

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Room 578, City Hall
28 June 2005**

Present

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

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

Also

Kiki Bolender, Schade and Bolender Architects, 2044 Spruce Street
Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance
Julia L. Scott, Reku design, 1225 Waverly Street
Craig Charlton, 434 Pine Street, owner
Jack Thrower, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Meg Delevan, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Peter Vanko, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Mary Watlington, Maple Mt. Vernon, 1702-1 Mt. Vernon Street
L. Kern, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
Aimee Lala, CRCG
Louis Cicaler, DRDG, 519 Walnut Street
Joe Hamilton, 20 Belav Studio
David O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbors' Association
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Jonathan Walston, Brett Webber Architects
Allan Rubin, Spring Garden Civic Association, 1920 Brandywine Street
Craig Slater, SRK Architects
Joe Duffy, Duffy Murphy Group
William Murphy, Duffy Murphy Group
Jill and Brian Klazmer, 257 South 9th Street
Stuart Rosenbach, SGRD
Sarah Levin, SGRD
Massimiliano, Scarchilli, SGRD
Gerry Gutierrez, Group G Architects
Scott Yowe, L5C
David Schmauk, Monaguan
Bob Dubree
Linda Brockway

John Ciccone, John Ciccone Architects PC
Ray Germann, Owner, 321 South Iseminger Street
Marc Morfei, Center City District
Andrew Tull, 609 North 17th Street

Vincent Rivera, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m.

2044 Spruce Street

Owner: David Nazarian

Applicant: Rachel Schade, Schade & Bolender Architects

History: c. 1880, perhaps G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, architects

Project: Demolish chimney; add elevator tower

This application proposes the demolition of a chimney and the construction of an elevator in its place at the grand late nineteenth-century mansion at the southeast corner of 21st and Spruce Streets. The chimney is highly ornamental and is visible from 21st and Cypress Streets.

In February 2005, the Commission denied an application for this address, applicant, and owner that included the demolition of the same chimney and construction of a taller elevator tower as well as the addition of a very large roof deck. The owner has decided to abandon the plans for the deck. Therefore, the elevator would now run only as high as the top floor, not the roof. Subsequently, the height of the elevator tower above the roof can be reduced significantly from the earlier design.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the demolition of the chimney and addition of the elevator, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. The staff would recommend approval of an elevator that did not require the demolition of any significant historic fabric.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Kiki Bolender represented the proposal. She stated that the reasons for demolishing the chimney were twofold: to salvage brick for the repair of another chimney on the building and to install the elevator. Ms. Bolender and Mr. Farnham pointed out the many chimneys on the building for the Committee. Mr. Farnham also provided an overview of the earlier proposal.

Ms. Voith suggested that the applicant have new bricks fabricated to match the original brick rather than demolishing one chimney to repair another. She acknowledged that it would costly. Ms. Bolender explained that the location of the chimney proposed for demolition is the only viable location for the elevator. She noted that extensive studies had been undertaken to locate the elevator. She stated that altering any of the grand rooms for the elevator would be unacceptable.

Ms. Voith asked about the visibility of the chimney and proposed elevator tower from the street. All agreed that the chimney is visible from the west and south. Ms. Voith sketched on a photograph to demonstrate that the new elevator tower would be visible. Ms. Bolender asserted that the sketch was not accurate.

Mr. Rivera opined that the elevator would be a positive addition to the building,

extending its life and usefulness. Lenore Milhollen of the Preservation Alliance and the Center City Residents Association also lobbied for the approval of the elevator.

Ms. Voith asked the applicant if she could remove the chimney on the interior, but either retain it or rebuild it on or beside the elevator tower. Ms. Bolender stated that she would explore the possibility, but that she needed a resolution to the question of salvaging brick.

Ms. Pentz remarked that she could not vote to recommend approval of the project without proof that the elevator could not be located elsewhere. She noted that the application did not include any interior plans. Ms. Pentz also suggested that the owner salvage brick from one of the other chimneys that is not visible or is not decorative.

Ms. Voith suggested that the architect investigate other types of elevators that would not require tall overruns.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, provided that the elevator tower is reduced in height above the roofline to the absolute minimum and that the historic chimney is replicated above the roofline as part of the elevator tower.

434 Pine Street

Owners: Craig and Janet Charlton

Applicant: Julia Scott, Reku Design

History: c. 1978

Project: Construct third-floor rear addition

This application proposes infilling a small third-floor rear porch. The addition would be faced with stucco and fenestrated with aluminum-clad, simulated divided-light windows.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham introduced the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Craig Charlton and architect Julia Scott represented the application.

