

**THE MINUTES OF THE 516th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
12 August 2005**

**1515 Arch Street, Room 18025
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair**

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair

James Brown, IV

Eileen Evans, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses & Inspections

Warren Huff, Director of Urban Design, City Planning Commission

Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property

Sara Merriman, Special Assistant to the Director, Department of Commerce

Vincent Rivera, AIA

Harris Steinberg, AIA

Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.

Norman Tissian

Scott Wilds, Deputy Commissioner, Office of Housing & Community Development

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist

Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner

Jonathan E. Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Officer

Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Eileen Quigley, Esq., Senior Attorney, Law Department

Also

David O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbors Association

Joanne Phillips, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll

Eileen M. Magee, The Athenaeum of Philadelphia

Serge Nalbantian, Brown Hill Development

David Mercuris, Washington West Association

Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Matt DeJulio, Society Hill Civic Association

Andrea Layden, Society Hill Civic Association

Bernice Hamel, Society Hill Civic Association

Carol LeFaivre Rochester, Society Hill Civic Association

Michael Rochester, Society Hill Civic Association

Steven Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association

Bradley Griffith

Bob Toryak, St. James Court

Beuela Fuer Langsday, Lippincott Condominiums

Michael Sher, WSE

Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Robert Powers, Powers & Company

Carole Sivin, Hopkinson House

Tania Rorke, Society Hill Civic Association

Peggy Conver, Chestnut Hill Academy

Paul C. Smith

Norman Lieberman
Sylvia W. Lieberman
Allen S. Kirschner
Frances D. Kirschner
Robin Komita
Nancy Frenze
Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association
Liz Zimmers, Zimmers Associates
Michelle McKnight
Mary Cole
Edwin Rivera, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Mark Wieand, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
David A. Hayne
Philip Lipkin
Wayne Zukin, Zukin Development
Robert W. Freedman, Goldenberg Group
David Brownlee
Robert Rosen
Art Elwood, 200 Christian Street
Steve Pollock, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
Craig Deutsch, Harman & Deutsch Architects
A. Michael
Bruce Lavery, The Athenaeum of Philadelphia
Cynthia Dahl, Society Hill Civic Association
Julie Dowfrib, PEM
Kate Jefferson, SDN
Richard DeMarco, Klehr Harrison, LLP
Gregory Heller, Ed Bacon Foundation
Mike Zuckerman, University of Pennsylvania
Randall Cotton, Preservation Alliance
Thomas Scheufele
Anjani Jain, 31 Summit Street
Lorna Katz-Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Cara Carroccia, Cara Carroccia Architects
Gerry Gutierrez, Group G Architects
Mike Wass, Society Hill Civic Association
Sally Katz, Society Hill Civic Association
Jean C. Drake
Jeff Krieger, Krieger Architects
Jeff Goldstein

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 516th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:05 a.m.

THE MINUTES OF THE 515TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Upon a motion made by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Mr. Tissian, the Commission voted to approve the minutes of the 515th Stated Meeting, 8 July 2005, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue, Vice-Chair, because of his firm's involvement with the Dilworth application.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 28 JULY 2005

Thomas Sugrue, Chair

1000 and 1020 South Broad Street and 1001 South 15th Street

Designation Committee Recommendation: rescission of the designations of 1000 and 1020 South Broad Street, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the Rules & Regulations and the reaffirmation of the designation of 1001 South 15th Street

This application proposes the rescissions of the individual designations of parcels now known as 1000 and 1020 S. Broad Street. The Historical Commission designated the two parcels along with a third as historic under the single address of 1000 S. Broad Street on 31 May 1966. Historically, the site was occupied by a complex of buildings known collectively as the Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore Railroad Station. The site is bounded by Broad, Washington, 15th and Carpenter Streets.

In 1968, the federal government demolished all buildings on the site except the freight station train shed at the northwest corner. As a municipal agency, the Historical Commission could not assert its jurisdiction over the federally owned properties. Therefore, the Commission neither reviewed nor approved the demolitions.

Sometime after 1968, the block was subdivided into the three parcels. The School District of Philadelphia took title to the parcel located at the southwest corner of Broad and Carpenter Streets and now known as 1000 S. Broad Street. A Munroe Muffler Shop in a modern building now stands on the parcel.

In 1994, A & A Foods took title to the surviving historic freight station train shed, which stands on the portion of the site now known as 1001 S. 15th Street.

In 2001, the Philadelphia Authority for Industrial Development took title to the portion of the site now known as 1020 S. Broad Street, a large vacant parcel running between Broad and 15th Streets along Washington Avenue.

The applicant requests that the Commission rescind those portions of the original designation that are now known as 1000 and 1020 S. Broad Street, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of its Rules and Regulations. With the demolition by the federal government, "the resource has ceased to meet the criteria for listing on the Register because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed." The applicant also requests that the Commission retain the designation of the surviving historic resource under its current address, 1001 S. 15th Street.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Commission members.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

103-05 and 107-09 Walnut Street

Designation Committee Recommendation: rescissions of the individual designations of 103-05 and 107-09 Walnut Street, but the maintenance of the site on the Register as “non-contributing” to the Old City Historic District

This application proposes the rescissions of the individual designations of 103-105 and 107-109 Walnut Street. It does not propose any action on the district designations.

The Historical Commission designated as historic the buildings at 103-05 and 107-09 Walnut Street on 26 May 1970 as part of a larger effort to designate numerous nineteenth-century commercial structures between Front and Second Streets in Old City.

