construction that is visually incompatible or that destroys historic relationships within the setting.]. The new construction should be more compatible with this highly intact streetscape. It should be two stories, have a symmetrical design and its openings should follow the rhythm of those of the other houses on the block.

217 Quarry Street

Owner/Applicant: Joseph Schiavo

Project: New construction on vacant lot – 45-day review and comment

This application proposes new construction on a vacant lot in the Old City Historic District. Quarry Street has several multi-story, brick industrial buildings that date to the nineteenth century. The owners wish to build a four-story single family house with a roof deck. The first floor would have a garage and pedestrian entrance and the living space would occupy the upper floors. The front façade would be faced in zinc-colored metal panels with grey stone detailing. The west façade would be stucco. The entrance would have a flush metal door and the garage would have a galvanized metal door. The upper floors have balconies with three-pane sliding glass doors over the bay with the garage door and single-light windows in the bay over the pedestrian door. The roof deck has a simple metal railing only visible in the bay over the garage door.

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

Ms. Spina presented the project and explained that this was a 45-day review and comment application. Wesley Wei, the architect and Janet Kalter and Joe Schiavo, the owners, appeared to represent their project.

Mr. Wei showed a sample board with the zinc metal panels for the façade, the stone detailing, and the metal mesh for the balcony railing.

Mr. Thomas applauded the design, but thought that the first floor should really incorporate some glazing so that it does not present a fortified appearance to the street. He said that this would help in terms of appearance and safety in allowing views to the street. He said that the front door or garage door could incorporate some glass. Mr. Wei said that he had studied this issue and that the projection over the door has lights, softening the solid effect. Mr. D'Alessandro thought that the balconies should be set into the wall rather than project out.

John Gallery explained that he had not had time to thoroughly review the design, but that he thought that the zinc material should be substituted with brick to harmonize better with the area, even if it was grey brick. He also objected to the projecting balconies. Mr. Wei countered that projecting balconies exist in the district and he has respected the character of the area in the contrasting materials on the base and above.

The issue of paving was discussed. Quarry Street has granite block and is part of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. The street itself will not be disturbed. The curb is already depressed so the project does not need a curb cut. The sidewalk is made of granite block that was installed several years ago. Other sidewalks on the block include bluestone slabs, covering existing vaults, and concrete. The owners said that they will remove the granite block during construction and reinstall it afterwards.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials,

features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.]

240-46 Arch Street

Owner/Applicant: Michael Yaron

Proposal: New construction on vacant lot – 45-day review and comment

This proposal calls for the construction of a seven-story building on a vacant lot, with commercial on the first floor and residential on the upper floors. The irregularly shaped structure has an interior courtyard to provide the necessary light and air requirements for the adjacent development on North 3rd Street. The first floor will have large plate-glass windows for the commercial space, with large columns dividing the expanse, and a recessed entry leading to the interior courtyard. The next four floors will have brick facing and casement windows. The two top floors will set back slightly from the building line and dormer windows. The sloping mansard at these floors will be faced in standing seam metal.

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

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Richard Wesley and Dan Magno represented the application. Mr. Wesley explained the proposal to the Committee with the aid of a model on a Lazy Susan. He reported that it would be a courtyard building, continue the street line, and have a public scale at the first floor. He noted the balconettes, displayed a sample of the grey standing-seam roofing, and commented on the unusual curved mansard.

Mr. Thomas commended the design and suggested that it should be approved as proposed.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he admired much about the project, for example the respect for the building line along the street and the recessed balconies, but criticized the proposal for being neither related to its context nor sufficiently different from it. He stated that a design that differed significantly from those of the area would be more acceptable. He asserted that the proposed building lacked continuity; the different sections of the building do not harmonize with one another. There is a lack of connectedness between the base, middle, and top. It should be more integrated. He declared that it would be disruptive to the character of the block and neighborhood.

Mr. Wesley thanked Mr. Gallery for his comments, but contended that he did not understand the composition, which the architect asserted is subtle and complex. He noted, for example, that the brick portion of the façade is deliberately differentiated from its context. He stated that Edwin Lutyens, the witty, imaginative turn-of-the-century British architect, inspired the design.

The Committee members approved of the design, but suggested that a less variegated, more uniform brick be employed on the front façade.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval with a uniform brick for the front façade.