Ms. Voith inquired about the color proposed for the stucco. Ms. Scott informed her that she is considering white or pale yellow. She noted that the extant party wall is an off white. Ms. Voith suggested that stucco was not the appropriate siding for the addition. Ms. Pentz agreed that other sidings might more appropriate than the stucco. The applicants explained that the staff had recommended the stucco; they preferred brick. Mr. Farnham stated that he was unaware that another staff member had objected to brick. He remarked that he would deem several cladding materials appropriate including brick. Committee members agreed that several materials including brick, stucco, Hardiboard, and wood clapboards would be acceptable. They noted that vinyl siding would not be appropriate. Mr. Farnham suggested that the applicants reconsider their cladding choice before the Commission meeting.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the addition with an appropriate cladding material, with 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.].

1701, 02, 04, 06, 10, 11, 13, 21, 23, 36, 38, 40 Mt. Vernon Street
602 North 17th Street

Community Realty Management, Owner

Mary Watlington, Applicant

DATE: 1710: 1902; all others: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Paint facades, door surrounds and watertables

These twelve houses on this single block are painted and the owner wishes to repaint the façades, watertables, lintels, sills, and other details. The proposed colors are the present ones, light grey for the façades and dark grey for the trim. None of the paint appears in poor condition or seems to require repair. 1701 Mount Vernon, a.k.a. 602 North 17th Street, has a mural painted by the Anti-Graffiti Network (the pre-cursor to the Mural Arts Program), which features the face of the Statue of Liberty. The application does not state whether the mural will be painted over. 1710 Mount Vernon is faced in brownstone, which can be adversely affected by paint to a greater degree than brick. On 1736 and 1738 Mount Vernon, the marble watertables and door surrounds have been stripped of paint and should not be repainted.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 7. Where possible, the paint should be removed using the gentlest means possible.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Mary Watlington, who works for the company that manages the rental properties, represented the application. She stated that the paint on all of the buildings needs touching up. She reported that her company plans to repaint all of the blue-gray buildings on the block; they would be repainted the same color.

Ms. Voith asked if the paint had been removed from some of the marble and other masonry details on the buildings. The applicant replied that it had been removed on some buildings. It was removed in 2004 because the City required the abatement of lead paint.

Ms. Pentz noted that the Commission has typically required that masonry, if already painted, be repainted in the color of the underlying masonry. Ms. Voith and Mr. Rivera affirmed that they could not recommend approval of this proposal. Ms. Pentz asked if the buildings had been painted prior to designation. Ms. Spina affirmed that they had been. Committee members noted that the painting of the brownstone building was especially problematic, but that all painting of masonry can potentially lead to its degradation or failure.

Ms. Watlington stated that she would not paint any masonry that was not currently painted. She also offered to have the original artist touch up the mural.

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend denial of the blue-gray colors; denial of any painting of painted or unpainted masonry details such as lintels, sills, door surrounds, and watertables; denial of the painting of the brownstone building

unless an investigation reveals that the removal of the existing paint would damage the stone, in which case the building may be painted colors that match the original materials; and approval of painting the brick facades an appropriate brick red color; with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 7 [Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.].

230-34 North Christopher Columbus Boulevard

Delaware River Development Group, Owner

Megan Delevan, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1985 – non-contributing to Old City Historic District

PROPOSAL: Demolish non-contributing building; construct 30-story multi-unit building with parking

The proposal calls for the demolition of a two-story Post-Modern building and construction of a thirty-story residential tower. The extant building is classified as non-contributing in the Old City Historic District inventory.

The proposed building occupies almost the entire lot for the first five stories, with retail, lobby, and storage on the first floor and parking for 330 cars on the upper four floors. Floors six through thirty comprise a tower that stands on the northern half of the lot and will house anywhere from four to nine units on each floor, with amenities on the top floor. A total of 179 units will be in the building, which will stand over 345 feet tall. All four façades of the tower will have pre-cast concrete panels punctuated by large windows and metal balconies. The penthouse floor with the amenities will have a curved glass wall, like a giant greenhouse. The lower five stories will have pre-cast concrete panels and “Bermuda shutters” in the garage openings, with the north, west and south façades otherwise remaining unarticulated. The retail spaces and lobby on the east façade will have storefront openings with double-leaf glazed doors, plate glass windows, and awnings. Concrete walls, steps, and planters hide most of the first floor from the street. The door to the main lobby will have a canopy, but the plans do not include details such as materials.

This lot and the Hertz Lot just to the north occupy the land that marks the transition from the city to the waterfront. These sites hold great archeological potential. The riverfront in 1682 reached to King Street (now Water Street), with the docks over this patch of land. By 1762, the area along the waterfront had been infilled and the docks and piers pushed further into the river. Then in the 1830s, using monies endowed by Stephen Girard, the City further expanded the waterfront and created Delaware Avenue. The piers on the eastern side of Christopher Columbus Boulevard were redeveloped in the 1920s as part of a large-scale municipal project, and the ones just north of this lot were redeveloped again in the mid-twentieth century. The 300-block of North Front Street retains the grading and scale of the development from the nineteenth century and the original eighteenth-century steps leading to the river at Wood Street remain. The lot to the north, known as the Hertz lot, the site of the Pennypot Tavern and West Shipyard, has been the subject of a major archeological study and holds the remains of four wharves and a slipway.