During the early 1990s, the Commission and its Committees reviewed proposals to demolish the buildings, which had fallen into disrepair. The owner at the time claimed that the buildings were dangerous and could not be reasonably reused. The Department of Licenses & Inspections declared 103-05 Walnut, but not 107-09 Walnut, imminently dangerous. Preservation and neighborhood activists claimed that the buildings suffered from demolition by neglect. On 13 December 1995, the Commission unanimously approved “the demolition of 103-05 Walnut Street based solely on economic hardship without reference to the building’s condition or how it got that way and conditioned upon the owner’s erecting the fence wall shown in the submitted plan.” It also unanimously approved “the demolition of 107-09 Walnut Street also based on economic hardship.” The buildings were demolished soon thereafter, but the “fence wall” was never erected.

The vacant parcels were designated as non-contributing sites in the Old City Historic District in 2003. In June 2005, the Commission approved the construction of a mid-rise condominium building on the site.

The applicant requests the rescissions pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the Commission’s Rules & Regulations. That section stipulates that an entry may be rescinded from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places if “the resource has ceased to meet the criteria for listing on the Register because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed...” The sites were designated because of the nineteenth-century commercial structures that stood on them. Those buildings were demolished with the Commission’s approval, albeit without the satisfaction of the “fence wall” provision.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal.

Mr. Tissian moved to accept the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

223-25 South 6th Street, Dilworth House

Designation Committee Recommendation: denial of the application and the reaffirmation of the current classification of both the house and site at 223-25 S. 6th Street as “significant” to the Society Hill Historic District

The owners of the property at 223-25 S. 6th Street, commonly known as the Dilworth House, have submitted an application requesting that the Historical Commission amend its classification of the property in the inventory for the Society Hill Historic District from a single “significant” classification to a “non-contributing” classification for the building and

a “contributing” classification for the site. The Commission first designated the house as historic in 1999 with the creation of the Society Hill Historic District. The house was erected by Mayor Richardson and Ann Dilworth in 1957 to plans prepared by architect G. Edwin Brumbaugh in late 1956 and early 1957. The Mayor and his wife moved into the house in December 1957 and resided there until the ends of their lives.

The applicants seek the reclassification to facilitate the complete demolition of the historic house and the construction of a 15-story luxury condominium building. In parallel with this application, they have submitted an in-concept application seeking the approval of the demolition and new construction.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Joanne Phillips, representing the applicants, John and Mary Turchi, addressed the Commission and requested that the review of the application be continued to a special meeting of the Commission. She noted that she had discussed this request with the City’s Law Department and that she had informed Paul Boni and Larry Silver of the opposition of her plan to make the request. Ms. Phillips explained that she did not accept the thirty-minute time limit for her presentation proposed by Mr. Sugrue, that her team needed more time to review the materials submitted at the 28 July meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation, and that he witnesses were not present at the meeting. She also added that the granting of continuances by the Historical Commission was customary.

Mr. Sugrue stated that, at his direction, the Historical Commission’s staff had presented the applicant and opposition with two options for the subsequent review immediately after the meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. If both the applicant and opposition agreed to limit their presentations to 30 minutes each, the Commission would review the application at its meeting of 12 August 2005. If either party was not willing to limit its presentation, the Commission would arrange a special meeting to review the Dilworth matter, probably in September. Mr. Farnham reiterated Mr. Sugrue’s statement and specified that he had informed Ms. Phillips that he required a response from her prior to the issuance of agenda for the 12 August 2005 Commission meeting. Ms. Phillips answered that she had declined the 30-minute time limit offer and had requested a special meeting. She had discussed the matter with the City’s Law Department through email and phone conversations.

Mr. Sugrue asked Ms. Phillips why he had not received her request for a continuance in writing until 8 August 2005. Ms. Phillips answered that she had informed the City’s Law Department of her intent to request a continuance in emails and conversations with Mr. Reuter.

Mr. Wilds stated that the Commission usually grants continuances on the day of the meeting and that he believed that this was not an unusual request. Mr. Farnham clarified that under the Rules & Regulations the staff is empowered to grant one thirty-day continuance for building permit applications, but that the Rules did not offer continuance procedures for designation applications. Mr. Wilds added that the typical motion for such requests was to table the application for up to six months. Ms. Phillips clarified that six months was the time limit for building permit applications, but that, in her view, there was no time restriction for designation applications.

Mr. Steinberg asked Mr. Farnham if he had given the applicant a specific deadline to respond to Mr. Sugrue’s offer of a 30-minute time limit or a special meeting. Mr.

Farnham answered that he had informed Ms. Phillips and Mr. McClure that they needed to respond by the beginning of the week of 1 August 2005. Ms. Phillips asserted that the offer should have been tendered in writing. She stated that the offer was made at the end of the meeting, while she was collecting her belongings. Mr. Farnham stated that the offer for a special meeting was made with a deadline for response to preclude the unnecessary expenditure of staff time to reproduce and mail the hundreds of pages of Dilworth documents to the Commission members and, more importantly, the needless attendance of the Commission meeting by dozens of members of the public, who expected the matter to be heard. Mr. Sugrue asked Mr. Farnham if there had been any other conversations between the staff and the applicant's attorney. Mr. Farnham answered that he attempted to contact Ms. Phillips when she did not respond to the offer. She was unavailable, so he left a telephone message for her during the afternoon of Wednesday, 3 August 2005 informing her that the offer for a special meeting had expired and that the application had to be placed on the agenda. Mr. Sugrue concurred with Mr. Farnham's statement, adding that Mr. Farnham had verified this course of action with him. Ms. Phillips stated that she had left a telephone message telling Mr. Farnham that she planned to request a continuance. She also added that a telephone message had been left for Mr. Reuter, informing him of her plan to request a continuance. She followed up on the message with an email.

Mr. Tissian agreed with some of his colleagues that thirty minutes was not enough time to discuss the project. He asked Ms. Phillips that if she would be willing to proceed today with an hour each party for presentations. Ms. Phillips answered in the negative and added that she had released all her witnesses. Mr. Tissian asked on what basis she had released her witnesses. She answered that she had done so based on her conversation with Mr. Reuter. Mr. Sugrue asked Ms. Phillips if she had also released her witnesses on the assumption that the Commission would grant the continuance. When she replied that she had, Mr. Sugrue replied: "That is a risky move."

Ms. Phillips asserted that the Commission commonly granted continuance requests. Mr. Farnham countered that he knew of no instance when the Commission had granted a continuance in a designation matter. He stated that, in fact, he knew of only one request for a continuance in a designation matter. He explained that attorney Neil Sklaroff, Ms. Phillips's colleague at Ballard Spahr, had requested a continuance during the review of the Presser Home nomination one year ago. The Commission denied the request before hearing two hours of testimony on the matter. Mr. Steinberg stated that the Commission should give this proposal a full hearing. He asserted that it is a project of extreme merit that warrants a special meeting. Mr. Wilds concurred with Mr. Steinberg.

Mr. Boni, speaking on behalf of the Society Hill Civic Association and the Preservation Alliance, contended that, in the opposition's opinion, the applicant had not presented any cogent reasons for a continuance and added that the applicant has the option to withdraw the application. He also mentioned that there had been ample time to review all new documents, which were not voluminous. He stated that Ms. Phillips had not identified the witnesses who were unavailable and why. He added that the date of this meeting was announced six weeks ago in mid June, yet the applicant had only requested a continuance three days ago.

Mr. Sugrue asked Mr. Boni if he believed a special meeting was appropriate, given the significance of the proposal. Mr. Boni answered that he believed that all relevant issues had been vetted at the Committee meeting and that he was prepared to present his case

with any time limitations imposed by the Commission.

Mr. Steinberg asked Mr. Farnham when the staff report had been made available to the public. He replied that the staff report was available one week before the Committee meeting, when it was mailed to the members of the Committee. He also specified that a copy of the staff recommendation had been provided to the applicant at the Designation Committee meeting. Ms. Phillips answered that she did not believe that had been the case and that it was not in her records.

Mr. Sugrue opened the floor to audience comments. Russell Harris, a Society Hill resident, mentioned that he opposed a continuance. He stated that he had ventured to the meeting today despite significant health problems. A postponement of the meeting would impose a personal hardship on him.

Tania York, the president of Society Hill Civic Association, asserted that the proposal had been thoroughly discussed at the Committee meeting and that her organization opposed a continuance.

Eileen Lipton, a Society Hill resident, stated that Venturi was a wonderful architect, but added that the Dilworth site was the wrong location for a mid-rise condominium building. She contended that this request for continuance was an attempt to delay the inevitable denial.

Marlene Zalacynk, a Society Hill resident, declared that the property is in a terrible state of disrepair and that a six-month postponement would allow the house to deteriorate further. Mr. Wilds mentioned that he had walked by the property early that day and that it was not in a terrible state of disrepair. Mr. Sugrue added that demolition by neglect was not the case here. Ms. Phillips objected to the claim that her client was demolishing the building by neglect.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization had accepted the 30-minute time limit and wished to proceed with the review. He added that Ms. Phillips had had plenty of time to review the new material since the Committee meeting. He also stated that he had never received any letters informing him of a request of continuation from the applicant. Ms. Phillips responded that the letter had been sent to his counsel, which was sufficient notice. Mr. Gallery closed the discussion by adding that he and his colleagues were present at the meeting and ready to proceed because they had been scheduled to appear. He added the amount of time was sufficient to review all the records. Mr. Sugrue asked Mr. Gallery if he believed that a lengthier presentation would be appropriate. Mr. Gallery answered that the presentation during the Designation Committee had been very extensive and that all the points made were presented in writing to the Commission. He felt that restating everything again would be unnecessary. He claimed that thirty minutes per side would easily accommodate the discussion. Mr. Tissan stated that he had spent five hours reading the report and supplemental documentation and that he found it to be repetitious. He said that the issues were clear and could be easily summarized.

Mr. Tissan made a motion to deny the request for a continuance and to grant each party one hour to present its case at today's meeting. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 2 to 6, with two abstentions. Ms. Merriman and Ms. Evans and Messrs. Wilds, James, Huff, and Rivera opposed and Messrs. Sugrue and Steinberg

abstained. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Tissian asked if the Commission should limit the discussion to a finite amount of time. Mr. Wilds suggested that one hour for each party would be appropriate, but that the time limit would not be included in his motion.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to grant a continuance until a special meeting in September 2005. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 8 to 2. Messrs. Tissian and Brown opposed. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JULY 2005

Vincent Rivera, Chair

223-25 South 6th Street, Dilworth House

Owner/Applicant: John and Mary Turchi

Built: 1957, G. Edwin Brumbaugh, architect, for Mayor Richardson Dilworth

Proposal: In concept, demolish significant building, construct 15-story residential building

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial of the demolition of the significant resource and denial without comment of the new construction, pursuant to §14-2007(7)(j) of the Philadelphia Code

This application proposes in concept to completely demolish a house and construct a 15-story residential building in its place at 223-225 S. 6th Street, on the east side of Washington Square. The house was designed and constructed by architect G. Edwin Brumbaugh in 1956 and 1957 for Mayor and Mrs. Richardson Dilworth and is listed as significant in the Society Hill Historic District.

Section 14-2007(7)(j) of the Philadelphia Code clearly defines the conditions under which the Commission may approve the demolition of a significant historic building. It states: "No permit shall be issued for the demolition of ... a building ... located within a historic district which contributes, in the Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Commission finds that issuance of a permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose which it is or may be reasonably adapted." As currently classified, the Dilworth House contributes to the character of the district, but the applicant has proffered no claim of hardship or public interest. Instead, the applicant has submitted a parallel application to the Committee on Historic Designation and the Commission proposing the reclassification of the Dilworth House from "significant" to a "non-contributing" building and a "contributing" site. The Committee on Historic Designation will review the application on July 28 and the Commission on August 12.

Until such a time when the Commission chooses to reclassify the Dilworth House as non-contributing, this Committee's options are limited to one. For its recommendation to be in compliance with the City ordinance governing the Commission, this Committee must recommend denial of the demolition. Furthermore, any discussion of the new construction by this Committee would presuppose the demolition and therefore run counter to the ordinance. The Committee should recommend denial of the new construction without comment on its architectural or other merits.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to table the proposal for a period not to exceed six months. Ms.

Merriman seconded the proposal, which passed unanimously. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

421 Chestnut Street

Owner: 421 Chestnut, LP

Applicant: Jay Tackett, architect

History: 1857-1859, John M. Gries, architect; rear addition, 1903, Theophilus Chandler, architect

Proposal: Final approval of penthouse and new windows and openings

Architectural Committee Recommendation: final approval of the penthouse and windows in the west façade, with the staff to review the penthouse façade color for approval, pursuant to the Commission's in-concept approval of April 2005.

This application proposes the final approval of a subset of the myriad additions and alterations approved in concept for 421 Chestnut Street by the Commission in April 2005. The former Bank of Pennsylvania, this building was designed by important architect John Gries and is a highly significant edifice on Bank Row in the Old City Historic District. At its April 2005 meeting, the Commission voted to approve in concept several additions and alterations including the revised penthouse design, provided the façade color is a darker grey and the windows have larger panes; and the west party wall revisions, provided the windows have larger panes.

Excepting the lack of information about the proposed façade color of the penthouse, this proposal complies with the Commission's approval in concept for the penthouse and windows in the west facade.

The applicants explained that they had reviewed the color of the stucco with the staff of the Preservation Alliance and would gladly review it with the staff of the Commission.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the application, with staff to review details. Mr. Riviera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

210 West Washington Square, N.W. Ayer Building

Owner: Brown Hill Development, Goldenberg Group, Washington West Associates

Applicant: Serge Nalbantian

History: 1927-1929, Ralph Bencker, architect

Proposal: Add penthouse, balconies, doors, canopy, etc.

This application proposes several alterations and additions to the N.W. Ayer Building, an Art Deco office building on the western edge of Washington Square, which is classified as significant in the Society Hill Historic District. The building currently houses a restaurant and offices. A second commercial space would be added to the lobby. The upper floors including the penthouse addition would be dedicated to residential use. Parking would be added at the basement and mezzanine levels.

To add the parking, an existing loading-dock door along St. James Street would be

widened for a garage door; an adjacent window would be converted to an emergency exit; and several mezzanine windows would be replaced with louvers. At the west façade, a single-leaf door would be converted to a double-leaf door.

At the front façade, part of the large window in the northern bay would be converted to a door. A free-standing glass and metal canopy would be added at the center bay.

At the roof, a one-story residential penthouse would be added atop a large mechanical penthouse constructed in the 1950s. It would be framed in steel and clad in glass and solid panels. The applicant will present plans to the Commission of a revised penthouse more in accordance with the Committee's recommendation.

At the south façade, balconies would be added in the light well. The addition of the balconies would require the conversion of windows to doors.

Staff Recommendation: When the application was first submitted to the staff, it lacked many details; therefore, the staff recommended that any approvals were in concept only. Before the submission of additional details, it recommended approval in concept of the penthouse, provided that it is redesigned to be more symmetrical, more vertically oriented, and more compatible with the historic building, but no taller; approval in concept of the balconies and related alterations, provided the railings are recessive and the design of the doors is appropriate; approval in concept of the parking and other rear alterations, provided the designs of the doors and louvers are appropriate; approval in concept of the west service door, provided its design is appropriate; approval in concept of the retail door in the front window, provided all historic fabric is retained and the door design is appropriate; denial of the original metal and glass canopy because its Expressionistic design competes with the significant historic doorway; denial of all other aspects of the proposal owing to incompleteness, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal. Wesley Wei, architect for the project, presented a number of plans outlining details that were lacking in the initial submission. He noted that the developers have met with the Society Hill and Washington Square Civic Associations about the project and that the revised plans presented to the Committee account for their comments.

Mr. Wei briefly described the one-story penthouse addition, which will be added to an existing but not original mechanical penthouse. The penthouse has an asymmetrical design and will be clad in metal panels. This new design is much shorter than the previous, three-story penthouse proposed at the last meeting.

The alterations to the front façade include a free-standing canopy of painted steel with a glass roof. The canopy will stand at the front façade in the same place as the non-historic sign band, which reads "210 West Washington Square." For the new commercial space to the north of the main entrance, the developers have hired artists Jeb Wood to make a door out of the central portion of the large historic window system. The architect presented details to the Committee at its meeting. The historic lower panel, which is set in place with bolts, would be installed on the new door. A heavy piece would be added at what would become the head of the door; it is necessary for reinforcement.

Mr. Wei presented new details and explained that two garage doors would be added at an existing loading dock for the parking entrance on St. James Street. In addition, an

emergency exit door would be cut at an existing window. On Perth Street, the proposal calls for widening a service door from a single-leaf to a double-leaf configuration. The doors would all be metal.

On the south façade in the shallow light well, painted metal balconies would be installed. They would have metal-framed glass railings. Twenty-two windows, tucked into the corners, would be cut into single-leaf doors with single-light transoms above. The architect presented details for the door and railings. The new doors would look like enlarged versions of the historic windows.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion.

Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the Commission break the review down into pieces. Beginning with the penthouse he asked how it had been revised. Mr. Wei explained that it had been made more vertical and symmetrical, but that it is not completely symmetrical because it incorporates an existing mechanical penthouse, which itself is not symmetrical.

