

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

**Suzanne Pentz, Acting-Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
25 March 2003**

Present

Suzanne Pentz, Acting-Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Herbert Levy, FAIA
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA

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

Also

Cathy Harris, Mural Arts Program
David Guinn, Mural Arts Program
Doug Seiler, STD Architects
Priya Shamkar, STD Architects
Chris Smith, CMS Design
William Caton, Unicorn Holdings
Kevin Angstandt, QB3
Stephen Mileto, QB3
Bob Hytha, RJH Architects
Anthony Console, Console Construction
Vincent J. Talotta
Robert Pisani
Thomas Kroljic
Kalyam Som
David Nasatir, Esq., Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel, LLP
William Alesker
Robert Shaffer
Marilyn Ashbrook
William G. Schwartz, Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel, LLP
Tom Kirk
Nick Schmanek, Office of Councilman Frank DiCicco
Mitchell Golding, 637 Catharine Street
Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance/neighbor
Benson Goldberger, 2043 Mt. Vernon Street
Rena Vander Heide, 708 Fulton Street
Michael Bruder, 2238-40 Mt. Vernon Street
Jonathan Oler, 625 North 16th Street
Jill Fink, 2100-10 Fairmount Avenue
Angela Vendetti, 2100-10 Fairmount Avenue
Al Peterson, Agoos Lovera Architects
Mario Santoro, Genesis Construction
Brian Reinmiller, 150 Roesch Avenue
Fred Duling, Loonstyn/Duling, LLC

John Bushmiller, Cope Linder Architects
 William Merewether, 2135 Green Street
 Richard Cohen
 Christopher Scalone
 Stephen Verner, Cecil Baker and Associates
 Patrick Dewey, Loews Hotel
 Linda Holberg, 235 South 10th Street
 Jeffrey A. Bossert, BVI Architectural Group
 Matthew Koenig, J. K. Roller Architects
 Jonathan Broth, J. K. Roller Architects
 Annette Billups, Philadelphia Management
 James P. Campbell, Royal Bank of Pennsylvania
 Robert R. Tabas, Royal Bank of Pennsylvania
 Ken Simmons, Ritz Carlton
 Dave Graham, Ritz Carlton
 Robin Schatz, Office of Councilman Frank DiCicco
 Carl Jadach, Philadelphia Water Department
 Lennart Rustam, Philadelphia Water Department

Suzanne Pentz, Acting-Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:37 a.m.

265 South 22nd Street

Quaiser Bakht, Owner
 Evan Rofheart, Applicant
 DATE: c. 1890
 PROPOSAL: Re-side rear bay

This proposal calls for re-cladding the bays at the side and rear of the building with a combination of original ceramic tile and orange asphalt shingle. The side bay, which has visibility from 22nd Street, is currently clad with a mix of damaged ceramic shingles and forty-year-old asphalt shingles. The rear bay which can be partially seen from Van Pelt Street has the original ceramic tile, but in a poor state of repair.

The proposal calls for removing all the covering on the bays, consolidating the tile on the side bay and recovering the rear bay in orange asphalt shingle.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Ms. Pentz noted the damaged tiles, but thought the submitted plans unclear. The plans read that the applicant proposes to eventually replace the terra cotta, which the Committee determined to be ambiguous. It believed that the applicant should provide more information, as well as a sample of the proposed asphalt shingle. Mr. Tyler thought that a site visit could better determine an appropriate match of the tiles.

Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance, thought it important that the applicant present a sample of the proposed asphalt since this is a very visible property.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal as submitted. It thought that the applicant should provide additional information.

1933-35 Spruce Street

George Karavis, Owner

Jane Golden, Mural Arts Program, Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: Mural on the 20th Street façade

This proposal calls for painting a mural on the much altered 20th Street ground floor facade of this Second Empire style house. The ground floor had a pent-eave that was removed without a permit. The ground floor, stuccoed in the past and now painted white would be the area of the mural. The design of the mural has not yet been determined. The Commission's policy has been to only approve murals on former party walls, not on main facades.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 9. A photograph exists of the original ground floor, and staff could work with the applicant to improve the first floor based on that information.

Mr. Baron explained the application. Mr. Tyler said that although the historic fabric has been removed and a blank wall exists, it is clearly visible street façade and that the policy of approval on party walls should be administered.

Committee members thought that the mural would be a dis-incentive to the eventual restoration of the façade because no one would wish to damage the mural.

Yael Heller Jekogian, Cathy Harris and David Guinn attended the meeting. Mr. Guinn said that the stucco portion, which is painted white, is the location for the proposed mural. He believed that the proposed mural with its subtlety would blend with the streetscape, and it would not prevent the restoration of the historic features. Ms. Jekogian said that the wall is an eyesore and believes that the mural is a good way to enhance the wall.

Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance, speaking for herself and Randy Cotton, Preservation Alliance, expressed concern with setting a precedent. Ms. Millhollen emphasized that the mural would not address the pressing maintenance issues of the building.

Mr. Levy cited an application for 23rd and Walnut Street, which was denied and expressed concern that given that the Commission does not review content, the wall would become a billboard with commercial advertisement. Mr. Tyler made the suggestion of a painting to replicate the existing building on this wall; however, Ms. Millhollen vehemently disagreed with this suggestion.

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

241-43 Chestnut Street

Carol Caton, Owner

Doug Seiler, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 241 Chestnut Street, built 1857, architect, Stephen Button

243 Chestnut Street built 1897, architect, Wilson Eyre

PROPOSAL: Add to fire escape on 241, new dormer on 243, rear stairtower and addition

This proposal in concept involves combining two buildings to have restaurant use on the first floor, apartments above and an owners residential unit in the upper floor of 243 Chestnut Street. On 241 Chestnut, the plans call for the installation of fire escape platforms on the front façade of the building with the windows of the eastern-most register exchanged for doors.

On 243 Chestnut Street, the plans call for a wide dormer on the main hipped roof to provide living space at the top floor, and a two-story addition at the rear, which would provide additional space and a fire stair. The existing fire escape on the north façade would be removed.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 9 *[New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and 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 property and its environment would be unimpaired.]*. In particular the dormer would have visibility and would change the character of an otherwise intact example of a work by an important architect. The rear addition could be acceptable if recessed to reveal the quoins of the existing building; however, the plans for the addition have not yet been developed. The fire platforms should be considered only if no internal solution exists and with the knowledge of the owner next door whose fire escape would be used.

Bill Caton, the owner, Doug Seiler and Priya Shamkar, the architects, and Chris Smith attended the meeting. Mr. Seiler explained that since his initial submission, he has developed a change to the stairtower, which would now be a scissor-stair. This will lengthen the dimensions of the tower, but allow two means of egress from the second floor as well as the basement to accommodate the tenants on the upper floors. He also noted that the only alteration to 243 is the installation of a door opening in an existing rear window and the building over a current skylight in the rear of 241 and putting windows on the new visible 3rd Street facade. He said that the owner had conferred with the Department of Licenses and Inspections to get some indication, whether through Zoning or an easement of the possibility of a one bay extension of the deck of the fire balcony as a second means of egress. The Department offered a fifty-fifty chance for acquiring a variance, which would then have to be reviewed by the Commission. Mr. Seiler detailed the addition of a dormer on 243 to allow additional headroom and space for the owner's apartment. He said that a mock-up of two-by-fours was erected on the roof to ascertain visibility. He noted that from the southwest corner of Chestnut Street, the dormer is visible, but going up Third Street towards Fourth Street, the dormer is hidden by the Society Hill Hotel and up Third Street the trees and the Visitor's Center obscure it. In the north wall of the Wilson Eyre building, a door would be created with the removal of the sill of an existing window. Mr. Seiler offered details of the new fire escape windows, on the façade of 241 Chestnut Street. The proposal calls for changing the windows into doors with the resulting shift in the location of the heavier horizontal line of the meeting rail and transom bar. Only the easternmost bay would be altered in this way.