22 North Front Street

Owner: Michelle Sweeney

Applicant: Kip Ketchum, contractor

History: bet. 1828 and 1832 by estate of Stephen Girard

Proposal: Remove rear addition, seal rear doorway

An addition was constructed at the rear of this building, which is significant in the Old City Historic District, in the late nineteenth century. Owing to poor maintenance by several owners, the addition has partially collapsed. The proposal calls for the complete demolition of the rear addition, removal of the debris, and infilling with brick the opening in the original building left by the collapse and demolition. The northern wall of this addition is shared with the southern wall of the rear addition of 24 North Front Street, which still stands but is in need of repair. Care must be taken when performing work at 22 North Front to avoid damaging the adjacent structures.

Staff recommendation: Approval, provided a plan showing precisely the demolition and alteration is presented, with the staff to review details.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Kip Ketchum, the contractor, represented the application. Ms. Spina stated that the application does not include any architectural drawings or precise definition of the scope of the demolition and new construction. She asserted that the applicant should provide a plan showing precisely the demolition and alterations proposed. Mr. Ketchum stated that he would provide a drawing delineating the work proposed.

Mr. Ketchum displayed photographs of the existing conditions on his computer. Ms. Spina suggested that he provide the Commission with printed versions of the photographs. He stated that the partial collapse had resulted in a dangerous condition at the building on Church Street to the west, which is undergoing rehabilitation. Scaffolding at the Church Street building near the property line is at risk. He reported that he intended to remove the collapsed rear addition and seal the opening into the remaining building. He also stated that he would remove parts of the buildings at 24 and 26 N. Front Street. Ms. Spina cautioned the Committee that the application only addressed 22 N. Front. Any proposals for work to the other buildings would require additional applications to the Commission. Mr. Ketchum stated that he would file supplementary applications for the other properties.

Mr. Thomas agreed with Ms. Spina that an accurate drawing detailing the work was needed. Mr. D'Alessandro concurred.

Mr. Ketchum explained that his crew would remove the rubble by hand. When asked about the infilling of the opening, he stated that he would install a new lintel at the opening before sealing it. The Committee and applicant discussed the infill material. They deliberated on plywood, concrete block and brick. The Committee concluded that concrete block with a stucco finish would be the most appropriate.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the rubble removal and demolition of the remainder of the rear addition at 22nd N. Front Street, provided a detailed plan of the work is submitted and the opening in the remaining building is infilled with a steel door with lintel and a concrete block wall with a smooth stucco finish, with the staff to review details.

239 Chestnut Street, Lewis Building

Owner: Fresher Start Corporation

Applicant: Noele Parris Huie, architect

History: 1852, Stephen D. Button, architect; cast-iron by Daniel D. Badger of Architectural Iron Works, New York

Proposal: New roof deck on front portion of building

This application proposes to install a roof deck on the southern (front) portion of this building classified as significant in the Old City Historic District. A hatch at the rear of the building will provide access to the roof and concrete pavers along the roof will lead from the hatch to the deck. The deck, which measures 24 feet by 35 feet, will have a metal-rimmed glass railing and will sit approximately eight feet behind the front cornice.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guideline.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects John Wagner and Noele Parris Huie represented the application. Mr. Thomas asked Ms. Spina why the staff had recommended denial. Ms. Spina replied that the staff had recommended denial because the deck would be visible from the public right-of-way. She suggested reducing its visibility by moving it back to the rear of the building. Ms. Huie stated that a skylight prevented its removal to the rear. Mr. Wagner noted that the owner seeks the view from the front of the building. He stated that the deck would be set back six feet from the front façade. Ms. Pentz asked if the building had a parapet wall. Mr. Wagner replied that it did not. Ms. Spina suggested that there was space for a deck to the north of the skylight, at the rear of the building. After Mr. Thomas inquired, Mr. Wagner explained that the owner lives in the top unit in the building and that this would be his private deck. Mr. Thomas suggested deleting the front portion of the deck up to the steps shown on the current plan. Mr. Wagner stated that the setback would be 18 feet from the building line.

The Architecture Committee voted unanimously to recommend the approval of the deck provided the section of the deck south of the steps on the current plan is deleted from the design, leaving a deck set back 18 feet from the front facade, 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 the Roof Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as decks or terraces so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

47 North 2nd Street

Owner: Paul Bagga

Architect: Allison Fritch, architect

History: built c. 1865; top three floors later removed

Proposal: Reconstruct top three stories, add roof decks, front restoration, new side openings

This application proposes the reconstruction of the top three stories that are now missing from this commercial building, using the nineteenth-century Baxter's drawing of the streetscape and a detailed insurance survey. The front façade will accurately reproduce the original including the two-entry storefront. The side façade will include the original openings, but will add intermediate windows. These windows will be demarcated by a simplified design that omits the granite lintel of the originals. The applicant proposes cutting a new rear entry and two storefront windows in the side façade on Cuthbert Street. On the roof, the drawings show two roof decks, two stair houses and an elevator mechanical room set back 3'9" from the side facade and 13'3" from the front façade. The building has no rear ell.

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

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jay Tackett represented the application and noted that the staff had been very helpful during the planning process.

Mr. Baron noted that the applicant would not replicate the cellar bulkheads on the Cuthbert Street façade, but would install basement windows instead. He also noted that all of the windows on the side would be wood, true-divided-light windows with 7/8"-wide muntins. He said that the Commission had previously approved a storefront window on the Cuthbert Street side of the building in a previous application for the building.

Mr. Tackett stated that Mr. Baron had pointed out an error in the design of the front doors. They were set at the wrong plane; he will correct the problem.

Ms. Pentz asked about the iron joists mentioned in the insurance survey. Mr. Tackett replied that he did not have detailed information about them, but would assess them.

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 a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new 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.].

421 Chestnut Street

Owner: 421 Chestnut Street, LP

Applicant: Martin Jay Tackett, architect

History: 1857-9, John Gries, architect; rear addition, 1903 Addison Hutton, architect

Proposal: Convert rear bays to balconies, window replacement – final approval

This application proposes a variety of window schemes for different facades of this former bank, turned residential building. On the front façade, the applicant proposes

wood casement windows with a seven-inch-wide, vertical muntin running down the center and altered frame details. On the rear, the applicant proposes vinyl windows. No details are shown at all. The applicant shows one register of bays converted to balconies as formerly approved in concept by the Commission.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the balconies, pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of the vinyl windows based on material and lack of details. Denial of the details for the front casement windows, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jay Tackett represented the application. Mr. Baron explained that the center mullions, stiles, and frames of the proposed front windows are much wider than those of the historic windows. He stated that there would be a loss of approximately 10 inches of glass across each window. Mr. Tackett stated that he originally proposed a center mullion that was five inches wide, but the window manufacturer required a minimum of 7 inches to fabricate the windows correctly. The casement windows are very tall and would flex too much without a heavy center mullion. Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro stated that they would prefer a double-hung window to the casement; it would replicate the historic window and not require the very heavy frame. Mr. Tackett noted his preference for the casements. Mr. Farnham reported that the Commission had already addressed this issue and had approved in concept either double-hung windows or casements that look like double-hung windows. The Committee members agreed to recommend denial of the proposed windows.

Mr. Tackett explained that he would like to install wood replicas of the historic windows at the north or Ranstead Street façade. He would like to install vinyl windows on the east and west facades at the rear. If the vinyl windows are not approved, he will leave the existing, non-historic aluminum windows in place. Mr. Baron stated that Mr. Tackett had not submitted any detailed information on the vinyl windows. Mr. Tackett replied that the vinyl windows would be gray.

Mr. Rivera arrived at the meeting and joined his colleagues.

Ms. Pentz stated that she deemed the vinyl acceptable on the east side because the façade is not highly visible and faces a parking garage. The Committee concurred, concluding that vinyl was acceptable on the east, but that wood windows should be installed on the more visible west façade. They agreed that Mr. Tackett's proposed pane configurations were appropriate.

The Committee members also agreed that the proposed balconies were acceptable and complied with the Commission's in-concept approval of them.

Mr. Tackett implored the Committee to reconsider its decision on the front windows. Mr. Baron displayed a copy of the commercial panorama showing the original windows for the Committee. Mr. Thomas stated that the proposed windows are not adequate replicas of the historic double-hung windows. The Committee refused to change its opinion.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the front windows and denial of the vinyl windows on the west rear façade, but approval of the vinyl windows on the east rear façade, approval of wood windows on the north and west

rear facades, and approval of the balconies, 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 a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new 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.].

257 South 9th Street

Owner: Brian Klazmer

Applicant: Massimiliano Scarchilli, architect

History: c. 1802

Proposal: Exterior rehabilitation, rear demolition and additions – final approval

This application proposes the restoration of the front façade of this brick house with shutters, a bulkhead and new windows. It also proposes additions and alterations to the rear ells and garage. The plans show the demolition of a wood-covered stairhall and brick ell at the rear and construction of a link building in place of the rear ell. The rear of the existing house will be retained, but will receive a second floor addition with a deck and a small modification to the roof of the rear ell. The one-story garage would be rebuilt as a two-story structure with a larger footprint to accommodate a larger house and a two-car garage. This scheme had been previously approved in concept by the Commission.

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

Mr. D'Alessandro and Mr. Thomas exited the meeting, leaving only Ms. Pentz and Mr. Rivera. Mr. Baron explained that the Committee lacked a quorum and asked if anyone objected to proceeding with the review without a quorum. No one objected. Mr. Baron then presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owners Brian and Jill Klazmer and architect Massimiliano Scarchilli represented the proposal.

Ms. Pentz asked about the attic space. Mr. Scarchilli explained that he would reopen the dormers, remove the floor, and add tie rods. Mr. Baron asked if he would retain the historic roof structure. The architect explained that he would. Mr. Baron noted that the other floor structures would be rebuilt. Mr. Klazmer explained that he has retained an engineer and contractor who are experts in this area.

Mr. Rivera inquired about the existing stair in the attic. The architect stated that it will remain. He noted that the owners may in the future consider a deck on a rear addition. He also noted that he was requesting the approval of a small “bump-up” on the rear ell where it meets the main block for headroom; he noted that the “bump-up” would remain below the level of the rear cornice on the main block.

Mr. Baron asked if the architect planned to remove the chimney. He stated that he did not; he would ensure that it was sound.

Vivian Ehret, a neighbor who knew the former owner, approved of the proposal and stated that she is glad to see the building restored and improved.

The members of the Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, 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 a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new 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.].

1519 Spruce Street

Owner: 1519 Spruce Street Partnership

Applicant: Robert Boyd

History: 1890

Proposal: Legalize alterations to rear, construct roof deck on main section

This application seeks to legalize work that was performed at variance with what the staff had approved in October 2002. Although the back portion of this house only has visibility from other buildings, it features an extraordinary round rotunda room. In 2002, this architect approached the staff with a proposal to build on the back a restaurant that would sit away from the round walls and attach via a bridge through an ornamental bay on the back of the building. The bay was to be retained in large part and the restaurant was going to have a glazed atrium so that the rotunda would be a feature that could be enjoyed in a semi-public fashion. The new addition was to be covered in a sand-finish, smooth stucco. The development team, which included the architect, constructed the building at variance to the plans, including more demolition of the rear bay, less glass at the addition a rough textured, not smooth, stucco. That development team disbanded and a new investment team using the same architect has bought the building and now plans office and residential use. They seek to legalize the changes to the 2002 plans and approval of a roof deck on the front section of the building.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the legalization of the alterations to the rear; approval of the rear deck; denial of the main roof deck, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guideline.

Mr. Baron explained that the Committee lacked a quorum and asked if anyone objected to proceeding with the review without a quorum. No one objected. Mr. Baron then presented the application to the Architectural Committee. He explained that the application proposes both legalization and new additions. He stated that the rear alterations undertaken in the past few years do not comply with the approved plans. Owner David Lerman and architect Carl Massara represented the proposal.

Mr. Massara reported that the work at the rear addition did not comply with the approved plans because the Department of Licenses & Inspections required a wider passageway

from the old building to the rear addition. He displayed photographs of the work. Mr. Baron noted several other differences between the approved plans and the completed addition. Mr. Massara stated that some of the other changes were related to the fire code and windows at property lines.

Mr. Lerman stated that the rear addition was complete when he bought the property. He added that the Commission sought to protect the view of the rear semi-circular bay, which is not visible from the public right-of-way, but the neighboring property owners do not appreciate it. The neighbor to the west uses his side yard for trash containers and slop buckets.

The discussion turned to the proposed decks. The Committee members agreed that the lower rear deck was acceptable because it would not be visible. Mr. Massara stated that he had undertaken a mock-up of the upper deck, which he photographed. He stated that it would not be very visible, but did not provide the photographs. He offered to provide them at a later date. Mr. Rivera noted that the deck on the main roof may or may not be visible from in front of the building, but would certainly be visible from the side. Mr. Massara reported that there is a parapet on the building. If a parapet exists on the building, the applicant should provide evidence of it, Mr. Rivera asserted.

The members of the Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the legalization of the rear alterations, approval of the rear deck, but denial of the main roof deck, 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 the Roof Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as decks or terraces so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

314 South Iseminger Street

Owner: Sonia Neilson

Applicant: John Sheridan, contractor

History: c. 1830

Proposal: Legalize demolition of kitchen shed, construct new two-story structure

This application seeks to legalize the demolition of a brick rear ell and construction a two-story structure with deck in its place.

Staff Recommendation: Denial as submitted, but approval if constructed in brick with wood windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

Mr. Baron explained that the Committee lacked a quorum and asked if anyone objected to proceeding with the review without a quorum. No one objected. Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Neither the applicant nor the owner of the property attended the meeting.

Ms. Pentz questioned whether the new kitchen addition followed the same footprint of the historic rear ell. Mr. Baron answered that judging by the demolition plan and measurements provided it appeared to follow the same footprint. Mr. Rivera pointed out

that given its frame construction and windows on the side yard it could be in violation of certain fire code regulations.

Both Ms. Pentz and Mr. Rivera agreed with the staff's recommendation of denial as submitted, and agreed with the staff's suggestion that the addition should be re-constructed in brick.

The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, but approval if it is constructed in brick with wood windows, 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 a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.].

403 South 3rd Street

Owner: John Grossi

Applicant: John DiNuovo

History: built c. 1827

Proposal: Two-story side addition

This application involves changes to a proposal that was previously reviewed and approved by the Commission. The applicant seeks to enlarge a rear addition and close and open several windows to accommodate the placement of showers in several bathrooms. These changes, although visible from Pine Street, would be made to later additions.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron explained that the Committee lacked a quorum and asked if anyone objected to proceeding with the review without a quorum. No one objected. Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Mr. John Sabatini, architect, attended the meeting and did not oppose to proceed without quorum. Ms. Becky Stolof, from the Society Hill Civic Association, attended the meeting as well. Mr. Baron added at the end of his presentation that he had worked with the applicant on the placement and dimensions of the windows.

Mr. Sabatini mentioned that, aside from the changes seen on the drawings, there was a question as to the finish of the deck approved in the previous proposal. He mentioned that the owner would prefer not to paint the railing white. Mr. Baron specified that the reason for painting was to give the deck a finished look and given that the Commission had approved the project with paint on the railing the owner should follow that approval and paint it.

Mr. Sabatini then presented a second scheme with a different window arrangement. Both Ms. Pentz and Mr. Rivera agreed that either scheme was acceptable and that they would support both. Ms. Stolof mentioned she preferred the alternate scheme. Mr. Sabatini specified that the owner preferred the submitted scheme, not the alternate.

The members of the Architectural Committee voted unanimously 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 a property.].

301 South 8th Street

Owner: Pennsylvania Hospital

Applicant: Ron Norbury

History: built 1960, Rogers & Butler, architects

Proposal: Alteration to steps, installation of ADA ramp, new canopy

This proposal includes the construction of a handicap ramp. The entrance to the ramp would require a cut through a brick knee wall. The marble steps would be demolished and a new straight stair constructed of cement would be substituted. The brick side rails flanking the stair would be modified to remove a stepped design. A canvas barrel awning would cover the stairs and hide the fanlight.

Staff Recommendation: Approval; conditioned on a marble facing for the stair pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron explained that the Committee lacked a quorum and asked if anyone objected to proceeding with the review without a quorum. No one objected. Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Mr. Kurt Baur, architect, attended the meeting and had no objections to proceed without quorum.

Ms. Pentz asked Mr. Baur if the new steps could be covered with a marble veneer. Mr. Baur answered that more than traffic flow precipitated the new design. He stated that the marble could be very slippery and that the hospital had covered them with mats to prevent falls. The mats, in turn, greatly deteriorated the slabs by trapping moisture.

Mr. Rivera asked if the steps would be cast in place and if they had considered pre-cast steps instead. Mr. Baur answered that they proposed cast-in-place steps and that the pre-cast option had not been fully explored. Mr. Rivera mentioned that pre-cast units would look more like stone and have a greater finished look with crisper lines; furthermore they could be polished to a high luster to better blend with brick and marble sills of the façade. Mr. Baur mentioned that if steps were pre-cast then the top landing, which would be cast in place, would look different than the rest. He accepted the comment and agreed to look further into the option.

Mr. Rivera expressed that, with either a pre-cast or cast-in-place approach, the concrete should not be grey, but should be white or a lighter color to blend with the rest of the façade. Mr. Baur accepted this comment as well.

Ms. Pentz and Mr. Rivera agreed to recommend approval of the proposal and asked that the applicant look further into Mr. Rivera's comments prior to the Commission's meeting.

The members of the Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal, 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 a property].

261 South 22nd Street

Owner: Virgil Procaccino

Applicant: Craig Deutsch, architect

History: c. 1890, garage door alteration 1911, façade demolished 2005

Proposal: Construction of new façade

This application requests the construction of a new façade. At its last meeting, the Commission approved the demolition of the historic façade based upon its condition. They asked the applicant to store the cornice for possible incorporation into the new design. The applicant has proposed a design to match the neighboring new building.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. The staff contends that the applicant should replicate the historic façade and reinstall the cornice.

Mr. Baron explained that the Committee lacked a quorum and asked if anyone objected to proceeding with the review without a quorum. No one objected. Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Architect Craig Deutsch owner Virgil Procaccino attended the meeting.

Mr. Deutsch mentioned that their original goal was to match the new façade with the old. However, their engineer pointed out that the corbels would not satisfy the building code and that the cornice was unsound owing to extensive rot.

Mr. Baron was skeptical about the code compliance of corbels, given that it was not uncommon to see these elements reconstructed as well as projections on new construction. Mr. Deutsch answered that these particular corbels, given their mass, would not fulfill the building code. Mr. Rivera questioned the purpose of pasting an old cornice on a new building. Mr. Baron answered that it was not unusual for facades to be demolished because they are unsound, but that the staff regularly requested that they be reconstructed based on measurements taken prior to demolition based on Standard 6. That Standard says that “where the severity of deterioration requires the replacement of a distinctive feature that the new feature will match the old.”

Ms. Pentz stated that the façade was gone, but that the corbels were very interesting and that the cornice was very unusual. Mr. Deutsch reminded the Committee that no decisions about the use of the salvaged cornice had been made at the previous Commission meeting. He also mentioned that Mr. Powers produced a report for them and concluded that the façade was not historic. Mr. Baron looking at the building permits said he had not seen any clues that would lead him to believe the façade was not historic. The permit for constructing a new façade in 1957 seems to be for the building addition at 263 S. 22nd, not this façade. Ms. Pentz read a letter from Mr. Powers in which it specified that the corbels and cornice were late nineteenth century fabric.

Ms. Pentz contended that the corbels and cornice should be put back on the new façade. Mr. Rivera disagreed with her comment and mentioned that he believed there was no context left and that the entire façade should be new. Both members stood by their opinions, which yielded a split recommendation.

The members of the Architecture Committee were split. Ms. Pentz recommended a reconstruction of the corbels and the reinstallation of the historic cornice on the new façade; Mr. Rivera recommended approval of the new façade as submitted.

1528 Waverly Street

Owner: Ursula Hobson

Applicant: Ariel Vazquez

History: c. 1895; new storefront, c. 1950

Proposal: Changes to garage and front doors

This application proposes to change the ground floor of this late nineteenth-century commercial building facing Waverly St. The Historical Commission approved changes and additions to this building on 30 April 2002. At that time the approval included the enlargement of the ground floor to accommodate for two garage doors. The applicant now wishes to reconfigure this ground floor to include two smaller garage doors divided by a central fixed window, which would mimic the window design on the upper floors and complement the verticality and symmetry of the rest of the building. In addition the applicant wishes to replace an existing door with a new wood door of similar design and place a canvas awning over the opening.

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

Mr. Danta presented the proposal. Hugh Zimmers and Ariel Vazquez attended the meeting. The staff explained to the applicant and the audience that the meeting lacked quorum. All present agreed to proceed without quorum.

Ms. Pentz stated that the proposed changes were acceptable. Mr. Rivera contended that the central window was a bit strange, but that otherwise he did not object to the proposed changes. Ms. Pentz asked for clarification of the door replacement. Mr. Zimmers answered that the new door would fit within the existing opening, and that the transom would remain.

The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired].

2525 South Garnet Street

Owners: Tina Rago and Harry Kane

Applicant: Ralph Hayden

History: 1910, James and John Windrim

Proposal: Enclose rear porch, construct new rear deck

This application proposes to enclose a screened porch with a more permanent design. The porch is located on the rear of the property and visible from Shunk St. and partially From 19th Street. Currently, the porch is semi-enclosed with screens and siding.

The applicant proposes to place a sliding door in the side, facing Shunk St, where a

screen door exists today and add a double hung window on the rear portion of the porch. Both areas would be sealed with "Philadelphia Board" or beaded board. The other side of the porch, away from Shunk St, would be closed up completely with beaded board and the existing non-historic steps removed. In addition, the applicant proposes to install a raised wooden deck, which would wrap around the Sunk St side of the porch and out into the rear yard. The deck would be adjacent to the property line and would have its own railing. The historic hair pin fence between the two properties would remain.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided the muntins in the new windows have depth and the wooden deck rail is painted, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

Mr. Danta presented the proposal. Mr. Harry Kane, the owner, and Mr. Ralph Hayden, the contractor, attended the meeting. The staff explained to the applicant and the audience that the meeting lacked quorum. All present agreed to proceed without quorum.

Mr. Kane expressed his desire to maintain the historic appearance of the property and did not object to the staff's suggestion expressed by Mr. Danta during the presentation. Mr. Hayden mentioned that they were not using vinyl windows on the porch. Mr. Kane corrected a discrepancy on the drawings and clarified that all sides would be enclosed with bead board.

The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the project as submitted, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired] and Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.].

2015 Spruce Street

Owner: Kenneth Balin

Applicant: Thomas Witt, Esq.

History: 1867

Proposal: Remove side bay and wall, construct one-story addition in side yard – in concept

This application in concept proposes the removal of a metal and leaded glass bay facing the side yard of this brownstone on Spruce Street. The existing bay does not extend to the second or third floors. In its place the applicant proposes to construct a one-story addition, which would infill the entirety of the side yard. The application also proposes to alter the openings of the rear ell facing the back yard, which currently has a sliding door. In the place of these sliding doors the applicant proposes to place three double-leaf French doors. The entire wall on the ground floor facing the yard would be removed to expand the rooms on this rear ell. However, no structural drawings have been done yet that detail how the loads of the upper floors would be transferred or dealt with once the ground floor wall is removed.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to standards 2, 9 and 10.

Mr. Danta presented the proposal. Thomas Witt, Esq., Ken and Betsy Balin, the owners, and architect Spence Kass attended the meeting. The staff explained to the applicant and the audience that the meeting lacked quorum. All present agreed to proceed without quorum.

Mr. Rivera asked if he had zoning approval for this project. Mr. Witt answered that they had zoning approval. Mr. Rivera asked for clarification of the window on the party wall. Mr. Witt answered that the window was approved by zoning and that it had to be a fire-rated window.

Mr. Witt explained that the Balin family owned the property since 1979 and had restored it through the years. He explained that, although the building is a grand house, it did not have an adequate kitchen area and that it did not conform to Mr. and Mrs. Balin's needs. Mr. Witt also explained that the proposed alterations would not be visible from any public ways and that only the next door neighbors would view it. Mr. Witt asked that the proposal be reviewed for final approval and not in concept as presented by Mr. Danta. Mr. Danta answered that the presentation in concept had been agreed upon with the architect owing to lack of structural drawings. Mr. Witt answered that other city agencies would be looking at the structural drawings and that this conceptual review had been a staff suggestion, not a request of the owner. Ms. Pentz clarified that it is usual practice to review in concept owing to lack of structural information to ensure the safety of the building, but that she believed this project could be reviewed for final approval as submitted.

Mr. Balin mentioned that the bay had been added around 1900 and that its foundations had failed, thus making the bay pull away from the building. Mr. Witt added that there was nothing of architectural value in the first floor of the rear ell. Mr. Balin explained that this addition would greatly enhance the flow of interior passage and use of the space. He further noted that they had received approval from the next door neighbor to construct the proposed addition.

Mr. Rivera asked if the addition had to be the same length as the rear ell. Mr. Balin explained that it had to be given the use of the interior space and their concept for the kitchen, butler's pantry, and dining area.

Ms. Pentz mentioned that she believed it was an acceptable change given its location and its lack of visibility. Mr. Rivera expressed his reservations to a full length addition and mentioned that the addition should be set back an amount equal to the width of the side yard.

The members of the Architectural Committee had a split recommendation. Ms. Pentz voted for approval of the proposal. Mr. Rivera voted for the addition to be set back the width of the side yard, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a

manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired].

265 South 19th Street

Owner: Premier Properties

Applicant: Lanny Leibowitz, architect

History: c. 1855; alterations, c. 1950

Proposal: Roof deck on rear ell, exterior alterations

On 26 April 2005 the Architectural Committee reviewed this proposal as part of a larger application. At that time the committee suggested that a staff member should investigate the locations of proposed window openings. Mr. Baron of the staff performed this site visit and found that there was CMU block infill in the locations where the applicant wished to open two new windows for the commercial space. The applicant now returns to get approval for these openings, which include two at the ground floor level and two on a rear ell. The proposed two openings on the side of the building would be infill with fixed pane display windows for the commercial space. This treatment would be in keeping with the c. 1960 alterations to this commercial ground floor. The two new windows on the rear ell would be wood one-over-one double-hung windows.

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

Mr. Danta presented the proposal. Architect Lanny Leibowitz attended the meeting. The staff explained to the applicant and the audience that the meeting lacked quorum. All present agreed to proceed without quorum.

Committee members lauded Mr. Leibowitz for his hand-drawn plans. They agreed that the proposal was acceptable.

The members of 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.]; 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.].

271 South Van Pelt Street

Owners/Applicants: Joseph and Kristin Braun

History: c. 1870 carriage-house, heavily stuccoed exterior with c. 1970 openings for parking, balcony and shutters added

Proposal: Raised roof deck

The applicant proposes to add a cantilevered deck on the back of this two-story former carriage house. The deck would measure 20' by 10' and cantilever over the roof of a one-story addition on the back of the property and would be visible from Manning Street. Currently there is no access to this area and the applicant proposes to configure a window into an access door with a stair to access the deck. The applicant met with the staff prior to the submittal of this proposal and was advised that the deck should not be cantilevered but rather should sit either on the one-story rear roof or the main roof of the carriage house. The applicant mentioned that neither would be an option because the

back addition has a hipped roof with mechanicals and the main roof is deeded to another condominium.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to standards 2, 9 and 10.

Mr. Danta presented the proposal. Joseph and Kristin Braun, the owners, attended the meeting. The staff explained to the applicant and the audience that the meeting lacked quorum. All present agreed to proceed without quorum.

Mr. Braun explained that they owned unit B, which occupies the second floor of this former carriage house. He also mentioned that the owner of unit A, from whom they purchased their unit, would not allow a deck on the main roof of the house, but would allow a deck over the hipped roof of the one-story rear addition. He also mentioned that they had purchased the property with the expectation of constructing an outdoor space.

Mr. Rivera asked for clarification of the drawings, which he could not understand. Mrs. Braun walked him through the drawings with the help of Mr. Danta. Ms. Pentz expressed that this deck would be too conspicuous and that she believed it would receive a denial at the Commission meeting. Mr. Rivera advised the applicants that they should hire an architect and rethink the structural design of the deck. Ms. Pentz reiterated her opinion that this deck, given the circumstances of the location and its cantilever design, is not likely to be approved.

Mr. Farnham recommended to the owners that they reconsider their plans and consult with a qualified architect.

The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired]; and Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.].

1723 Walnut Street

Owner: Two Nuts, LP

Applicant: H&M, tenant

History: c. 1961

Proposal: Remove original metal and glass entryway, construct new glass entryway

This two-story six-bay modern building is listed as non-contributing within the Rittenhouse/Fitler Residential District. During the creation of this district, a clear distinction was made between residential buildings that had been transformed into commercial spaces through the passage of time versus those structures that were constructed specifically as commercial spaces. This building is an example of the later and as such it was classified as non-contributing.

This application proposes to demolish the original circular bronze and glass entry way of the building. The applicant proposes to reconstruct a new cubic contemporary glass and stainless steel entryway. The new entryway would occupy the same location as the existing one and have roughly the same dimensions.

Staff Recommendation: No recommendation

The staff explained to the applicant and the audience that the meeting lacked a quorum. All present agreed to proceed without a quorum. Ms. Pentz recused herself, since Keast & Hood is involved in the project. Mr. Danta presented the proposal. Jacek Zienkiewicz of H & M, the store that will occupy the space, and Carolina Miller of TEK Architects attended the meeting.

Mr. Zienkiewicz explained the expansion plans of the Swedish clothing store in the city. He also expressed the store's philosophy of openness and a welcoming attitude, which would be reflected in the new design of the entryway.

Mr. Rivera asked the staff about its recommendation. Mr. Farnham explained that he advocated for approval of the proposal because of the building's non-contributing status. He asserted that the Commission is charged with protecting historic resources; the resource in this case is the district, not the building. This proposal should be evaluated only on the basis of its impact on the district, which is the resource. Mr. Farnham asserted that this alteration would have no impact on the district. Other staff members sought to preserve the entryway, which is an excellent example of this style of architecture. Mr. Farnham agreed that it is characteristic of this style and acknowledged a personal appreciation of this brand of 1960s Modernism, but argued that the Commission was not charged with protecting it.

Mr. Rivera expressed that in his opinion this entryway was a landmark on the Walnut Street commercial corridor of Rittenhouse Square. He described it as "Philadelphia's leaning tower of Pisa". He also reported that he would hate to see it disappear. However, he asserted that the new design captured the essence of what made this entryway special in its day. He believed that the retention of the open mezzanine and the hanging chandelier were part of what made this entryway special.

Ms. Miller noted that the proposal retains and respects the curved back plane of the entranceway. Mr. Rivera replied that that was appropriate.

Mr. Danta asked if the new doors would help the flow of traffic into the store. Ms. Miller answered that the new doors would be somewhat larger than the existing doors.

Mr. Rivera mentioned that he objected to the H&M sign on the entryway. Ms. Miller answered that all of the signage would be submitted as a separate package. She was only seeking approval of the entranceway.

Mr. Rivera, chair of the Architectural Committee, recommended approval of the proposal.

The Architectural Committee meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron, Jorge Danta, Jonathan Farnham