As a second item, Commission members discussed the balconies. Some neighbors objected to the diagonal support structure under the balconies, which might be visible from the street. The Commission discussed whether to require a cladding for the structure to hide it from view. Eventually, the Commission members, at Mr. Steinberg's urging, agreed that it would be more appropriate to leave the structure exposed.

The Commission agreed that the alterations for the parking were acceptable. Mr. Sugrue asked for an explanation of the design of the louvers. It was explained that they will incorporate a fine mesh that will make them less visible.

The applicant explained that there is a need to create an additional front entrance in the north bay of the front facade to allow direct access to the commercial space without entering through the lobby. The members of the Commission discussed the alteration and determined that it would be acceptable provided additional details are reviewed.

Mr. Tissian stressed the significance of the N.W. Ayer name to the history of advertising and the City and asked if the developers would retain it. He suggested they might consider a plaque in the lobby to describe the history. Serge Nalbantian, who represented the developer, stated that no final decision had been made, but that the developer was considering retaining the Ayer name.

Next the Commission members took up the issue of the canopy. Mr. Wilds commented that he understood the need for a canopy at the front of the building. Mr. Steinberg asked how much of the sculpture around the door would be hidden. Mr. Wei responded that none would be hidden. Mr. Riviera said that he objects to the canopy because it would change the character of the soaring opening. He said the vestibule was already a structure standing in front of the building; adding the canopy would insert a second layer. He asserted that it would detract from the grand space.

Mr. James asked about the design of the cell phone antennas and how they would fit in; they are mentioned but not shown on the drawing. The applicant agreed to resubmit an application for the cell phone antennas at a later date with additional documentation.

Paul Boni spoke against the canopy, stating his concern that it will compromise the sense of the opening. Mr. Boni also asked that, if an approval is granted for the garage, that a mockup and site visit by the staff be required to ensure that the public does not view the fluorescent lighting of the parking garage from the street. He also suggested that shop drawings should be reviewed for the doors.

Mr. Riviera noted his objection to considering the application for final approval at this time.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance commended the applicant for meeting with and responding to the community organizations. He emphasized the significance of this Art Deco building. He said that this application should only be considered in concept because the new design had only been delivered to the Commission recently and had not been seen by the public or the Architecture Committee. He asserted that any rooftop additions should be inconspicuous and claimed that this one would not be inconspicuous. He showed several large photographic views of the roofline of the building taken from various points on surrounding streets. He pasted on facsimiles of the penthouse addition to show its impact. Some Commission members and the applicant asserted that the photographs were deceptive because they were taken with a powerful zoom lens. Mr. Gallery stated that he had not used a zoom lens, but had employed the zoom on his digital camera. Returning to his comments, he contended that the revised design did not fully respond to the Committee's comments. He said that this design was not like the rest of the building and did not carry through the building's verticality, symmetry, or relationship of glass to solid. He also asserted that the penthouse was too tall. He noted that the roof of this building proves visible from many different locations. Its original, tall parapet wall indicates that the architect sought to hide any rooftop equipment. The architect of the later mechanical penthouse designed it specifically so that it would be as invisible as possible. He suggested that a penthouse should not be added to this building. If a penthouse is added, though, Mr. Gallery agrees with the staff's recommendation that the new design must be more compatible with the historic building. Mr. Gallery noted the unusual and highly decorative entry and opined that a canopy would obscure the important ornamental details. He said that most residents of Society Hill and other neighborhoods make the passage between their cars and their doorways without canopies. He also thought that many restaurants are entered through building lobbies without their own separate entrances.

Gersil Kay, speaking as a representative of the International Coalition of Art Deco Societies, asserted that the parking should be automated. Others noted that the applicant is already proposing automated parking.

Bernice Hamel noted her opposition to the penthouse after hearing Mr. Gallery's compelling testimony.

Gene Drake, a resident of the area, said that Washington Square is a public park and he objected to any addition to the top of a building that would interfere with sunlight reaching the park.

Mr. Steinberg complimented the architect, but noted his concern for the impacts this proposal would have on the building.

Mr. Nalbantian reminded the Commission that the developer has met with the neighborhood and the Preservation Alliance. The developer also reduced the size of the penthouse and revised its design in response to the Committee's comments. He said that the penthouse was 21' -11" above the parapet. He said that Mr. Gallery's pictures were not accurate representations of the penthouse. Mr. Gallery disagreed.

Mr. Sklaroff noted the extraordinary significance of the Ayer building and said he was troubled by the proposed penthouse. He acknowledged that Mr. Gallery's testimony was very persuasive.

Messrs. Wilds and Sugrue withdrew their original motion.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve all elements of the application in final form, but deny the penthouse and canopy. Mr. Riviera seconded the motion.

Several Commission members requested that the distinct elements of the proposal be considered individually.

Messrs. Tissian and Riviera agreed to modify their motion to allow for a separate vote on each major element of the proposal.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the balconies and related alterations as proposed without the cladding on the support structure, with staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the alterations for the interior parking including the garage doors at the loading dock, emergency exit, window louvers, and rear service entrance, with the staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the conversion of a section of the north front window to a door, with the staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7 to 3, with one abstention. Messrs. Tissian, James, and Steinberg dissented and Mr. Sugrue abstained.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to deny the canopy. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 8 to 2, with one abstention. Messrs. Wilds and Sugrue opposed and Ms. Evans abstained.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to deny the penthouse. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

415 S. Iseminger Street

Owners: Thomas Scheuffele and Michael Anderson

Architect/Applicant: Cara Carroccia

History: built 1830

Proposal: Demolish roof, construct new roof and enlarged dormer

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of rebuilding the roof to its historic configuration, but denial of an enlarged dormer, 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 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 historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

This application proposes to rebuild the roof and expand an existing dormer at the main facade of the subject property. The applicant justifies the roofing work with the claim that it will resolve a severe water penetration problem. This water penetration has led to a mold infestation on the third floor of the residence.

The new dormer design matches those found on adjacent properties such as 421 Iseminger, which was approved by the Historical Commission. Most of the enlarged dormers in the area were added before the Commission designated the buildings. Some were added illegally after designation. A large shed dormer extending almost the full width of the building with a three-part wood window is proposed. It would have two four-over-four double hung windows flanking a single fixed-pane window in the middle. The dormer would be clad in painted wood clapboard.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal

Mr. Riviera made a motion to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Brown seconded the motion.

One of the owners, Thomas Scheuffele, and his architect, Cara Carrocia, attended the meeting. Ms. Carrocia explained that the Commission approved a dormer of the same size on a neighboring building at 421 South Iseminger in October of 2002. She explained that there are many other dormers of this type in this row and on Camac Street behind it. She also stated that the house is extremely small, encompassing only 675 square feet.

Commission members asked about the slight difference in window configuration between 421 South Iseminger and the window proposed in this application. Ms. Carrocia explained that the proposed design matches the remainder of the dormers on the street.

Messrs. Riviera and Brown withdrew their motion.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff again passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

500 West Willow Grove Avenue, Chestnut Hill Academy

Owner: Chestnut Hill Academy

Applicant: Eric Rahe, Architect

History: Commons building: 1905, Frank Miles Day, architect; Woodward gymnasium: 1907, Frank Miles Day, architect; Kingsley gymnasium: 1956 with additions in 1959 and 1980s, Martin & White architects

Proposal: Demolish Woodward gymnasium, build new gymnasium, rehabilitate Commons building with additions

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of the revised design, provided the parapet is deleted at the link between Commons and lunchroom, reducing its height, and provided the entire complex is roofed with a grey material, with the staff to review details.

The Commission previously approved in concept the retention of the Commons building with additions, the demolition of the Woodward and Kingsley gymnasiums, and the construction of a new gymnasium. The Chestnut Hill Academy is phasing the project and only applying for the work to the Commons building and the Woodward gymnasium at this time. The demolition of the Kingsley gymnasium and the construction of its larger replacement will come to the Historical Commission as the Academy's fund-raising progresses.

The Commons building, as the Academy argued at the Financial Hardship Committee meetings, requires additions to accommodate a growing student body and larger kitchen facilities. These needs would be met with additions on the ends of the building. On the end closest to the Main Building (the old Wissahickon Inn), the addition will have a low, one-story link of glass to preserve the gabled end of the original building, and then a one-story, gabled room addition to hold tables for the cafeteria. On the opposite end of the building, a one-story addition, which will house the kitchen, will run perpendicular to the Commons building and will also have a gabled end. A trash room area at the rear of this addition will have a flat roof and serve as the transition section to the contemporary squash court section that was built in the 1980s. The additions will all have stucco facades with Roman brick bases, aluminum windows and asphalt shingle roofs to match the Commons building.

The Commons building itself will be rehabilitated. The pebble-dashed stucco and wood cornice will be repaired and the roof replaced with red asphalt shingles. Wood clad windows are proposed. The building currently has aluminum replacement windows, but the original windows were probably wood. On the front façade, the application calls for cutting down six of the first-floor windows and installing panels below to augment the light into the main dining hall. However, the proposed windows should have a sill or strong horizontal mullion to demarcate the location of the original sill and the panels should be eliminated. Also, the original roof would not have been red, but a grey or greenish grey slate. The new asphalt shingles should reflect the original slate color.

The proposal includes the complete demolition of the Woodward gymnasium, which sits tucked between the Commons building and the Kingsley gymnasium, and the construction of a new, multi-purpose gym in its place. The link between the new gym and the Commons building consists of a one-story, flat-roofed connection that encases the façade of the Commons building, but leaves it intact. The windows, doors and façade will remain, although on the interior of the building, creating an interior wall separating the two buildings. The new gym building will be rectangular in shape with a large gabled roof and a smaller, gabled entrance section facing the Main Building. The entrance section

has an arcaded design with flanking, double-leaf entrances. The gym building will have a stuccoed façade, asphalt roof, and multi-light aluminum windows and doors.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal.

The school was represented by Peggy Conver, Tim Callagan, and Mark Wieand. Mr. Wieand explained that they had revised the proposal. He had lowered the parapet on the connector and substituted a slate grey asphalt shingle roof for the red roof. Mr. Tissian asked about the overhang on the roof that generated so much discussion at the Committee meeting. Mr. Wieand explained that that had been retained to provide shelter for people waiting for buses. Mr. Steinberg asked about adding a window on the Willow Grove side of the kitchen addition. Mr. Wieand explained that that area enclosed a freezer in the kitchen.

John Gallery spoke in favor of the revised proposal.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the Committee's recommendation to demolish the Woodward Gymnasium, construct a new Gymnasium, and rehabilitate and add to the Commons building as shown in the revised proposal presented to the Commission, with the staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sklaroff resumed the Chair.

704 N. 5th Street

Owner: Anthony Casey

Architect/Applicant: Liz Zimmers

History: c. 1855

Proposal: Construct rear addition and decks; replace windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial of the fourth-floor addition with deck and stair tower, 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.]; 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.]; and approval of the changes to the rear-ell door, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

This property suffered a severe fire three years ago. It damaged the mansard roof and the interior. The applicant proposes to construct a fourth-floor addition on the rear ell that would connect to the rear of the mansard. The addition would result in the demolition of the two existing rear dormers. The addition would measure 11' by 14' and would be

finished with stucco. The proposal also includes two roof decks. The lower deck would measure 6' by 14', be located on the roof of the rear ell, and be accessed from the new addition. The upper deck would measure 23' by 14', be located on the roof of the new addition, and be accessed through a new stair-house.

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

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Liz Zimmers represented the project.

Mr. Sugrue questioned the visibility of the addition. Ms. Spina explained its very limited visibility, but added that the Committee objected to the amount of demolition of the mansard and dormers as well as the design of the addition.

Commission members asked Ms. Zimmers to revise the design of the addition, making it more sensitive to the mansard.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve in concept the rear second-floor doorway alterations and fourth-floor addition with rear deck, but to deny the rooftop deck and stair tower. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

31 Summit Avenue

Owner/Applicant: Anjani Jain

History: built c. 1850

Proposal: Construct rear addition; add sunroom and deck

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of the proposal with a sand-finish, grey stucco base, not the synthetic stone, with the staff to review details, especially the basement door and window, 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.].

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. This application proposes to construct a new conservatory at the rear of this free- standing, single-family house. The house currently has a small non-historic deck at this location. The door from the house to the deck would remain as the access to the conservatory. The conservatory would be L-shaped and built of vinyl-clad metal and glass with a hipped roof and several skylights. It would also have a double-leaf door leading to a deck. The wood deck would wrap around the conservatory and measure 16' by 20', with a stair leading from the deck to the ground. The deck would stand above the ground approximately seven feet.

Dr. Jain represented the application. He stated that agrees with the Committee's recommendation and prefers the stucco to the synthetic stone for the base of the addition.

Mr. Huff made a motion to approve the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2134 Mt. Vernon Street

Owner/Applicant: Jeff Goldstein

History: built c. 1855

Proposal: Replace rear wall off ell, and rear gate

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial of the exposed wood frame wall system, 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.]; approval of the deck and door, with the staff to review details, and approval in concept of the rear wood gate, 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.].

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. This application proposes to demolish the stuccoed brick rear wall of the rear ell, which, according to the applicant, currently rests on a support beam and shows stress and structural cracks. The applicant would replace this wall with an exposed wood frame wall system that is similar to one found on a modern building at Bartram Gardens. In its finished state, it would have vertical studs supporting horizontal lath over a transparent solid panel. This wall would incorporate a double-leaf sliding door leading out to a new deck. The deck would also be constructed of wood and measure 8' by 11'. Although the ground-floor masonry wall would remain, the applicant proposes to clad it in the same wood frame system. The proposal also includes a new wood gate at the rear, but it is not shown on the elevations or the plans.

Mr. Goldstein, the owner and architect, presented pictures of Clay Street to show its diversity of design. He said that only four houses retain their original gable design in that row.

Some Commission members questioned the fire safety of the design but noted that that was an issue for the Department of Licenses and Inspections. They said that if the design changed it would have to return to the Commission for approval.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the proposal. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which was approved with a vote of 9 to 2. Messrs. Riviera and James opposed.

112 Market Street

Owner: Jung Wha Ahn

Architect/Applicant: Harold Lichtman

History: c.1830, top two stories removed after a fire

Proposal: Demolish façade, build new façade and three story addition

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial of the proposed project, but approval of a revised project that would include:

1. The construction of a first-floor storefront and door as proposed;
2. the retention of the historic second-floor brick façade;
3. the addition of two more floors with a two-bay design with reduced window and floor heights at the upper floors;
4. the construction of a cornice rather than a parapet following the height of the other buildings in the row;
5. the construction of a fifth floor set back 15 to 20 feet from the cornice;
6. and the construction of a roof deck set back 5 to 10 feet from the cornice.

These recommendations are made with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and 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.].

The Architectural Committee reviewed an earlier version of this proposal last month. It proposes demolishing the historic second-floor two-bay brick façade and constructing a new façade as well as three additional upper floors. The proposed design features four floors of single, nearly full-width windows divided by four vertical muntins. The fifth floor would set back from the front facade to provide space for a roof deck. A raised parapet would serve as the front railing for the deck. The adjacent buildings are four stories in height. The proposed building would not correspond to the existing or historic buildings in massing, scale, or rhythm of openings

The Architecture Committee previously asked the applicant to research the historic façade for a possible accurate restoration. In the case of a new design, they asked for the applicant to respect the cornice line of the row and the ratio of solid to void. They rejected the false historicism of the steep roof and dormer shown in the earlier design.

Mr. Baron presented the application. No one appeared to represent the application.

Mr. Sklaroff noted that the Committee recommendation was more of a recipe than a review.

Mr. Baron explained that the applicant had submitted several designs after consultation with the staff and the Committee and he asked the Committee to give him clear advice on a design before he redrew the proposal. The recommendation took pieces from each of the applicant's previous submissions. The Commission members thought that the submission should be denied without prejudice. They indicated that the revised design

could be drawn and submitted to the Architecture Committee for its review.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to deny the proposal without prejudice. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff vacated the Chair and Mr. Sugrue assumed the gavel.

261 S. 22nd Street

Owner: Christian Street Partners, LP

Architect/Applicant: Craig Deutsch

History: built c. 1860; façade rebuilt, 1957

Proposal: rebuild front façade, alter window openings

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

Mr. Baron presented this application, which proposes the demolition of a large portion of the front façade of the building and the rebuilding of the façade with modifications. The applicant claims that the façade is seriously bowed and should be rebuilt. He would reuse the existing bricks. The historic third-floor windows are currently narrower than those at the second floor. They propose to widen the narrower windows when they rebuild the wall.

Steve Pollock, Esq., architect Craig Deutsch, engineer Robert Rosen, and preservation consultant Robert Powers represented the project. Mr. Pollock stated that the application has changed since the Architectural Committee met. The Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the building Imminently Dangerous. Therefore, the proposal is now to demolish the front façade and rebuild it. However, they do not have plans for the proposed new façade.

Mr. Rivera noted that he visited the site and the wall has delaminated. Mr. Rosen, a structural engineer, explained that the wall was not tied into the main structure. Mr. Pollock assured the Commission that the condition was not the result of the construction at the property. When asked if the historic façade would be rebuilt, Mr. Pollock said that the end corbels for the cornice could not be rebuilt because of their projection over the sidewalk. Mr. Powers noted that although the cornice dates to the nineteenth century, the façade was rebuilt in 1957. Mr. Baron emphasized that, if the façade was rebuilt in 1957, it replicated an earlier design.

Mr. Wilds agreed that the documentation showed that demolition is necessary; however, he emphasized that the Commission would retain jurisdiction over the new construction. Mr. Huff believed that the cornice should be retained and reused in the new construction. Mr. James concurred. Mr. Pollock said that the client would rather have a new design that mirrored the building next door.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the demolition of the front façade provided the cornice is salvaged and perhaps used in the new construction. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 8 to 2. Messrs. James and Huff dissented and Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

2021 Pine Street

Owners: David and Jessica Hayne

Applicant: Cheryl Bestenheider

History: built c. 1845

Proposal: Demolish rear vestibule, construct rooftop additions and decks

Architectural Committee recommendation: denial of the front deck, but approval of all other aspects of the application, 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 the Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as ... decks and terraces ... when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

Mr. Baron explained the application. This proposal involves additions to the rear and roof of this brick townhouse. The back of the building faces Panama Street. The plans show the demolition of a single-story stuccoed vestibule and alterations to several openings on the side of the rear ell. The applicants seek to construct a ground-level deck with a new door and mechanical equipment. At the roof level, the plans show a new stair house positioned at the juncture of the rear ell and main roof. The stair would lead to a rear deck on the ell and a front deck at a slightly higher level. The building's position between two taller buildings would help to hide the roof additions.

Jeff Krieger, the architect for the proposal, argued for the deck on the main portion of the building. He showed an elevation of that portion of the block and said that this particular house stands one story shorter than the two neighboring buildings, which both have mansard additions. The proposed deck would sit six to seven feet behind the cornice line and the mansards on either side would hide it. Mr. Sklaroff noted that approving this deck would set a precedent for other decks on the main portions of buildings.

David Hayne, the owner, said that the neighbors support the application. He said that the roof-top area is wasted without a deck and that the property has no other outdoor space. Commission members noted the size of the deck proposed for the rear ell.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee and to deny the front deck but approve the remainder of the proposal. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 8 to 3. Ms. Merriman and Messrs. Tissian and Rivera dissented.

2304 Wallace Street

Owner/Applicant: Bradley Griffith

History: built c. 1855

Proposal: Construct 3rd floor addition and deck on rear ell

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval, provided the staff verifies with a mock up that the alterations will not be visible from the front of the building, 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.].

Mr. Baron presented this application for a single-story rear addition over an existing rear extension. The applicants propose a new deck on top of the addition as well as a stair house to reach the new deck. This new stair house would rise above the roof with potential visibility from the front and back.

Mr. James believed that a mock-up should be erected prior to the Commission meeting to allow the Commission to vote in an informed manner.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and conditionally approve the addition and deck, with the staff to verify with a mock-up that no portion of the proposed deck is visible above the front façade of the building. Ms. Evans seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 9 to 2. Messrs. James and Sklaroff dissented.

532 N 22nd Street

Owner: Loonstyn Brothers Properties

Applicant: Collin Robinson

History: built c. 1855

Proposal: Demolish section at rear, construct addition and deck; cut new windows and door

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial of the reconstruction of the front façade and the re-stuccoing of the side façade pending additional information, denial of the new corner door at the side façade, denial of the six-over-six window configuration at the first-floor front, denial of all five-panel doors, but approval of the remainder of the proposal. It recommended a two-over-two configuration for all new windows and a four-panel configuration for all new doors, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and 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.

Mr. Baron explained the extensive alterations and additions proposed for this Italianate corner house. Earlier alterations include a covering of stucco facing to simulate brick and a modern storefront. The applicant claims that the walls are in need of stabilization. The

applicant wishes to rebuild the front wall in brick, remove the modern storefront, and install a six-over-six double hung window and an unusual five-panel door in its place. On the side façade, the plans call for removing the perma-stone and restuccoing with a smooth finish. Mr. Gutierrez also proposes cutting a side storefront door, again with the unusual five-panel design. He also proposes closing a door and a window and adding two windows. On the upper floors, the applicant wishes to demolish the sloped rear ell roof and construct a flat roof with a single-story addition and two decks. A single-story brick rear wing would be truncated to allow for the parking of several cars. A new curb cut would lead up to wood paneled gates at the parking pads.

Mr. Sklaroff said that when he walked by the property earlier in the day, the building appeared to be under construction. Mr. Baron further explained that after the Committee meeting, the Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the building Imminently Dangerous and staff approved a demolition permit for the front façade. Mr. Wilds noted that the staff typically approves permits for buildings that have been deemed Imminently Dangerous by the Department.

Mr. Wilds questioned the six-over-six windows as opposed to one-over-one windows. He believed the six-over-six windows to be faux Colonial, not the period of this building.

Gerry Gutierrez, architect for the project, explained that the Imminently Dangerous violation by the Department changed their proposal. The proposal now before the Commission calls for a new brick façade on the front, with a 16-inch return around the corner onto the Brandywine Street façade. The side façade would then have a stucco finish. Mr. Gutierrez presented plans that showed the revisions.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the revised design, with a sand-finish stucco on the side façade, with the staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE HISTORICAL COMMISSION STAFF, JULY 2005

Mr. Steinberg commended the staff on their work for the month.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the \$26.67 expenditure for lunches for the Architectural Committee. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

CLG COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

Germantown School Number 2

Mr. Farnham briefly summarized the nomination for the Germantown Grammar School Number 2 and said that the resource meets Criterion C for the National Register.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to recommend the Germantown School Number 2 to the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. James made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner