

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Room 578, City Hall
26 July 2005**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Herbert Levy, FAIA
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz
Robert Thomas, AIA

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

Also

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Kate Jefferson
George Thomas, Civic Visions
Joanne Phillips, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
Matthew McClure, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
Robert Venturi, Venturi Scott Brown Associates
Carey Yonce, Venturi Scott Brown Associates
Jay Tackett, Tackett Associates
Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association
Gersil Kay, Building Conservation International
G. Craig Schelter, Schelter & Associates
F.B. Addo
David Mercuris, Washington Square Associates
Serge Nalbantian, Brown Hill Development
Randy Cotton, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Wesley Wei, Wesley Wei Architects
Jim Angestadt, Tuesday Communications
Bruce Laverty, Athenaeum of Philadelphia
Wayne Zukin, N.W. Ayer Building
Larry Silver, Esq., Langsam Stevens & Silver
Cara Carroccia, Cara Carroccia Architect
Kevin Aires, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Mark Wieand, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Tim Calligan, APG
Hugh Zimmers, Zimmers Associates
Peggy Conver, Chestnut Hill Academy
Liz Zimmers, Zimmers Associates
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
Harold Lichteman, GLP Architects
Craig Deutsch, Harman Deutsch Architects

Cheryl Bestenheider, Krieger + Associates
David Hayne, Krieger + Associates
Jessica Hayne, Krieger + Associates
James D. Grainge, Douglas Grainge, RA
Bradley Griffith
Michael Loonstyn, 532 North 22nd Street
Gerry Gutierrez, Group G Architects
Anjani Jain

Vincent Rivera, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

421 Chestnut Street

Owner: 421 Chestnut, LP

Applicant: Jay Tackett, architect

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

Project: Final approval of penthouse and new windows and openings

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.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the penthouse and windows in the west facade, with staff to review a penthouse façade color sample for approval, pursuant to the Commission's approval in concept of April 2005.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Jay Tackett, the architect for the project, apologized for the partial nature of the application. He explained that he submitted the current application to facilitate a review by the Board of Building Standards for an internal stairway. He will submit an additional application to the Commission with the balcony, window, door, and other details. Mr. Tackett acknowledged the façade easement owned by the Preservation Alliance. He noted that the Alliance and Commission will have to coordinate to determine the color of the penthouse façade. A mock-up can be staged on the roof to help determine the color.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend 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.

223-25 South 6th Street, Dilworth House

Owner/Applicant: John and Mary Turchi

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

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

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.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the demolition of the significant resource; denial without comment of the new construction; pursuant to §14-2007(7)(j) of the Philadelphia Code.

Mr. McCoubrey and Ms. Pentz recused because their firms are involved in the design of the proposed building.

Mr. Farnham presented the application and highlighted the sections of the Historic Preservation Ordinance that pertained to the proposal. Joanne Phillips, Esq., counsel for the applicant, introduced John Turchi, the owner of the property and developer of the project; Robert Venturi, architect for the new construction, who was accompanied by his associate Carey Yonce; Craig Schelter and George Thomas, consultants for the project, and Matthew McClure, Esq. Ms. Phillips referenced the section in the ordinance, §14-2007(7)(e), that requires the submission of the plans for new construction at the time of application for a permit including a demolition permit. She requested that the Committee comment on the new construction. Ms. Phillips asserted that the bifurcation of the demolition application and new construction application proposed by the staff was predicated on a limited view of the ordinance.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he could not recall an instance when the Committee reviewed the plans for new construction before settling the question of the demolition. Mr. Robert Thomas of the Committee questioned the order of the meetings and asked why this Committee received the application before the Designation Committee had settled the classification issue. Mr. Farnham explained the difficulty of scheduling the Designation Committee meeting in light of the 30-day notice requirement and numerous summer vacations.

Ms. Phillips further argued that the letter sent announcing this meeting requested that the applicant prepare to make a presentation. Mr. Farnham responded that it was the standard form letter announcing the meeting, not a unique letter tailored for this application.

Mr. Levy commented that he was willing to hear a presentation. Mr. Copeland asked if the demolition application was based on the premise that the building was "significant" or "non-contributing." Mr. Robert Thomas noted that he did not believe that the Committee should comment on the new construction, which assumes the demolition of a "significant" building. He added that a review of the new construction would be appropriate if the application proposed saving the historic building or a part of it, but it does not. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that a presentation would be helpful if it included a justification for the demolition. Mr. Levy agreed.

Mr. Robert Thomas suggested having a special Architectural Committee meeting after the Designation Committee voted on the classification issue, to allow the project to proceed in a timely manner to the Commission on August 12, 2005. Ms. Phillips rejected the offer.

The Committee agreed to hear the presentation concerning the new construction, but stated that it would not comment on the new construction segment of the proposal. Mr. Robert Thomas noted that a new structure cannot exist in the same space as a "significant" historic building.

Mr. Venturi, using boards, presented the proposed mid-rise condominium project. He began by discussing the evolution of Washington Square and opined that his building would further that evolution. He explained that he wanted to bring harmony to the Square not through unity but through contrasts of materials and heights. The building has a classical order with a base, middle, and top. The front façade would be clad in brownstone with limestone accents and the other façades would be clad in brown brick. The mezzanine floor would connect with the Athenaeum to provide that institution with storage space. The parking would be at the rear. At the ground level, the front façade would have an arcaded portico and a memorial to Richardson Dilworth. Mr. Venturi then showed several rough ideas for the signage that he would like to install to commemorate Mayor Dilworth. He said that the memorial would be like commercial signage and would enliven Washington Square.

Mr. Venturi said that he once met G. Edwin Brumbaugh, the architect of the Dilworth House. He is not impressed by the design of the Dilworth House and likened it to a dollhouse or a Chester County farmhouse. He studied the idea of preserving the house, but was unable to successfully integrate it into the design for the luxury condominium building.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance supported the staff recommendation. He contended that any comments on the new construction at this stage would be inappropriate.

Larry Silver, Esq., counsel for the Society Hill Civic Association and the Preservation Alliance, noted that the Turchis' submission on 27 May 2005 included applications to both the Architectural and Designation Committees, thereby ensuring that the Architectural Committee submission would be reviewed first.

Gersil Kay of Building Conservation International opined that the proposed condominium tower is the wrong use for the property. She suggested that the Dilworth House be converted to an office or a residence. She noted that the Venturi building could be built on a vacant lot in the district.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend 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.

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

Project: 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 in the lobby and offices on the upper floors. A second restaurant or retail 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. A similar application was submitted to the Commission in May 2005, but was withdrawn after some opposition at the Architectural Committee meeting.

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 at the sides and rear 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, originally with a rather Expressionistic design but now simplified, 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.

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.

Several other minor alterations and maintenance projects are proposed throughout the

building including window replacement, masonry cleaning, lighting, and signage. Details are not provided.

Staff Recommendation: The staff contends that too many details were lacking in the initial submission for a final approval; therefore, it recommended that any approvals are in concept only. 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. 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.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance commended the applicant for meeting with and responding to the community organizations. He emphasized the importance of the Art

Deco building. He asserted that any rooftop additions should be inconspicuous. 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, perhaps, 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. Gersil Kay, speaking as a representative of the International Coalition of Art Deco Societies, asserted that the parking should be automated. Others noted that it would be.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval in concept of the penthouse on the condition that it is revised to be more compatible with the historic building; approval in concept of the balconies; approval in concept of the parking entrances and emergency and service doors. The Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the alterations of the large window for the commercial door with a vote of four to two. The Committee split evenly on the canopy, with a vote of three to three.

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

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

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.

Staff recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details including window shop drawings, pursuant to Standard 9.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee and distributed a letter from the Preservation Alliance. Mark Weiland and Kevin Aires of Bower Lewis Throver Architects, consultant Tim Calligan of APG, and Peggy Conner of Chestnut Hill Academy represented the application. Mr. Weiland spoke for the applicant. He noted that he had revised the plans slightly since the submission in response to comments from the Commission's staff. He had signified the location of the former sill at the enlarged windows and altered the entrances to the gym building to make them more compatible. He explained that, despite the staff's objections, the school would like to install a red asphalt shingle roof on all of the buildings. It would match the roof on the Inn building and unify the campus. He displayed colored renderings of the campus with red roofs. Ms. Spina noted that the original roof on the Commons building would have been a grey not red slate. Committee members noted their preference for a grey roof on the historic building. The applicants remarked that they preferred the roofs on the historic and new building to match. If they cannot install a red roof on the entirety of the new complex, then they will install grey shingles throughout. Mr. Weiland asserted that the Commons' original roof may have been wood, not slate. Ms. Conner added that the building has a long and complex history that includes many alterations. Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro asserted that the historic building should be roofed with a material matching the historic color.

Discussion turned to the design of the lunchroom addition, which would extend off the front of the Commons building. Mr. McCoubrey asked why the addition was tall. Ms. Conner explained that they needed the height inside to prevent the space from feeling cramped. Mr. Weiland noted that the historic building originally had an extension located where the new lunchroom is proposed. He stated that he could lower the roofline at the connection between the lunchroom and the historic building. Mr. McCoubrey thought

that this revision would be an improvement. He noted that the parapet at the connection makes the link appear taller than it actually is.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance reported his approval of the overall plan, which he deems "great." He also expressed his approval of the most recent revisions. He noted his preference for a grey roof on the historic Commons building. He suggested a stronger break between the new and old portions of the complex; he thought that this could be accomplished with a flat, not sloped roof. He stated his opposition to the "doodad" hipped roofs at the corners of the additions. He also rejected the overhangs at the link to the lunchroom addition. Ms. Conver countered that the overhangs are necessary to create a transitional space to be used when children move from the Commons to the buses at the nearby driveway. Mr. Rivera suggested a bus shelter at the driveway. Ms. Conver stated that the staff needed unobstructed views from the building to the buses. Mr. Calligan added that it is a matter of "command and control" and the school cannot create "satellite" control centers. The Committee accepted the need for the overhangs.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend 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.

704 N. 5th Street

Owner: Anthony Casey

Architect/Applicant: Liz Zimmers

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Construct rear addition and decks; replace windows

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

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the fourth-floor addition with deck and stair tower, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9 and 10. Approval of the changes to the rear-ell door, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Hugh Zimmers, the architect, and Liz Zimmers, his associate, represented the application. Ms. Zimmers stated that a rear dormer was destroyed in the fire. She also noted that the changes would not be visible from the street. Ms. Spina countered that the rear ell can be seen

through the side alley. Ms. Zimmers reiterated that the alterations would not be visible from the street. Ms. Zimmers reported that the building is being converted from a single-family to a two-family residence; that it has been significantly modified at the rear; that the interior is completely new; and that the building has lost some of its historic character.

Ms. Spina suggested that a smaller, more compatible addition should be proposed. Mr. Zimmers offered to create a mansard addition. The Committee believed the overall massing of the addition problematic, not just the shape of it. Ms. Pentz inquired about the exterior cladding of the addition. The applicants responded that it would be brick or stucco. She then asked how the addition would be attached to the sloped mansard. Ms. Zimmers stated that it would run straight into the mansard. Ms. Pentz replied that the design would be extremely difficult. Ms. Zimmers noted that they might employ a steel frame. Ms. Pentz suggested that they provide more details.

Mr. Levy asserted that the deck on the addition was inappropriate. He stated that it is not compatible with the mansard and should be eliminated. Ms. Zimmers remarked that the deck is an important feature because it will offer exceptional views. She suggested that it could be reduced in size. Mr. Rivera agreed with Mr. Levy that the deck was not architecturally appropriate. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he is opposed to the addition, which significantly changes the massing of the building. Ms. Pentz seconded her colleague's comment and added that the intersection of the mansard and addition are very awkward. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed and suggested denial.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend 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.

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

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.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of rebuilding the roof to its historic configuration, but denial of an enlarged dormer, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Cara Carroccia, the architect, represented the property owner. She noted that this proposal is very similar to one the Commission approved for a nearby building at 421 Iseminger Street. She claimed that it would not be highly visible from the street. She informed the Committee about the water penetration problem.

Mr. Levy asserted that Ms. Carroccia was essentially proposing the addition of a new floor, not simply a larger dormer. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. The Committee asked Ms. Spina to provide some background information on the approval at 421 Iseminger Street. She explained that the Commission had approved the large dormer, but that both the staff and Committee had recommended denial. Ms. Pentz stated that the proposed dormer is not compatible with the character of the historic building. The Committee decided that it must be consistent with its earlier recommendation of denial for 421 Iseminger.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend 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.].

31 Summit Avenue

Owner/Applicant: Anjani Jain

History: built c. 1850

Proposal: Construct rear addition; add sunroom and deck

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.

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

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Anjani Jain, the owner, represented the project. He reported that the existing enclosed deck is "makeshift" and needs replacement. He apologized for the quality of the architectural drawings and noted that he had drawn them himself although he is an applied mathematician, not an architect. The Committee commended him on his drawings. Ms. Pentz inquired about the stone facing on the proposed foundation. Mr. Jain replied that he planned to use a synthetic stone that would match the schist of the historic house. Several Committee members were skeptical that a synthetic stone could successfully match the original stone. They suggested a stucco finish instead. They also suggested that the designs of the basement door and window below the conservatory be revised to be more appropriate for the historic building. They asked the staff to work with the applicant.

The Architecture Committee voted unanimously to recommend 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.].

2134 Mt. Vernon Street

Owner/Applicant: Jeff Goldstein

History: built c. 1855

Proposal: Replace rear wall off ell, and rear gate

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 running 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.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the exposed wood frame wall system. The wall should be stuccoed and read as a solid to match its twin, pursuant to Standard 6. Approval of

the new deck and the new door and approval in concept of the rear wood gate with staff to review details pursuant to Standard 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one attended to represent the application. The Committee members agreed that the proposed wood wall system, although interesting, is not appropriate for this historic rear ell, which abuts the adjacent, mirroring stuccoed rear ell. They also agreed that the small deck and the concept of a gate were acceptable, but that details should be provided for the gate.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend 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.].

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

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.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and the staff recommendation. He said that the applicant's original submission last month better maintained the rhythm and character of the streetscape at the second and third-floor levels. The recessed porch and the tall

gable roof with dormer drew the most criticism at the last Committee meeting.

The architect stated that he was surprised because he had the impression that the staff would recommend approval of this proposal. He said that he received contradictory advice. He explained that he thought that the Committee had tried to steer him away from his earlier window design. He had met with some members of staff and thought that he was complying with the Committee's suggestions. He requested clear and consistent advice from the staff and Committee. Jung Wha Ahn, his client, echoed the architect's assertions.

Ms. Pentz explained that it was her belief that the applicant must make a claim of public interest or financial hardship if he is seeking an approval of the demolition of the historic second-story brick facade. She noted that this application makes no argument for demolition in the public interest or based on financial hardship. Ms. Pentz suggested that the architect retain the original wall and pin it into the new construction. If he could, thereby preserving the fabric, he would not be required to make a public interest or hardship argument. Mr. Baron noted that the new brickwork will not match exactly, but that there are many buildings in Society Hill with new brick at the first floors.

Committee members reviewed the other aspects of the design. They understood the applicant's desire for a larger gallery window and recommended approval of the large storefront window with a door to the side as shown in the new application. At the second floor, they recommended installing new windows in the existing masonry openings. On the third and fourth floors, they recommended continuing the two-bay design with reductions of the heights of floors and windows. They asked the applicant to place a cornice in line with the other buildings in the row instead of the proposed taller parapet. They recommended approval of a fifth floor, set back 15 to 20 feet behind the front wall, and a deck set back between five and ten feet. They asked the staff to review these dimensions in the field based on the visibility from directly across the street.

The Architectural Committee recommended 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.].

261 S. 22nd Street

Owner: Christian Street Partners, LP

Architect/Applicant: Craig Deutsch

History: built c. 1860

Proposal: rebuild front façade, alter window openings

This application 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.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron explained that the row of three narrow third-floor windows balances with the two wider second-floor windows. He reported that the Commission approved the addition of a third second-floor window between the two historic second-floor windows during an earlier review, but asserted that this approval did not justify enlarging the historic third-floor windows.

Craig Deutsch and Virgil Proccacino attended the meeting. Mr. Deutsch explained that he thinks that the center portion of brick between the piers was constructed separately from the flanking piers because there is a joint between them. Rudy D'Alessandro disagreed. Mr. Deutsch is concerned that the cutting of the new center second-floor window might cause the wall to collapse. Committee members suggested that the Commission might not have approved the cutting of the new window if it had known that it would result in the rebuilding of the front façade. They noted that although the engineer's letter describes a bulge in the wall, but it does not state whether this condition could be corrected with anchors or a partial localized reconstruction of the wall. They said that they have not received enough information to recommend approval of the total rebuilding of the wall. They asked that a condition assessment of the wall and repair options be prepared by an engineer. They also did not favor enlarging the windows.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended 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.].

2021 Pine Street

Owners: David and Jessica Hayne

Applicant: Cheryl Bestenheider

History: built c. 1845

Proposal: Demolish rear vestibule, construct rooftop additions and decks

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 wish 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.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the front deck on the main body of the house; approval of all other alterations, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

The Architectural Committee did not object to any elements of the proposal except the installation of a deck on the front portion of the house. They explained that the Commission has traditionally not approved decks on the front portion of houses where there is space for a deck on a rear ell. Ms. Bestenheider said that they understood this but thought that with the adjacent mansards that this was a special circumstance. She noted the applicant's lack of a back yard due to the parking spaces. Committee members stressed their concern with establishing a new precedent for decks.

The Architectural Committee recommended 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.].

2304 Wallace Street

Owner/Applicant: Bradley Griffith

History: built c. 1855

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

This application proposes 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.

Staff recommendation: Approval, provided the staff verifies with a mock up that the alterations will not be visible from the front of the building, pursuant to Standard 9.

The owner, Bradley Griffith, attended the meeting and explained that the new stair house would not be visible from Wallace Street, but would have limited visibility from Fairmount Avenue. He offered to provide a mock-up for the staff to review.

Committee members noted that the addition and deck would sit on a lower stuccoed rear ell. They could not identify a better location for the stair house. They said that the

stucco finish should be smooth and cream to beige in color.

The Architectural Committee recommended 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.].

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

This application proposes extensive alterations and additions to an 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.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the demolition of the rear single-story wing to allow for parking, the addition of the decks, and the conversions of the door and window into two windows. Denial of the new window in place of the storefront, the new five-panel doors [absent evidence that these replicate the originals], the rear addition, and the alteration to the rear ell roofline, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

Gerry Gutierrez and Michael Loonstyn represented the application. They explained that the building has been weakened by the demolition and rebuilding of an adjacent façade. They have not finalized their plans to stabilize the building, although the drawings call for rebuilding the front façade in brick and restuccoing the side facade. They said that they looked to a building on the next corner as a model for the reconstruction of the first floor.

Committee members considered each aspect of the project separately. They thought that the six-over six window configuration was not appropriate for an Italianate building. They asked Mr. Gutierrez to use a two-over-two design. They explained that in the rebuilding of the front window, he should try to ascertain the original size of the storefront opening by peeling away an area of stucco. If the opening is too wide for a single window, they suggested that he install a pair of double hung sash. They said that the door should be a four-panel rather than five-panel type. On the 22nd Street façade, they recommended against a second corner door, but did not object to the additional

windows and the reconfiguration of the window and door toward the rear of the façade to make two windows. They also found the partial demolition of the rear and the installation of a parking gate acceptable as long as the gate is painted. They also accepted the idea of the decks, the revised roofline, and addition on the rear ell. They did not approve of the new stucco on the side wall, thinking that it is perhaps better to retain the brick pattern stucco. They rejected the notion of a large cream-colored building at the end of a brick row.

The Architectural Committee recommended 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.

The Architectural Committee meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron, Jonathan Farnham, and Laura Spina