This site is bounded by Interstate 95 and the Benjamin Franklin Bridge at the west and south. The embankment for the highway and the bridge has separated the parcel from

the rest of Old City. However, the anchorage for the bridge, which stands approximately 160 feet tall, is a strong visual feature and establishes a scale for the development of the site.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the demolition and new construction, provided a Phase 1 Archeological Study is performed prior to the start of construction, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9 and Setting Guideline.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Jack Thrower and Meg Delavan of Bower Lewis Thrower Architects and attorney Carl Primavera represented the project.

Mr. Thrower presented a comprehensive overview of the design. He emphasized that the tower had been located at the northern end of the lot to maintain the views of the bridge. He noted that a utility easement prevented building along Vine Street. Ms. Voith asked whether the building would be developed as condominiums or rental units. Mr. Thrower answered that the units would be sold as condominiums. Ms. Pentz asked for details on the parking garage shutters. Mr. Thrower described the Bermuda shutters as awning-like shutters.

Ms. Voith asked if the applicants had considered the question of archeology raised by the staff. Mr. Thrower reported that the developer has retained Cultural Resources Consulting Group to evaluate the archeological potential of the site. Amy Lala of CRCG introduced herself and stated that her firm would undertake a Phase 1 archeological study at the site.

Mr. Primavera stated that the height of the building conforms to the area's zoning regulations, which do not include Old City's 65-foot height limit.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance praised and supported the project. He noted the set back from the bridge, the well designed parking, the lack of variance requests, and the inclusion of retail.

Mr. Rivera asked if the garage portion of the building could be faced with brick "to bring Front Street down to Delaware Avenue." The applicants stated that they did not consider that suggestion to be appropriate for the contemporary building.

Ms. Voith asked the architects to clarify the color of the glass. They stated that it would be clear, not green as it appears in the rendering.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the demolition and new construction, provided a Phase 1 Archeological Study is performed prior to the start of construction, pursuant to Standard 8 [Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.]; 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 Setting Guideline [Not recommended: Introducing new construction into historic districts that is visually incompatible or that destroys historic relationships within the

setting.].

200 West Washington Square, aka 700 Walnut Street

Owner: St. James Associates

Applicant: Joe Hamilton

History: PSFS Bank, built 1869, Addison Hutton; alterations and addition by Hutton, 1886 and 1888; alterations and addition by Furness & Evans, 1898, 1919

Project: Add awnings, banners, canopy, and front doors

This application proposes several exterior additions to the former PSFS bank building, which is being converted to a restaurant. Awnings with the restaurant's logo would be added at the 7th and Walnut Street facades. A large retractable awning would be added at the rear or south façade, where an outdoor dining area is proposed. Three flag poles are proposed along Walnut Street, in locations approximating those of historic flag poles. A barrel-arched canopy is proposed for the easternmost entrance on Walnut Street; it would extend from the building, down the steps, and to the curb. Finally, new front doors are proposed for the same entranceway; they are based on historic doors that survive on the building.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the awnings, flag poles, and doors, but denial of the canopy, which is not architecturally compatible with the building and would block views of the grand doorway, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect Joe Hamilton represented the application.

Ms. Voith asserted that the scale of the proposed doors appeared incorrect. Mr. Hamilton explained that the existing historic frames and transoms would be retained and only the non-historic doors would be replaced. He stated that the scale was determined by the extant historic fabric. He also explained that the new doors would be based on other doors on the building that were not original, but that replicated original doors. Mr. Farnham noted that the inner, vestibule doors, which are original and very ornate, could be used to substantiate the design of the new outer doors. He offered to work with the architect to document the original outer doors and then ensure that the new doors are appropriate.

Discussion turned to the awnings on the first-floor windows. Ms. Voith and Ms. Pentz deemed them inappropriate because they block the views of the ornate grillwork. Mr. Hamilton explained that the awning design was already a compromise. He reported that he had met with Mr. Tyler to discuss the plans and had proposed an awning covering the entire arched heads of the window openings. Mr. Tyler had convinced him to lower the awnings to allow views of the arches. Ms. Voith asked about the purpose of the awnings on openings that face east and north and would not receive direct sunlight when the restaurant was operating. Mr. Hamilton replied that they give the rather imposing façade a pedestrian scale. Ms. Voith countered they give the façade a corporate identity. She asserted that the canopy at the door was awkward and inappropriate for the building. She suggested deleting the awnings and installing a grander, more appropriate canopy at the door to identify and advertise the restaurant. She stated that the current canopy is too diminutive. Ms. Pentz agreed with Ms. Voith. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance also agreed that the awnings should be

denied. All concurred that the retractable awning at the rear as well as the flags were acceptable.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the window awnings; approval of the canopy, provided it is redesigned to be more appropriately scaled for the historic building; approval of the rear retractable awning; approval of the doors, provided their proportions and panel and glazing configurations match the historic doors; and approval of the flags; with 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.].

700-702 and 704 South 3rd Street

700-704 South 3rd Street, LLC, Owner

Craig Slater, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Demolish buildings

This application to demolish two buildings completely and erect five townhouses is sent to the Commission under the Queen Village Demolition Moratorium Ordinance, §14-1628. Passed in the spring of 2004, the ordinance regulates demolitions within Queen Village, which it defines as the area bounded on the north by Lombard Street, on the west by S. 5th Street, on the south by Washington Street, and on the east by the Delaware River. The ordinance states that:

No demolition of any building or other structure within Queen Village shall be permitted, unless (i) such demolition is necessary to abate an imminently dangerous condition, (ii) a building permit for such demolition is obtained in accordance with all provisions of the Historical Commission's ordinance, applying those provisions as if Queen Village were a designated historic district, or (iii) either a permit for demolition was issued prior to April 15, 2004.

The moratorium ordinance empowers the Commission to treat the Queen Village area "as if it were a designated historic district" when demolition is proposed. Without a nomination for a Queen Village historic district, which would define a Period of Significance in the Statement of Significance and date and classify the buildings in the Inventory, the Commission and its Committees and staff are disadvantaged. The 1972 National Register nomination for the Southwark District is entirely insufficient. It consists of a meager one-page Statement of Significance; it does not include an Inventory. It is not possible to determine whether these buildings would contribute to a district without a precise definition of the district. Therefore, the staff will assume that all buildings within the bounds defined above are Contributing unless contrary information is provided by the applicant. Subsection §14-2007 (7) (j) of the Commission's ordinance requires that demolitions of Contributing buildings be justified by either a financial hardship or public interest claim. The application proffers no such claim.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to §14-1628 (2) *[No demolition of any building or other structure within Queen Village shall be permitted, unless ... a building permit for such demolition is obtained in accordance with all provisions of §14-2007(7) and the regulations issued pursuant to that Section, applying those provisions as if Queen Village were a designated historic district.]* and §14-2007 (7) (j) *[No permit shall be issued for the demolition ... of a building ... within an historic district which contributes, in the Commission's opinion, unless the Commission finds that issuance of the permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.]*.

Mr. Farnham explained that the application as submitted does not present either a financial hardship or a public interest argument.

Karl Krumholz and Craig Slater of SRK Architects represented the application. Mr. Krumholz explained that the property was recently cited as Unsafe, but not Imminently Dangerous, by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. He reported that the buildings formerly housed a bar; they have been neglected and are now vacant. The party wall and stairs have been removed between the two northern buildings effectively combining them. The interior floor levels of the two sections do not align. He explained that the basis for the demolition request is financial hardship. The high cost of rehabilitation would not be offset by the value of the resulting buildings. He showed photographs of the conditions.

Mr. Thomas of the Committee remarked that he would recommend denial of the proposal.

Mr. Baron stated that given these buildings bounded the old Washington Market, which stood between 3rd and 5th Streets where Bainbridge Street is wider. One could even argue that they could be classified as significant because the ordinance specifically allows for the designation of buildings that are part of or related to a square, park, or other area.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asserted that, absent a hardship application as mandated by the ordinance, that the Architecture Committee could not recommend anything other than denial. He suggested a detailed investigation of the project's financing to determine if demolition was the only option.

Ms. Voith asked about the condition of the storefronts. The applicants offered no information. She suggested researching them. She asked if the Commission would have the jurisdiction to review the new construction. David O'Donnell of the Queen Village Civic Association said that the Commission would review the new proposal. Mr. Farnham clarified that the Queen Village Demolition Moratorium ordinance does not give the Commission explicit jurisdiction over new construction, but that the Commission could condition a demolition approval to include the plenary review of the new construction. Committee members suggested that, if the Commission chose to approve the demolitions of these buildings, it should condition the demolition approval with the requirement that the Commission must review the new construction for approval.

The applicants stated that they would withdraw the current application and prepare a hardship application for submission to the Commission.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to §14-1628 (2) [No demolition of any building or other structure within Queen Village shall be permitted, unless ... a building permit for such demolition is obtained in accordance with all provisions of §14-2007(7) and the regulations issued pursuant to that Section, applying those provisions as if Queen Village were a designated historic district.] and §14-2007 (7) (j) [No permit shall be issued for the demolition ... of a building ... within an historic district which contributes, in the Commission's opinion, unless the Commission finds that issuance of the permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.].

2019-23 Green Street

Green Street Collaborative, Owner

Joseph Duffy and William Murphy, Applicants

DATE: 1860; significantly altered in 1922 and 1959 – non-contributing

PROPOSAL: Demolish 1-story building; construct four 3-story houses with parking

The Commission previously approved the demolition of the non-contributing building on this site for the construction of a multi-unit building with a single garage entrance; however, a neighboring property owner has appealed the zoning approval of the development. The owners are now returning with a new development proposal for the site. The application includes the demolition of the non-contributing remnant of the former building on the site. The new construction consists of four, three-story townhouses that face onto an interior courtyard with a garden at the rear of the property. Access to the development occurs through a single opening at the center of the property for both pedestrians and vehicles.

The Green Street façade would consist of red brick with a bracketed cornice and two large bays. Nine-over-nine windows would fenestrate the façade. The application includes two options for the access opening. The first has a large segmentally-arched opening. The other has a smaller arched opening with a paneled roll-down door flanked by two arched doors that lead to the southern townhouses.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the demolition and approval of the new construction, but with a simplified design, pursuant to Standard 9. The windows should have a one-over-one configuration.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Joseph Duffy and William Murphy described the two options, either of which they find acceptable. Mr. Duffy said that potential buyers prefer the residential scale imparted by the small-paned sash.

Allan Rubin, representing the Spring Garden Civic Association, spoke in favor of the project.

Mr. Thomas did not object to the nine-over-nine windows, opining that no one would mistake the building for an historic structure, but he did favor the design that had the single entrance rather than the entrance flanked by the two doors. Ms. Voith found the placement of the windows in relationship to the archway to be troubling. She suggested moving the stone base further up as if the stone supported the bay windows. Ms. Pentz

believed that the Committee's role was to ensure that the new structure basically fit the scale of the district.

After some discussion, the Committee agreed that two-over-two windows would be better than the nine-over-nine windows. The applicant agreed to the change.

The Architecture Committee unanimously recommended approval subject to the windows being changed to two-over-two, 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.].

220 Delancey Street

Mary Sales, Owner

Brett Webber, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840; façade built c. 1895; façade rebuilt 1970

PROPOSAL: Alter former alley entrance to main entrance with steps and transom, add stone watertable

This building has a complex history. It was built about 1840. A new façade with a two-story bay and Roman brick was installed about 1895. The original marble watertable and alleyway entrance survived the 1895 alterations. During the Redevelopment Period, the late nineteenth-century façade was completely removed, including the original doorway and watertable, and the present façade was installed. However, the alleyway entrance survived. The main entrance to the property was moved to a door in the alley.

In May 1999, the owner applied to convert the alleyway entrance into the main doorway. In June 1999, the Historical Commission, after much deliberation, approved an addition in the alleyway for a larger entrance, but with a setback to preserve the appearance of the alley.

The current application proposes installing an entirely new entrance at the same level as the main entrances at neighboring houses, completely erasing any reminder of the historic alleyway opening. The new entrance would be at the opposite edge of the façade from the original, but no lost, original raised entrance. The entrance would have marble steps and lintel, four-light transom and six-panel wood door. The application also proposes adding a marble watertable.

The proposal also calls for new six-over-six wood windows, expanding several windows on the rear of the property, and altering the slope of the rear flat roof for drainage. These alterations may be approved at the staff level.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5 and 9.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. She reiterated that the windows and roof alterations may be approved at the staff level. Jonathan Walston of Brett Webber Architects represented the project.

Suzanne Pentz and Bob Thomas recalled the great concern expressed by the neighbors

at the time of the previous proposal and the desire of the Committee and Commission to retain a sense of the alleyway. They said that they would not be averse to the reestablishment of the door in its original location on the east side of the façade, but that they could not recommend approval of any proposal that further compromised the alley door.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended denial of the alleyway alteration, 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 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.].

257 South 9th Street

Brian Klazmer, Owner

Massimiliano Scarchilli, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1802-10

PROPOSAL: Construct three-story rear addition

This property represents an early example of a three-and-half-story, Federal Style house with a three-story rear ell that has its original half-gable roofline and a nineteenth-century two-story addition. The upper portion of the rear is visible from Schell and Latimer Streets because the garage at the back of the lot is only one story in height. The application proposes the demolition of the rear wall of the main section, as well as the entirety of the rear ell and addition, and the construction of a three-story addition. The new addition will span the entire width of the house for approximately 18 feet and then narrow to a rear wing that projects approximately 12 additional feet. The addition will stand above the cornice line of the main section by about one foot.

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

Ms. Spina presented the application. Architects Stuart Rosenberg and Massimiliano Scarchilli and owners Jill and Brian Klazmer attended the meeting.

Mr. Rosenberg explained that the applicants wish to restore the front façade, but demolish sections at the rear to accommodate a spacious addition and an elevator. He said that the owners hope to live here for the rest of their lives. He offered that it might be possible to keep the upper floors of the wall of the rear ell, but that it would be entirely encased in new construction. He said that there is some visibility from the rear, but that the buildings to either side appear contemporary.

Mr. Baron explained that he had visited the site and that there is visibility of the back of this house from the street behind, particularly from the house across the street. He said that he counseled the applicants to consider the demolition of the newer rear addition, but to retain the rear ell and add onto it, retaining the half gable roofline.

Mr. Riviera said that he favors keeping rear ells because of the light and air the configuration ensures, but that this could be achieved in an addition as well. He said that

he finds an addition acceptable, provided it follows the shape of a rear ell. Ms. Voith said that rear ells are unfortunately disappearing quickly, but should be valued.

Some Committee members opined that it might be acceptable to add onto at the full width of the lot to the line of the adjacent house to the south and then add a new rear ell at the width of the original.

The architect then showed the Committee an alternate design that retained the main rear ell of the existing house from which projected a linking structure that connected to an addition to the one-story, non-historic garage. This scheme would shift much of the new construction to the rear of the lot, preserving the historic building's rear ell and creating a courtyard between the structures. The architect did not have complete plans for this option, only schematic floor plans and side elevation.

The Committee members favored this new scheme and discussed recommending approval in concept, but told the architect that he would need to return for final approval of the design when he has complete elevations of the design.

The Architectural committee unanimously recommended denial of Option One, but conceptual approval of Option Two, adding on to the garage and connecting to the historic rear with a minimal link that preserved its half-gable roofline, 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 new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

1531-33 Pine Street

1531 Pine Street Associates, LP, Owner

Gerry Gutierrez, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1865-66, Charles MacAlester, developer; 1533: mansard added, c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Add roof deck elevator, stair penthouse, rear windows, and doors with balconies

This property consists of two houses, one four stories and one five. The application calls for installing elevator and stair penthouses and a roof deck on the four-story building, beginning with a set back of ten feet from the cornice line. On the rear, the deck would have a solid railing, with simulated slate on the railing wall, sloped away from the cornice line as if it was part of the roofing structure rather than the railing of a roof deck. Owing to the five-story building, the visibility of these would be minimal from the west. A house to the east has a raised parapet that minimizes the visibility from the east. The roof of the mansard of 1533 Pine would be raised and windows added on the eastern wall overlooking the new roof deck. The mansard would also have simulated slate shingles.

On the rear, the property previously had a fire escape that is no longer needed. The proposal includes removing the fire escape and installing single-leaf, multi-light doors with transoms in the existing openings. Simplified metal balconies would be installed. All

other openings would have six-over-six wood windows. The rear is visible from 16th Street.

The work on the front includes the rehabilitation of the two facades, including new two-over-two wood windows and double-leaf glazed and paneled wood doors.

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

Ms. Spina presented the project. Gerry Gutierrez, the architect, and Scott Yowe, the contractor, attended the meeting. Mr. Baron explained that he had been out to check on the visibility of a mockup of the elevator and stairtower. He said that he could not see the mocked-up structures from any point on the public right-of-way.

Mr. Riviera voiced his opposition to the size of the elevator, saying that the size of the furniture would be limited by interior doorways. The applicant explained that their doors were large and allowed room for a piano or couch which could just fit into this elevator. It was noted that the elevator was largely an interior feature and the penthouse for it would not be seen from the street.

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

319-21 South 25th Street

Stephen Carlino, Owner

Brian Adams, Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Construct conservatory on existing rear terrace

The proposal calls for a third-story sunroom addition on top of a non-historic rear addition of this vernacular mid nineteenth-century house. The sunroom will attach to the historic rear of the house just above the cornice line and will have a cross gable design. It is unclear how the sunroom will meet the historic house at the cornice line. The work would be visible from Delancey Street.

Staff recommendation: Approval of a simplified design; the cross gable and cresting, which reflect a Victorian design, should be eliminated, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

The applicant was not able to come to the meeting owing to traffic. Ms. Spina presented the proposal. The Committee members agreed that the cresting and cross-gable are elements that are not architecturally appropriate for the house that dates to the 1840s.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a simplified design without the cresting or cross gable, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials,

features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

31 Summit Street

Anjani Jain, Owner

Brian Adams, Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: Construct conservatory on side of house

The proposal calls for a large, pre-fabricated conservatory addition on the rear of the house, which is visible from the road. The house has a small deck in this location; therefore, no openings would be cut to access the conservatory. The conservatory is an L-shaped design, built of vinyl-clad metal and glass with a hipped roof and several skylights. The conservatory has a double-leaf door that leads out to a deck that wraps around the house, but the plans indicate that the deck will be built by the owners and is not part of this application. The foundation of the conservatory is faced in fieldstone where it will be exposed, but stucco where it falls under the proposed deck. A door opening under the conservatory appears on the plans, but the drawings do not detail the door.

Staff recommendation: Approval in concept, but additional information including the proposed deck should be submitted before a final review, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Owing to unforeseen traffic, no one represented the project. The Committee reviewed the plans and concluded that more information about the proposed deck should be submitted before approving the conservatory because the two pieces cannot be separated. They offered a favorable comment on the proposed conservatory.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended denial of the application owing to its incompleteness.

1714 Spruce Street

Paul Alexander Monaghan, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855. Designated 2/8/1995, listed as Significant.

PROPOSAL: Build rear deck, cut metal bay for door

This application proposes to legalize two existing roof decks; one on the third floor above a metal bay and a second on the fourth floor. The third-floor deck is visible from Delancey Place and sits on the roof of a rear two-story addition. The fourth-floor deck sits on the back ell of the property and it is not visible from Spruce Street or Delancey Place.

The application also proposes to add a deck at the second-floor level of the rear two-story addition. This deck would be constructed of wood and roughly measure 12' by 8'.

The fenestration of an existing metal bay would need to be altered to access the deck. Currently the bay has five windows with upper leaded diamond-pattern glass. The applicant proposes to reconfigure these openings to a central two-leaf door and two side windows, all of which would have upper leaded diamond glass like the existing. In addition, the applicant proposes to cut a new opening for a door on the ground floor of the same rear two-story addition. The location of the proposed door seems to have had a larger window or door at an earlier time and currently has new brick infill. The new opening would have a six-panel wood door with a tripartite transom.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the legalization of the third and fourth-floor existing decks; approval of cutting a new door; denial of six-panel door, but approval of a flush wood door with a single-light transom, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Denial of the second-floor deck and related alterations to the metal bay, pursuant to Standards 2 and 4.

Mr. Danta described the proposal. Dave Schmauk attended the meeting. Mr. Schmauk showed photographs that depicted the conditions of the bay. He stressed the desire of the owner to copy the leaded glass pattern in the new doors and windows.

The applicant asked Mr. Danta why a six-panel door would not be appropriate. Mr. Danta mentioned that a six-panel door is an earlier door type not suitable to an Italianate building of this. He also mentioned that by placing a flush door with a single light transom would read as a new alteration and not give a false sense of history.

Mr. Thomas mentioned that the second-floor deck would have a strong presence in front of the bay and the rear of the building. He noted that other buildings face Delancey Place and that it is not a service alley. The Committee members all agreed that the bay is a prominent feature of the building. Mr. Schmauk asked the Committee members if the second-floor deck would receive approval without altering the bay. The Committee members did not provide a specific answer to the applicant's question. Mr. Rivera mentioned that they could only comment on the current proposal.

The owner stressed that the bay was not an original feature. Mr. Thomas specified that it was not original to the house, but an old addition that had achieved its own historical significance owing to its age. Ms. Pentz remarked that allowing a third-floor deck above the bay already compromised an important feature. Mr. McCoubrey expressed concern about obscuring the bay. Mr. Rivera concluded that this rear bay is a significant feature that must be preserved, not obscured.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the legalization of the third and fourth-floor existing decks; approval of cutting a new door; denial of six-panel door, but approval of a flush wood door with a single-light transom, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired]. Denial of the second-floor deck and related alterations to the metal bay, 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.]; and Standard 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their

own right will be retained and preserved.]

1921 Panama Street

Bob and Linda Brockway, Owners

Julie Stephens, Applicant

DATE: alterations c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Alter front door, add shutters

This application proposes changes to the front door of the property and the addition of shutters on the ground and second floors. The existing door opening contains two fixed panels and an operable third. The two fixed panels have a single vertical muntin and five horizontal ones. The door has a centered recessed panel. The entryway has a standing seam metal shed roof, which gives the entire ensemble a strong Japanese aesthetic.

The historic file for this property contains a 1987 photograph showing a Neo-Colonial door surround. The applicant proposes to bring back this Neo-Colonial appearance and has submitted two schemes. Both schemes retain the tripartite configuration and show a six-panel wood door. In addition, both schemes propose to eliminate three of the five existing horizontal muntins. The difference in the two proposed schemes lies in the pedimented door surround. Scheme one, proposes a larger pediment with 10" wide pilasters. Scheme two, proposes a smaller version of the same pediment with 8" wide pilasters, more in keeping with the proportions of the 1987 door surround. The neo-colonial theme would be accentuated with the addition of paneled shutters on the ground floor and louvered shutters on the second floor. The application does not propose any shutters on the third floor.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of Scheme Two (smaller pedimented door surround), approval of the new door and fixed panels reconfiguration, but denial of the shutters unless they are added at the third-floor level as well. This recommendation is pursuant Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Danta presented the proposal. Mr. Thomas inquired about the history of the property. Bob Dubree and Linda Brockway, the owner, attended the meeting. Ms. Brockway responding to Mr. Thomas query said that the house was built in the 1860s and was altered in the 1920s. This property previously had two entrances. Ms. Brockway emphasized her preference for Scheme 1.

Mr. Thomas mentioned that there was no evidence of the original configuration and that the property as it currently exists appears to have been altered in the 1950s. He also believed that Scheme 1 was more pleasing. Ms. Pentz commented that there was no evidence of shutters at the third-floor level. Ms. Brockway said that she would not be opposed to placing shutters at the third floor to maintain consistency.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of either Scheme 1 or 2, provided shutters are installed on all three floors, with staff to review details.

2019 Sansom Street

John Ciccone, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1885., listed as contributing.

PROPOSAL: Add roof deck and stair access

This application proposes to construct a new roof deck and stair access on the third floor of this property. The deck would measure 16' by 31' and have a set back of 16' from the front façade (Sansom Street). The stair access would be located on east side of the deck and would roughly measure 5' by 7'. The stair access would have aluminum siding for cladding material.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the deck, provided that the staff verifies with a mock-up that it will not be visible from Sansom Street, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Danta explained the proposal. The Committee reviewed the plans and concurred with the staff recommendation of approval based on the erection of a mock-up.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the deck, provided that the staff verifies with a mock-up that it will not be visible from Sansom Street, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired].

321 South Iseminger Street

Ray Germann, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1830

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof deck and stair access

This application proposes to legalize a roof deck. The roof deck sits on the main block of the house, which does not have a rear ell. The roof deck measures 15' by 15' and has a stair access penthouse with a French door, cedar siding and a gabled roof covered with shingles. The roof deck is visible from the front façade of the building on Iseminger and from Panama Street. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the deck. The owner, in order to complete the construction, added a gabled roof over the stair access. The Department issued a Stop Work Order because the owner continued to work after the issuance of the violations.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the deck, provided that a flat or shed roof is substituted for the gabled roof of the penthouse to minimize its verticality, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Danta described the application. Ray Germann, the owner, attended the meeting. He offered that the penthouse roof configuration was based on the surrounding architecture of Panama Street. Mr. German informed the Committee that the previous roof's condition allowed water infiltration. He noted that neighbors had given their support on the new appearance.

Mr. Thomas, based on the photographs presented, thought that the deck was not highly visible and that it did not overwhelm the character of the building. Mr. Danta commented that the gable roofline gives the penthouse a more elongated appearance which accentuated its visibility. Mr. Germann asked if the roof of the penthouse could be pitched to allow for water drainage. Mr. Rivera suggested a sloped overhanging roof.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the legalization of the deck, provided the penthouse roof is replaced with a flat roof.

660 Chestnut Street, Public Ledger Building

Greit-Public Ledger, LLC, Owner

Marc Morfei, Applicant

DATE: 1926-27 by Horace Trumbauer, listed as Significant.

PROPOSAL: Add banners on pilasters

This application proposes to add two new banners on the Chestnut Street faced of the 1926 Public Ledger building. The banners would be located at the western most entrance on that façade and partially cover two pilasters. The building currently has similar banners to those proposed that advertise the Lights of Liberty Show. These banners were approved in 1998. The proposed banners would be hung in the same manner as the existing ones. The support would be achieved by six pulleys attached to the granite base and marble entablature. These pulleys would in turn hold metal ropes to which the banners would attach. The banners themselves would have a vertical two-tone design and read "Center City District."

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the two banners, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10 and the 1998 approval of a similar proposal.

Mr. Danta described the proposal. Mr. Thomas inquired about the anchorage system.

Marc Morfei of the Center City District disclosed that the proposed banners would be installed with a tensioned system, in the same manner as the Lights of Liberty banners. He also mentioned that the banners would be kept approximately 3 inches from the building even on windy days.

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

609 North 17th Street

Andrew Tull, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859; listed contributing.

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof deck and penthouse

This application proposes to legalize a small roof deck. The deck is located on the rear ell of the property. It measures 5' by 7'. A stair tower serves as access to the deck. The

roof of the stair tower sheds in a slope opposite to that of the roof; therefore, it is not visible from the front of the building. The rear of the property faces a service alley and other backyards.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the roof deck, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Danta presented the proposal. Andrew Tull, the owner, attended the meeting and explained that the roof deck is located on a rear addition. He noted that, owing to sloping of the roofline, the deck is not visible from the front.

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

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron
Jonathan Farnham
Diane M. Hughes