Ms. Pentz said that Old City contains many fire escapes. She thought that the extension of the fire escape and the changing of windows to doors on the Chestnut Street façade was appropriate. Mr. McCoubrey inquired if an internal stair existed. Mr. Seiler said that an internal stair would encompass a lot of the interior space. He remarked that life safety issues and the need for window space for the restaurant govern his first floor's design. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the

proposed fire escape extension would affect the sills. In response Mr. Seiler said that the sills would line up to the deck extension of the fire escape.

Ms. Pentz found the visibility of the dormer problematic. Mr. Levy pointed out that the plans show that the dormer has a hipped roof, and he thought a hipped roof inappropriate. He said that the 3rd Street façade is very symmetrical and the dormer has no relation to the total symmetry of two floors. Mr. Baron suggested a larger rear addition instead of a dormer. Mr. Caton said that the dormer is less expensive approach, which allows for a second bedroom. He said that he is open to the possibility of moving the dormer to an alternate location on the roof. He also noted that the roof is a combination of copper and tar, which lead him to believe that the roof has been altered previously. Mr. Caton proposes to keep the building in its original state, with cleaning of the masonry and restoring doors to a usable state.

Addressing the alteration to the roof of 243 Chestnut Street, the Committee members thought that the roof was original though repaired. Ms. Pentz thought the concept of a dormer possible, but the applicant should explore alternatives for its location to minimize visibility. Mr. Levy said it should be reduced in length and lined up above two windows on the lower floors, while Mr. McCoubrey thought it better to tuck it away from Chestnut Street making it asymmetrical. Committee members agreed that a dormer is possible, but its location should be re-studied and the windows re-configured and a section through the space presented.

Chris Smith designer for the restaurant portion, presented a revised proposal for the rear addition, which would be largely glazed. He said the building would be stepped back to highlight the quoins. He proposed the building have wrought iron gates.

On the issue of the rear addition the applicant showed a much-changed scheme B with a fully glazed façade. Committee members thought that whichever scheme was used, the full depth of the quoins should be visible and the roof deck should sit below the belt course. Mr. Baron noted that the scheme shown on Mr. Seiler's drawing is traditional and has a vertical orientation, while Mr. Smith's design for the addition has a horizontal orientation. He noted that the proposed addition should not mimic exactly the detail of the existing building, but he thought that the horizontal orientation of the glazing of Mr. Smith's scheme fights with the verticality of the existing building. Spandrel glass is proposed for the railing of the deck. Mr. Levy took issue with the left side slot, he thought that the building should be carried over to pick up the entire floor. Ms. Pentz remarked that the primary focus should be to protect the corner quoins and to redesign the façade of the addition with a more vertical orientation. She said the notch should be set back from the corner and the quoins made fully visible.

Mr. Seiler noted that there is an existing areaway on the 3rd Street side of the building, which he proposes to reopen as a fire exit from the basement. He inquired about a railing design to protect pedestrians at that opening.

The Architectural Committee recommended conceptual approval of the following:

1. *Extension of fire escape on 241 Chestnut Street;*
2. *Changing windows to doors on the easternmost bay of 241 Chestnut Street, keeping head and jambs with muntin patterns similar to the existing;*
3. *Conceptual approval of a dormer on 243 Chestnut Street, but its location should be re-studied and the windows re-configured with a section through the space presented;*
4. *A railing installed in the steps of the basement areaway of 243, and*
5. *Rear addition on 243 Chestnut with a deck situated below the belt- course. The Committee recommended the retention of the visibility of the full length of the quoins and a more vertical design.*

47-49 North 2nd Street

Second and Cuthbert, LLC, owner

Stephen Mileto, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1858, altered with the removal of upper floors

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation, new storefront windows, and door

The proposal calls for installing a commercial use with an internal two-story atrium space. On the 2nd Street façade, the applicant proposes to refurbish existing masonry and woodwork and install modern frameless doors and windows. The second floor sash would be remade to match the original.

On the Cuthbert Street façade, the applicant wishes to cut a new store window toward the front, western end of the facade. He also seeks to cut away original brickwork to make an elongated window and a large square second floor window to express the atrium and sales office respectively on the exterior. The applicant also wishes to in-fill the cellar windows with brick and install a new flush door.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the window and masonry restoration and cutting a new storefront window. Denial of the cutting of the large windows and in-fill of the basement windows. Staff thought the storefront elements should have frames, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal.

Kevin Angstandt and Steven Mileto attended the meeting. Mr. Angstandt presented photographs showing the existing condition of the Cuthbert Street elevation. He believes that the proposed alterations give a visual unity to the northwest corner of the building, with the removal of the fire door and balcony and the installation of a large window in that location. He emphasized that the first sixty feet of the building will be restored. Committee members pointed out that Cuthbert Street is not an alley, but a street with many houses. Mr. D'Alessandro thought it important to protect the historic fabric by not introducing new fenestration. Mr. Levy thought that the proposed Second Street doors are contemporary and do not require frames. The other members disagreed with him.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the window and masonry restoration, cutting a new storefront window on Cuthbert Street, and the storefront elements should have frames, with the staff to review details. It recommended denial of cutting the large windows and the infill of the basement windows, pursuant to Standards 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and 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 property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

539 Queen Street

Vince Talotta, Owner

Robert Hytha, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1820

PROPOSAL: Complete demolition, new construction with garage

This proposal calls for the complete demolition of the structure and its replacement with a new house. The new house features a ground floor garage. After being found Imminently Dangerous by Licenses and Inspections in 2002, Mr. Talotta hired engineer Robert Rosen to devise a method to stabilize the property. The staff approved an application to install star bolts to stabilize the property in July of 2002; however, the owner did not perform the work. The owner now wishes to demolish the property completely. Because of a shared alley to the back yard and brickwork tied into the neighboring property, demolition work could affect the neighboring house.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standards 2, 5 and 10. An attempt should be made to save the façade. If this is not possible, the building should be reconstructed to its original form without a garage. This constitutes demolition by neglect.

Bob Hytha, the architect, and Vince and Anthony Talotta, the owners, attended the meeting.

The Committee noted that the building is in poor condition but it thought that the demolition might impact the neighboring building's structural integrity. It thought that the applicant should restore what is there and that the proposed garage would have a negative impact on the streetscape. Mr. Tyler remarked that this is a classic case of demolition by neglect and inquired if the owners have been cited for neglect. He pointed out that the star bolts recommended by the engineer to stabilize the property were never installed. Ms. Pentz inquired why the star bolts have not been installed. In addition, she believes that needling and shoring the front façade will also preserve the party wall. Mr. Talotta responded that he was not sure that the star bolts would rectify the poor structural integrity of the building. He noted that he is working with the neighbor to shore the building, which he has owned for about 20 years. Mr. Console commented that the front façade is sitting alone and in his opinion the star bolts won't achieve stabilization. He also pointed out that only one course of brick remains, therefore the wall cannot be built and pulled to it.

Ms. Pentz concluded that this deteriorated condition did not happen overnight, but evolved because no protection was given to the property to keep it water tight over the years. She emphasized strongly that this situation falls within the demolition by neglect guidelines. The Committee concurred that because of this, the new construction should match and reconstruct the historic building.

The applicants inquired if the alleyway between the two properties could be eliminated to allow for more space. The Committee informed that applicants that the neighboring owner has an easement on half of this space and that the opening most read as an opening. The applicant also inquired about the rear breezeway behind the yard to give more width to the property. Committee members cautioned that the zoning requirement for yard space must also be met. It thought that the demolition should be subject to the filing of the permit for the reconstruction to eliminate the possibility of the creation of a vacant lot.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the application pursuant to Standards 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.], 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.], 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.], and 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 property and its environment would be unimpaired.]. It recommended approval of the re-construction of the building to its historic features, subject to construction documents in place, owing to demolition by neglect, with the staff to review details.

757 South Front Street

Jean Vidi, Owner

R. J. Pisani, Applicant

DATE: c. 1790

PROPOSAL: Side addition, rear deck and alter dormer

After the Commission denied the proposal seen last month, the applicant has submitted new drawings to add two large additions to the brick house at 757 S. Front Street. The addition on the north wall of the building still largely covers the extraordinary glazed brick design of the north façade. Besides being out of scale, the proposal does not incorporate the Committee's request for a simpler glazed addition that does not compete or clash with the architecture of the existing building. On the rear, the applicant requests another large addition, also not compatible with the existing structure. The fourth floor alterations have been scaled back not to demolish the whole roof, but rather to demolish and rebuild a wider dormer as well as adding a deck.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standards 9 and 10 as well as the roofing and additions guidelines.

Mr. Baron presented the revised application, which addresses some of the areas of concern by Committee and Commission. However, the proposal still introduces new elements, which do not meet Standards 9 and 10.

Frederick Vidi, the owner, and Robert Pisani attended the meeting. Mr. Vidi said that he believed that the rear addition had been approved previously. He said that the rear addition was built on property owned by Penn Dot with a wall separating it from Interstate 95; however, the Department of Licenses and Inspections thought that its jurisdiction to not extend to this addition. Mr. Vidi believed that the only remaining issue with the rear addition was the visible air conditioning unit. He also believed regarding the side addition that the revised submission, which eliminates the mezzanine, would address the issue of covering a wall that has significance to the building.

Mr. Baron inquired about the relationship of the addition to the historic house. Ms. Pentz recommended denial of the legalization of the addition. In addition, she thought that the proposed side addition is overwhelming and incompatible to the historic house. Committee members concurred that visually the wall would still be covered with an elaborate addition. It also recommended that the elevator be put on the interior without a mechanical tower so as not to become an additional element. Members discussed the project at length, and agreed that the design and massing does not respect the historic building. Mr. Tyler offered the suggestion of a redesigned addition with a 5 to 6 foot gap between the buildings or some type of 2003 contemporary addition, which does not disturb the historic building. They also expressed their opposition to the removal of the dormer. Mr. Tyler remarked that the rear addition sits on Penn Dot's property, which could nullify jurisdiction of the Commission. Mr. Levy thought it important, that the jurisdictional issue be resolved.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal pursuant to Standards 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be

differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and 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 property and its environment would be unimpaired.] as well as the roofing and additions guidelines.

613-21 Catharine Street

Robert Shaffer, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1838

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation of historic building, construction of 13 townhouses-final approval

This development returns to the Committee and Commission for final approval; the Commission denied the application in concept as submitted at the February meeting. The Commission approved a development plan that eliminated all of the houses on the property in front of the historic building, with only three townhouses along Catharine Street on the adjoining property. The present permit application, though, includes four townhouses along Catharine Street.

The rehabilitation of the historic property includes the demolition of the 2-story rear section, removal of the non-historic fire-escapes and removal of signage. The rear façade will have a new wall with a stucco finish to match the existing. All of the existing window openings will have new windows to match the existing, except for the central windows in each façade. Party walls will bisect each of these windows, so a fire-rated mullion is required. This will make the original 8-over-8 double-hung windows into coupled, eight-light casements; the 12-over-12 double-hungs into coupled, 12-light casements, and the lunette in the gable a two-light window. The side elevations did not have windows in the upper floors of the southernmost bay. The proposal includes installing windows in these locations, which will align with the first floor windows and will have three-over-three, double-hung windows. On the rear façade, the plan includes six new three-over-three double-hung windows in the new wall. The plans do not include shop drawings or details for any of the windows.

The front entrance will have a new double-leaf door with a transom in the existing opening. The proposal also includes three new entrances into the historic building: one on the rear where the two-story section stood and one on each side façade in the center. These new entrances will have a fully glazed, single-leaf door with sidelights and a transom, as well as an aluminum and glass entry canopy.

The new construction has 3-½ stories, with brick facades and projecting bays on the front and recessed bays on the rear. The windows will consist mainly of coupled, single-light casement windows. The recessed entrances will have single-leaf, fully glazed doors with transoms and sidelights.

The computer renderings show the proposed fence and gate along Catharine Street, but the plans do not include details.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the rehabilitation of the historic building, subject to: no mullion in the front center windows; the windows in the new openings should have the same pane pattern as the historic windows, but a different brick mold and material; restoration of the historic front entrance, pursuant to Standard 6 and Standard 9. Approval of the new construction along the rear of the property, on the condition that the rear garden wall have stucco rather than bare CMU, pursuant to Standard 9 and Standard 10. Pursuant to the Commission vote, denial of the fourth house along Catharine Street, pursuant to Standard 9.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Mr. Tyler informed the Committee that an insurance survey gives the proportions for the historic entrance. He also said that he believes that the view corridor as submitted is appropriate.

William G. Schwartz, Esq., and William Alesker, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Alesker said that, at the request of the community, the proposed rear wall would be constructed in brick.

Nick Schmanek, a representative from Councilman Frank DiCicco's office, said that the councilman supports the project along with a majority of the community.

Tom Baggio, whose house abuts the new construction, said that the House of Industry has deteriorated and urged the Committee to support the proposal.

Tom Kirk, 623 Catharine Street, organized meetings with neighbors who would be impacted by the proposed development. He strongly supports the project, which would bring life back to the historic property.

Mitchell Golding, Bella Vista Civic Association, speaking as a neighbor, believes that the architecture of the proposed development is consistent with the streetscape. He also said that he is glad that the garages are on the interior and that a portion will remain as open green space.

Thomas Kroljic believes that developments should enrich for communities and expressed concern with the elimination of open space in the Bella Vista area. He noted that his historical research produced evidence that the proposed location of the rear townhouses was formerly a burial ground; however, records could not be found to establish whether the bodies have been exhumed. In conclusion, he noted that he does not support the project.

Committee members noted that the required fire-rated party walls could be installed in a way that would preserve the look of the center windows. Ms. Spina asked about the canopies and their attachment. Mr. Alesker said that the canopies would be glass and aluminum and bolted directly into the masonry through the back. Committee members suggested that the bolts be put through the mortar joints. Mr. Tyler told the applicant that if any graves are unearthed, the applicant must contact the Medical Examiner and petition the Orphans Court for their removal. The Committee concurred to approve the proposal as submitted or per the Commission's recommendation of only three townhouses on Catharine Street.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal on the conditions that the historic entrance be restored, and the central windows do not have the new mullions, 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. 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.].

2028-30 Fairmount Avenue

Savaas Navrdeidis, Owner

Kalyan Som, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Replace storefronts and new 4th-story additions

The proposal calls for replacing the existing modern storefronts on these two rowhouses with a storefront to duplicate the historic storefront at 2026 Fairmount Avenue next door. Additionally the plans call for replacing the brick front on 2028 Fairmount Avenue and adding a fourth floor with mansard to both buildings.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standards 3, 9 and 10. The façade should be repaired and saved if possible, the storefronts should be simplified absent historical documentation and the roofs should not receive a mansard addition.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal and noted that the bracketed cornices on the buildings are different. Since there is no documentation, he believes that the replication should be a simple design.

Kalyan Som, the architect, attended the meeting to explain the proposal. He noted that the storefront has stamped metal that would be easier to replicate.

Committee members agreed that the mansard roof on the addition is inappropriate but said that they find the storefront replication appropriate.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the replication of the storefronts, but denial of the mansard roof and the demolition of the façade. It recommended the use of star bolts where needed for the rehabilitation of the façade, with the staff to review details.

2032 Fairmount Avenue

Savaas Navrdeidis, Owner

Kalyan Som, Architect/Applicant

PROPOSAL: New construction on vacant lot

This proposal calls for constructing a new townhouse with first floor storefront and mansard on a vacant lot.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Some staff members thought the new building should take a more modern design.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal and noted that owing to the fact that the new construction is on a vacant lot in a historical district, the Committee and Commission has a 45-days for review and comment.

Committee members thought the new construction with the storefront of 2028 replicated and the mansard appropriate.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as submitted pursuant to Standards 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and 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 property and its environment would be unimpaired.] as well as the roofing and additions guidelines.

2043 Mt. Vernon Street

2043 Mt. Vernon Street LLC, Owner

Benson Goldberger, Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Rebuild decks

The proposal calls for rebuilding a porch that existed on the building at the time of designation.

Staff recommendation: Approval on the condition that the applicant paints the balusters, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal, which would legalize repairs to a 3rd floor deck, which existed at the time of designation.

Benson Goldberger, the owner, attended the meeting and said that he wishes to replace all the railings on the existing 2nd floor deck as well. He proposes to install square balusters. Mr. Levy thought that that the owner should install turned balusters on the 2nd floor to match the turned posts.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the third floor work with painting. On the second floor they recommended the installation of turned balusters to match the posts 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 material. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]

2238-40 Mt. Vernon Street

Jack Jallo and Gage Johnson, Owners

Michael Bruder, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: 4th floor rear addition with balconies and roof deck

This application is for work on the visible rear of the property. The rear ell has additions on the first, second and third floors. Staff previously approved an application to repair the addition at the third floor. The owners wish to continue the addition to the fourth floor. The addition will also include a staircase leading to a penthouse and a roof deck.

The roof deck will occupy the roof of the main buildings of both 2238 and 2240, with only a 3' 10" setback from the front cornice and no setback from the side elevation. To meet code, the owner wishes to have a mansard-roof style railing with slate shingles.

At the second and fourth floors on the rear the proposal includes new double-leaf leaded-glass doors and bulbous wrought-iron balconettes. The applicant has supplied two styles that vary slightly.

Lastly, the application includes a new side and rear garden wall made of stucco-covered CMU.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the rear fourth-floor addition, double-leaf doors and balconettes in concept, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. The applicant should submit more information for the addition, and the doors and balconettes should have simplified designs.

Denial of the penthouse and roof deck, pursuant to Standard 9 and roofing guidelines.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and explained that a deck exists on the rear ell of the property but the addition will require its removal.

Michael Bruder, the contractor, attended the meeting to get guidance from the Committee. He said that the proposed fancier railing would mimic the railing on a neighboring house. He also said that the proposed mansard on the roof would hide air conditioning units and other equipment. In addition, the mansard would eliminate the need for a railing on the deck. The rear garden wall would be either six feet or eight feet tall.

Committee members thought that the rear addition could be only one floor. They had issue with the penthouse and deck. The Committee recommended a simplified railing for the balconettes.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the rear fourth floor addition, rear garden wall, double-leaf doors and balconettes in concept, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment] and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the penthouse and 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 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 roofing guidelines [Not recommended: introducing a new roof features that is incompatible in size, scale, material and color.] [Not recommended: radically changing a character-defining roof shape as a result of incompatible design.]

2100-10 Fairmount Avenue aka 632 North 21st Street

Donato Spaventa, Owner

Angela Vendetti, Applicant

DATE: c. 1922

PROPOSAL: Cut new storefront windows, awnings

This application calls for installing several new windows on the first floor of the building, expanding three existing windows, and installing awnings and signage. On the north elevation, the plan proposes adding a new triple window with single-light windows and hoppers below in the first or corner bay, which would align with the triple windows on the floors above; elongating and changing a double-hung window to a single-light window and hopper below in the middle of the three bays; and installing awnings at the three easternmost bays. On the east elevation the proposal stipulates changing a coupled, double-hung window to an elongated, coupled, single-light window with hopper below as well as installing a second such window in the northernmost

bay. Again the new window opening would align with the windows above. A photograph of the property shows that a coupled window originally occupied this location. Also on the east elevation, the proposal calls for installing awnings at the two northernmost bays. All new windows would be made of wood.

Signage would include flat signs on both facades at the existing cornice above the first floor and a projecting sign at the building's corner. The application does not include details of the awnings or signage, such as material or method of attachment.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the new window openings, awnings and signage in concept pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the windows guideline [*Not recommended: introducing a new design that is incompatible with the historic character of the building.*]. Denial of the windows as designed; they should be double-hung or casements. The applicant should submit more information on the signage, but if non-illuminated it may be approved at staff level.

Mr. Levy took the chair. Ms. Spina presented the application, which proposes alterations to a storefront to create a coffee house and juice bar in a large building at the corner of N. 21st Street and Fairmount Avenue.

Ms. Fink and Ms. Vendetti, the co-owners, then discussed the application with the Committee. They explained that the building now contains apartments on all floors including the ground floor, where their establishment will be situated. They further explained that their business will be located at the corner with three bays along Fairmount Avenue and three bays along N. 21st Street. They also stated that they no longer desired the windows shown in their drawings, but wanted casements instead. They acknowledged that their drawings did not completely reflect their plans. Mr. Levy noted that their business would not occupy the entire ground floor and then suggested that, for consistency, the precedent for the storefront set by their business should be maintained by any other businesses moving into the building.

Ms. Spina referred the Committee to a historic photograph of the building, which shows that the original storefront had been altered and the windows changed during the second half of the twentieth century. Several Committee members noted that the window openings had been partially infilled and should be restored to their original dimensions. Originally, the windows extended up to the frieze band.

Committee members also asked if the change in use from residential to commercial would require changes for ADA compliance. The applicants thought that they might need to meet ADA requirements including adding a ramp, but had not yet made those determinations. Committee members then contended that the application did not accurately reflect the final plans for the storefront; too many issues related to the project remained open. For example, scant information was provided on the awnings and signage. Committee members informed the applicants that the staff could approve appropriate awnings and non-illuminated signage upon receipt of complete information. Mr. Levy stated that the applicants' architect should have attended the meeting to answer the Committee's many questions. The Committee, he explained, could not give final approval to this project, which is in a state of flux.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the proposal with casement windows provided that, if structurally feasible, the original window openings, which extended up to the frieze band, are reopened, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and Standard 10 [New additions

and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.] It also suggests that the standard set by this project be maintained for all storefronts in the building.

JF

625 North 16th Street

Jonathan Oler, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: New side stairs, close rear door, rear parking and fence

This property underwent a major renovation, but some aspects were not finished or did not conform to previously approved plans. The new owner now wishes to make some changes, many of which can be reviewed at staff level, such as replicating the missing cornice and repairing the chimney; other proposed changes require Commission review. The current proposal includes legalizing several items: removing the basement windows in the rear ell and applying stucco to the watertable; redirecting the stairs leading to the existing door on the side elevation; removing the existing door and stairs on the rear elevation. The application also includes installing a black aluminum fence surrounding the rear yard and parking area with a curb cut for three vehicles.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the new steps on the side and closing in the rear door, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Approval of the rear fence and parking, pursuant to the site guideline. Approval of the closing of the basement windows and the application of stucco on the rear ell watertable for a period not to exceed two years. Within the two-year period, the stucco must be removed and the basement windows replaced, pursuant to Standard 6.

Ms. Spina presented the project to the Committee. Mr. Citro, a zoning consultant for the applicant, submitted the project's zoning approval as well as a letter of support from the Spring Garden Civic Association. Committee members asked how the rear fence and gate at the parking area would operate. The applicant explained the system and noted that the Streets Department had approved the 27-foot curb cut. Committee members also inquired about the mechanism for administering the 2-year grace period for the basement windows. Ms. Spina explained that the staff tracks several time-limited agreements such as the one proposed and would inspect the property for compliance at the expiration of the grace period.

The Architectural Committee concurred with the staff recommendation and voted to approve the new steps on the side and the closing of the rear door, 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.] 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.]; to approve the rear fence and parking, pursuant to the site guideline [Recommended: designing new on-site parking when required by the new use so that it is as unobtrusive as possible.]; and to approve the closing of the basement windows and the application of the stucco on the rear ell watertable for a period not to exceed two years. Within the two-year period, the stucco must be removed and the basement windows replaced, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated 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.], all with staff to review details.

JF

1717 Spring Garden Street

Mario Santoro, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1878, by Charles Budd for John B. Stetson

PROPOSAL: New rear addition and balcony, new side dormers

The owner is converting this single-family residence, the Stetson Mansion, into four condominiums. Currently, the building has a projecting greenhouse addition on the rear at the second-floor level. The proposal calls for a first-floor addition filling the space under the greenhouse as well as a third-floor balcony above the greenhouse. The first-floor addition would have metal, fish-scale shingles, one-over-one windows, and a single-leaf door with steps on the side elevation. At the third-floor rear, an existing double-hung window would be removed and the opening expanded to accommodate a new single-leaf door leading to the proposed balcony. On the side of the rear ell, the proposal stipulates a new door and steps at the first-floor level and two new shed dormers at the fourth-floor or mansard level. The wood dormers would be fenestrated with coupled, one-over-one windows and would be detailed like the existing dormer on the rear façade. The plans do not provide details including materials for the new windows and doors.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the first-floor addition and side door, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Attachment and support details for the balcony must be submitted before the staff can render a judgment; however, staff recommends approval of changing the window to a door in concept. The new door should have a design that echoes the original window. Denial of the side dormers, pursuant to Standard 9 and the roofing guideline [*Not recommended: Radically changing a character-defining roof shape ... as a result of incompatible design....*]

Ms. Spina introduced the project. Then Mr. Peterson, the architect, explained that the balcony would not rest on the greenhouse, but would be independent of it; however, he did not include attachment details. He also explained that the new dormers would allow for a condominium unit in the attic.

After inspecting the plans, Mr. Levy asserted that one of the two proposed dormers was not necessary; only the proposed southern dormer for the master bedroom was needed. The owner agreed that the second, northern dormer was not required, but was included for extra light. The architect then noted that the proposed dormers could be lowered on the mansard to avoid disrupting the roofline. The Committee deemed the lowering of the dormers a good idea. Discussion shifted to the balcony. The owner stated that he, in fact, wanted to install a much smaller balcony than the one depicted in the drawings. He preferred a simple, shallow but wide balcony.

*The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of first-story addition, new side door and steps, balcony with door, and the southern dormer below the mansard roofline, 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.]; 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.]. Denial of the northern dormer, pursuant to Standard 9 and the roofing guideline [*Not recommended: Radically changing a character-defining roof shape ... as a result of incompatible design....*].*

JF

1903-05 Green Street

Fred Duling, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1903; c. 1859, refaced with Roman brick c. 1895, 1905; c. 1935

PROPOSAL: Three-story addition with underground parking at 1905, roof decks on 1903 and 1905

The Commission previously approved the demolition of the addition at 1905 Spring Garden and the rear ell of 1903 Spring Garden as well as the concept of the rehabilitation of 1903 and the construction of a four-story addition with parking at 1905. The owners have secured a new architect and now seek final approval of a new design.

For 1903, the proposed rehabilitation includes reopening the basement windows, restoring the brick, replacing the non-historic door with a single-leaf door with sidelights, reopening the transom, and installing a small metal fence to create a front garden.

The new addition at 1905 will replicate the height, massing, and fenestration of 1903. Although 1903 is faced with Roman brick, the addition would be faced red brick. The watertable, lintels, and sills would be of cast stone. The cornice would replicate the profile of the cornice at 1903, but would have only four brackets. A single-leaf door with sidelights and a transom would be set in a squared opening with softened corners. Like 1903, the addition would include a metal garden fence. At the center of the development a double-leaf wood door would lead to basement-level parking.

Both 1903 and 1905 would have roof decks, one on each of the rear ells and two on the main roofs. Small penthouses, sheathed in metal, would house stairs. The penthouses and main roof decks would sit 14½ feet back from the front cornices.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the addition, but the cornice should have a different profile than the one on 1903 Spring Garden, pursuant to Standard 9 and the setting guidelines. Denial of the proposed door for 1903; the historic, double-leaf door should be reconstructed, pursuant to the entrance guideline. Denial of the roof decks and penthouses on main roof of 1903, pursuant to Standard 9.

Ms. Spina introduced the project. The Committee then discussed the project with the applicant and his architect. The applicant agreed to substitute a historically appropriate double-leaf door as suggested by staff for the single-leaf door proposed for 1903 Spring Garden. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he would like to see modifications to the proposed cornice; as submitted, it appeared as if some of the brackets were missing. The architect agreed to revise the cornice design with coupled brackets. Mr. Levy and Mr. D'Alessandro turned the discussion to the roof decks. They explained to the applicant that a Commission policy allows for decks on rear ells, but not on front sections of historic row buildings. Therefore, they concluded, the Committee could not recommend approval of any decks on the front section of the historic building at 1903 Green Street. It could, though, recommend approval of all the decks proposed for the new construction at 1905, provided that they are not visible from any public right-of-way, as well as the rear ell decks at 1903. The architect suggested that the decks on the front section of 1903 could be moved back further from the cornice-line. The Committee countered that no amount of setback on the front section would satisfy the Commission's prohibition of decks on the front sections of historic row buildings.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the addition at 1905 Spring Garden with the revisions to the cornice, 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 [Recommended: designing and constructing new additions to historic building when required for a new use. New work should be compatible with the historic character of the setting in terms of size, scale, design, material, color and texture.]; and [Recommended: designing new parking so that it is as unobtrusive as possible, thus minimizing the effect on the historic character of the setting.]. Approval of the rehabilitation of 1903 Spring Garden with substitution of a double-leaf door for the proposed single-leaf door, pursuant to the entrance guideline [Recommended: designing and constructing a new entrance when the historic entrance is completely missing. It may be a restoration based on historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building.] Denial of the roof decks and penthouses on main roof of 1903 Spring Garden, 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.]. All with staff to review details.

JF

2319-31 Green Street, St. Francis Xavier Church

Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Owner

Brian Reinmiller, Applicant

DATE: 1894-1898, Edwin Forrest Durang, architect, renovated by Durang, 1906-1908

PROPOSAL: New light fixtures

This application proposes installing two light fixtures on a landing at the front steps leading to St. Francis Xavier Church in the Spring Garden Historic District. A photograph taken in the mid to late 1940s and submitted with the application shows that two 5-lamp, metal light fixtures once stood near the locations proposed for these new fixtures. The proposed 5-lamp, aluminum fixtures would be manufactured by Sun Valley Lighting. They would be approximately 10' tall and of a color not yet determined. The globes would be either spherical or acorn in shape. The applicant has chosen the following fixture components shown in the enclosed specification: the 1070 fluted shaft, the LAE1-YA diffuser, and the arm shown in illustration H. The proposed fixtures would approximate but not duplicate the historic fixtures.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided that a spherical, not acorn, globe is chosen, pursuant to Restoration Standard 7.

Mr. Farnham presented the application for new light fixtures on a landing in front of the church to the Committee. Brian Reinmiller, the contractor for the church, then answered questions about the project. He agreed that the lights would have spherical as opposed to acorn shaped globes and that the design is loosely based on lights shown in an old photo of the building. Committee members noted that that picture showed a slightly different placement of the lights.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval with the spherical globes, with staff to review details, pursuant to Restoration Standard 7 [Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.].

RB

2135 Green Street

Eve Chaloner and William Merewether, Owners

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: New windows with applied muntins, 2nd floor rear addition with bay, roof deck and stairtower

This application proposes a series of alterations to the Green and Clay Street facades of the brick rowhouse at 2135 Green Street. At the front or Green Street façade, it proposes new 4/4 double-hung wood windows at the first story. The vertical muntins would be true-divided-light; the horizontal muntins would be "Simulite" or simulated-divided-light. The "Simulite" muntins would allow for the employment of double-pane insulated glass in these very large windows.

The alterations on Clay Street would be more numerous. A two-story stair tower with glazed door, casement windows, and a stucco finish is proposed for the side yard. A door and window would be replaced with a very large picture window at the first story of the west façade of the rear ell; the stair tower would block any public view of this window. At the rear or north façade of the rear ell, French doors would replace a window at the first story; the second-story deck on the one-story addition would be removed; a large bay window would replace a door and window at the second story; the third-story deck on the second-story addition would be reconstructed; and French doors would replace a deck access door at the third story. All alterations but the picture window would be highly visible from Clay Street, a narrow service alley.

In October 2001, the Architectural Committee reviewed a project that included all of the above-noted rear alterations as well as the addition of a 4th story on the front half of the main section and the entirety of the rear ell. The Committee recommended denial of the application because of the 4th-story addition, especially its visibility. The applicant withdrew the proposal before its review by the Commission.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 6 and 9.

Mr. Farnham introduced the proposal. John Merriwether, the owner and applicant, discussed the project including the new front windows that would include a combination of true and simulated divided lights. He also discussed the proposed stair tower and bay addition on the rear of the building, which is visible only from Clay Street, a service alley. He also explained the placement of a picture window, which would be hidden in the courtyard created by the stair tower. Members noted numerous, often larger, rear alterations that had recently been approved on this block of Clay Street.

The Architectural committee unanimously recommended approval of the application, with staff to review details including the light pattern of the front windows, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; 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.].

RB

829 North 29th Street

North 29th Street Association, Owner

William Alesker, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1874

PROPOSAL: Rear addition-final approval

This application seeks final approval of a project that received conceptual approval at the Historical Commission's February 2003 meeting. The application proposes the construction of a three-story addition along the rear, east façade of the Second Empire building at 829 N. 29th Street. The owner is converting the former brewery headquarters into a mixed office and residential development. The addition would house four stairways granting access to residential units on the upper two floors. The Commission's conceptual approval stipulated the addition of more dormers at the mansard or third-story section of the addition. The original design included four dormers; the current, updated design includes six. The design is otherwise identical to that conceptually approved in February.

Staff Recommendation: The application meets the requirements set forth in the Commission's February 2003 conceptual approval.

Mr. Farnham introduced the project. Bill Alesker, the architect for the property at 829 N. 29th Street, presented the updated design for a rear addition, which had been reviewed and approved in concept by the Commission with the stipulation that more dormers be added to the new roof. The new design showed the greater number of dormers.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval of the updated design.

RB

328-30 Delancey Street

Richard Cohen, Owner

Christopher Scalone, Architect/Applicant

DATE: Two rowhouses reconstructed in 1950

PROPOSAL: Complete demolition, new construction with garage

This application proposes the construction of a large, single-family, 3-story, brick house at 328-330 Delancey Street. On 9 March 2001, L&I recorded the consolidation of the plots at 328 and 330 Delancey Street as well as the rear portion of the plot at 329 Pine Street into one large parcel. The construction of the house would require the demolition of two 1950s row houses, which has already been approved by the Commission. At its June 2000 meeting, the Commission reclassified the two buildings from "contributing" to "non-contributing" resources in the Society Hill Historic District. At its July 2000 meeting, it gave final approval to the demolition as well as conceptual approval to the new construction. The conceptual approval lapsed in July 2001.

The proposed design is very much like the design given conceptual approval. It is a large, 3-story building faced in brick. The architect has sensitively massed the Delancey Street façade to appear as three separate structures, thereby maintaining the rhythm and scale of the neighborhood's smaller, brick row houses. Like the earlier design, this plan includes a garage at 328 Delancey Street. The Streets Department approved the application for the curb cut on 7 December 2000.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

Richard Cohen, owner and Christopher Scalone, architect, attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Mr. Scalone and Mr. Farnham discussed the design that received the earlier conceptual approval. Mr. Scalone produced a drawing that accurately represented the conceptual design seen previously by Committee and Commission. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the community has commented on the final design. Mr. Scalone stated that the community did review the project previously and the design had not changed substantially. Mr. Farnham observed that the Committee meetings are open to the public and the Society Hill Civic Association was notified of the Committee's agenda. One near neighbor did review the proposal prior to the Committee meeting and stated that she approved of the project. The Committee and the applicant discussed the setbacks of the different elements on the new façade, which allow the large building to appear as three separate buildings.

The Committee voted 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.].

JB

227 South 16th Street, Lippincott Building

MCW Enterprises, Incorporated, Owner

Stephen Verner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1900, William Pritchett, architect

PROPOSAL: New doors and ladders on roof of north elevation

The developer previously proposed three large mechanical rooms on the roof of the north façade to house the elevator machinery. Catwalks and two ladders connected the rooms. Both Committee and Commission approved the three rooms and a single ladder, but denied the catwalks and the second ladder.

The developer now says that access to all rooms from the exterior is essential and proposes to have visible doors and ladders on all three extensions. Staff suggested having the access from the main attic space, but this would necessitate infill between the rooms and the roof, creating dormer-like projections. Also, the architect says that this alternative is not feasible.

Staff recommendation: As the Committee and Commission stated before, access to these mechanical rooms should be from the interior. If the applicant can prove that this is infeasible, the staff recommends approval of the previous submission from December 2002, pursuant to the roofing guideline.

Stephen Verner, architect, attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant if the original design with catwalks between the mechanical rooms was still possible. Mr. Verner responded that the intent of the original design was no longer possible because the mechanical room floor plans now require access doors on the north side. The Committee agreed that a continuous catwalk across the face of the mechanical rooms would be more visible than the proposed scheme of three separate ladders. The Committee discussed the high visibility of the north façade and the cluttered appearance of the various schemes. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the proposed color of the new addition. Mr. Verner responded that they are considering painted metal in a "zinc" color for the roof, mechanical

rooms, ladders and doors. The Committee and applicant discussed mounting a sample of the painted metal on the roof for review by the staff and/or Committee.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised scheme with three ladders, provided a sample of the painted metal is mounted on the roof for review by Committee and staff, pursuant to the roofing guideline [Recommended: designing additions to roofs such as elevator housing when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

JB

322 South Lawrence Court

Jack Panitch, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1970, Bower & Fradley, architects, for Penn Tower Development Corporation

PROPOSAL: Replace windows

This application proposes replacing the 2nd-story front and 3rd-story front and rear casement windows with new Pella casement windows in the Late Modern townhouse at 322 South Lawrence Court. The overall dimensions of the replacements would match the originals, but the dimensions of the details such as the widths of the dividing mullions (7/8" original vs. 1½" new) and sash (1½" original vs. 2 1/8" new) would differ from the originals. Unlike the original wood windows, the replacements would be clad with aluminum on the exterior. The original brickmold would be replicated.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5 and 6.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. The Committee discussed the submission and decided that the proposed windows did not sufficiently replicate the original windows in materials and dimensions.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; and Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.].

12 South 12th Street, PSFS Building

Loews Hotel, Owner

Patrick Dewey, Applicant

DATE: 1932, George Howe and William Lescaze, architects

PROPOSAL: Awning

This application proposes the installation of a shed awning over a Market Street doorway at the PSFS Building. One of the first and most important International Style buildings in the United States, the PSFS Building is, perhaps, the most architecturally significant building in Philadelphia. The proposed awning would obscure a segment of the original, stainless steel storefront and interrupt its flowing lines. From a preservation perspective, this or any awning on

the Market and 12th Street façades would be entirely inappropriate.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal for an awning with signage.

Patrick Dewey, the applicant, explained that the proposed awning, rather than a flat sign would give presence to the first-floor restaurant. He said that the proposed two-foot projecting fabric awning would be open at the top, allowing for the original stainless steel to be seen. Mr. Dewey noted that the recessed entryway dictates the projection of the awning.

Mr. Levy thought the awning inappropriate since none had ever been situated in that location. Mr. McCoubrey commented that he understands the need for identification of the restaurant; however, he believes that the proposed awning would not achieve this objective. Committee members concurred that the proposed awning is inappropriate and suggested possibly some type signage, even neon, behind the curved glass flanking the entrance.

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

327 South Juniper Street

Sheldon Strober and C. Scott Trull, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Install skylight, roof deck with hatch, stockade garden fence

This application proposes the following alterations to the row house at 327 S. Juniper Street:

1. a 4'x4' skylight in the front half of the gable roof
2. an 8'x16' roof deck on the flat roof of a small rear addition
3. a Bilco deck access door on the rear half of the gable roof
4. a 6'-tall wood stockade fence at the south and east edges of the rear garden

The deck would be placed on a rear, 3-story addition, like a diminutive rear ell, that was built about 1920. The skylight would not be visible from any public right-of-way, but the deck and fence would be highly visible from Panama Street. No buildings front onto this block of Panama Street.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs guideline.

C. Scott Trull and Sheldon Strober, the owners, attended the meeting. Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Mr. Levy inquired if the gate would open onto the neighbor's property and suggested that, if so, the applicant obtain permission from the neighbor. Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the streetscape of Panama Street. Mr. Farnham explained that this block of Panama is very short and narrow and is lined by side and rear but no front facades. The Committee discussed the proposed deck and agreed that the railing dimensions require adjustments in order to meet code.

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

235 South 10th Street aka 934 Locust Street

Linda Holberg, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Legalize vinyl replacement windows

This application proposes the legalization of 18 windows installed without the Commission's approval in the brick commercial and residential building at 235 S. 10th Street. The applicant installed 1/1 vinyl windows with snap-in muntins; 6/6 wood true-divided-light windows are the historically appropriate windows. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation on 17 December 2002. The applicant has applied to the Commission for other work to this property in the past and, therefore, was aware of the building's status as historic. Also, the property houses one commercial and six residential units; therefore, a building permit would be required to install new windows in this property regardless of its historic status.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5 and 6.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal for the legalization of windows installed without a permit, and noted that the historically correct window is the six-over-six configuration. Linda Holberg, acknowledged that she is aware of the historical status of the property; however, she said that she did not know that a permit is required for changing windows. She pointed out that the sash was replaced and the frames retained. Ms. Pentz said that vinyl windows do not meet the *Standards*, therefore in good faith the Committee could not recommend their legalization.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; and Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.].

1001 Chestnut Street, Victory Building

Philadelphia Management, Owner

Annette Billups, Applicant

DATE: 1873, Henry Fernbach, architect; three floors added by Phillip Roos, architect; three-bay annex added by Roos, 1895, two bays added to annex by Roos, 1900

PROPOSAL: New doors in annex

This application proposes alterations to two doorways at the Victory Building. At the Chestnut Street entrance to the annex, a roll-down metal gate as well as the glass block in the transom

would be removed. Glazed wood doors, a single-light transom, a wood panel with stainless steel lettering, and a large divided-light transom would be installed in the opening. At the rear or Ludlow Street façade of the 1873 building, infill would be removed from an opening and a single-leaf metal door surrounded by metal infill panels would be installed.

Owing to the importance of this building, the doorways should be restored to their historic appearances. Research that would uncover documentation of the original appearances of these doorways and provide a basis for their restoration should be undertaken. If the original doorway on Ludlow Street cannot be documented, a double-leaf door, not a single-leaf door with infill, should be proposed. All historic fabric, especially the cast iron at the Ludlow Street opening, should be safeguarded.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Jonathan Broh, the architect, Matthew Koenig, and Annette Billups attended the meeting. In response to Ms. Pentz's query about the basis for the proposed design, Mr. Broh said that the design of the door had been researched and that the proposed design would not require the removal of historic fabric except the glass block in the transom.

The Committee said that given the significance of this building, it believed that the exterior should be restored to its historic appearance. The Committee discussed the proposed doorway on Chestnut Street and found it inappropriate for a building constructed about 1900. The design looked to be from the 1930s, they claimed. Mr. Tyler commented that without any documentation of the historic doorway, the applicant should propose something sympathetic with its time. Mr. Levy suggested exploring the existing conditions more thoroughly to determine how the doorway has been altered. Mr. McCoubrey thought that the proposed infill panels at the rear entrance should be avoided. The Committee asserted that more research should be pursued before any final decisions are made.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]. It thought that the applicant should pursue more research.

1226-32 Walnut Street

Royal Bank of Pennsylvania, Owner

Liz Pisano, Applicant

DATE: 1901-04, Horace Trumbauer, architect

PROPOSAL: Cut new storefront door, install ATM, close existing door

This application has four parts. First, the bank wishes to close the entrance on Walnut Street, which would entail removing the doors and installing the granite base from the next bay and a large single-light window to match others on the elevation. Second, the bay just to the left of the current door would have the window changed to a door. The proposal includes removing the granite base and installing a single-leaf door with sidelights and multi-light transom. The plans do not include details of material or the plane of the entrance system. Third, the application calls for the removal of the double-leaf door and historic stone frame in the easternmost bay to install an ATM machine with enameled aluminum panels. The plastic, back-lit ATM sign that covers the historic transom will remain, though the file has no record of the Commission approving it. Lastly, the proposal includes changing the signage on the awnings. The awnings hide ornate

tracery in the Walnut Street transoms. The owner of the building applied to legalize these awnings in 1994; the Commission did not approve them.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2, Standard 5 and Standard 9. The Commission has required that ATM machines remain on the interior of the building, as this one currently stands. Unless the applicant can document the need to change the location of the entrance, the historic entrance should not change. The illegal awnings should be removed completely.

Robert Tabas, Jeffrey A. Bossert and Joseph Campbell attended the meeting. Mr. Tabas said that the entrance has double-leaf doors with each leaf only 2-feet wide. He noted that they wanted the building to meet ADA requirements. Also, he believes that the original entrance was in the second bay, but did not have a photograph or other information to substantiate that claim. The current ATM machine is in a vestibule, but the bank wants it on the street, citing security concerns. Mr. Tabas referred to the ATM machine at 13th and Walnut Streets, which is on the outside. Mr. Campbell said that the proposed alterations would allow for an ADA entranceway. The applicant is redesigning the interior space and moving the entrance over one bay would be helpful in the new design. Mr. Campbell thought that the location of the ATM very important owing to the access needed for its maintenance.

Mr. McCoubrey said that other banks have the same security concerns, and that the Committee's charge is the preservation of historic fabric. Ms. Spina noted that the plans for the ATM machine call for the removal of the historic, decorative moldings and jamb, but Mr. Tabas thought that the moldings would remain in place. Mr. Levy thought that more dimensions and information is needed to be able to address the ADA issues. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out the difficulty in the re-location of the door with the removal of its moldings and jambs. Again, the applicant claimed that the historic configuration would remain, although the plans showed a different design. Committee members agreed that the door location should remain, unless the applicant can produce documentation that the door was in a different location.

Ms. Spina stated that the Commission did not approve the awnings in 1994. The Committee members concurred that historic, ornate transoms on the Walnut Street façade should not be obscured. Mr. Campbell thought that the awnings could accommodate the signage. The Committee offered the applicants suggestions for other types of signage for the building.

The Committee thought the proposal should be tabled to allow more research on the historic entrance and for the applicant to correct the drawings to reflect the actual application.

The Architectural Committee recommended the tabling of the proposal for a period not to exceed thirty (30) days.

24-48 South Broad Street, Girard Trust Bank

The Ritz Carlton, Owner

Myra DeGersdorf, Applicant

DATE: Dome: 1905-08, McKim, Mead & White and Furness, Evans & Co., architects; tower: c. 1930, McKim, Mead & White, architects

PROPOSAL: Replacement door on Chestnut Street, new awnings

This application calls for replacing the door on Chestnut Street with a double-leaf glazed, painted metal door in the existing frame. The door was created to accommodate the building's use as a hotel. The proposal also calls for 18 awnings on the Chestnut, South Broad and South Penn Street facades. These will be installed at the transom bars of the windows and have signage on

the aprons.

Only the domed building appears on the Philadelphia Register; the tower is not in the Commission's jurisdiction. Photographs from 1908 and 1911 show the building without awnings, a period when awnings were used throughout the city on commercial and residential buildings.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the replacement doors, with staff to review shop drawings. Denial of the awnings except over the Chestnut Street door, pursuant to storefront guideline.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. David Graham and Ken Simmons attended the meeting. Mr. Graham said that the proposed awnings would advertise the presence of restaurants in the hotel. He said that the signage on the awnings would change as the restaurants change. Mr. Graham said that the proposed awnings would be attached to the transom bars of the windows.

Ms. Pentz thought that the awnings in the portico do not make sense. Owing to the depth in the portico, the awnings will not achieve their objective. Mr. Tyler pointed out that the tower is not under the Commission's jurisdiction; therefore awnings could be installed on those windows. Committee thought the replacement door with an awning above on the Chestnut Street façade appropriate. It recommended that the applicant devise a plan for signage behind the glass on the remaining windows of the domed building.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the replacement door on Chestnut Street and approval of the awning above the Chestnut Street door, with staff to review shop drawings. Denial of all other awnings on the domed building, pursuant to the storefront guideline [Not recommended: using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy remaining character-defining features of the historic building.].

1100 Block of Sigel Street

Michael Lavery, Water Department, Applicant

DATE: c.1900

PROPOSAL: Replace brick paving with asphalt

This dead-end street has red brick paving and is lined with commercial and light-industrial buildings. Currently, only one property owner has a water line and it requires replacement. The Water Department budgeted for the one water line and the reinstallation of the brick paving. Now other property owners on the street wish to have water lines and the department does not have the budget to install all of the lines and repave the street in brick. The department also claims that the brick has deteriorated beyond repair and it would be infeasible to repave the street with it.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2, Standard 9, and Standard 10.

Robin Schatz, Chief of Staff for Councilman Frank DiCicco, Carl Jadach and Lennart Rustam of the Philadelphia Water Department, and Kathleen Durham of the Streets Department/Historical Commission attended the meeting. Mr. Rustam said that one resident is to receive a new water line; however, the Water Department has been petitioned by other residents to install water lines on this block. If the Historical Commission does not require the reinstallation of the brick, the Department would install the additional water lines without charge to the property owners. Mr. Rustam believes that it would be difficult to replace the bricks in kind owing to the condition of the street. In addition, he said that this is a garage-lined street and the residents would prefer asphalt owing to the noise created by the brick pavers. Mr. Rustam said that there is an economic issue for the property owners because if the street paving has to be replaced in kind,

then the Water Department will not give service to these residents.

Committee members inquired about the size of the trenches to be dug and if they could be dug on the sides in such a way to retain the bricks in the center. Mr. Rustam said that the two lines to be installed require a two-foot trench and a three-and-a-half foot trench, and the Street Department restrictions require that the trenches extend to the curb. Ms. Pentz remarked that the paving is the only feature of this historic street.

Mr. Tyler pointed out that the integrity of this street is very high. He emphasized that lists of the proposed designated streets were sent to various departments on two occasions, with no response either time. He pointed out that the percentage of streets designated is minimal compared to the number of streets in the city; only 328 blocks throughout the city constitute the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. He also noted that when a private contractor does work in a designated street, he is charged an extra fee so that the Streets Department can patch the area in kind. Staff strongly opposed the replacement of this block with asphalt. Committee members agreed that the integrity of this street should not be lost.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.], Standard 6 [Deteriorated 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.] 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.].

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary