

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

**25 MARCH 2008, 9:30 A.M.
CITY HALL, ROOM 578
SUZANNE PENTZ, ACTING CHAIR**

PRESENT

Suzanne Pentz, Acting Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
John Cluver
Sean Evans
Dominique Hawkins

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner I
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

ALSO PRESENT

Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Steve Wiexler, Society Hill Civic Association
Harry Schwartz, Society Hill Civic Association
Myra Eskin, Society Hill Civic Association
Richard Lush, Society Hill Civic Association
Bernice Hamel, Society Hill Civic Association
Lorna Katz, Society Hill Civic Association
Heather Lutzker, Grayboyes Commercial Windows
Barry Eiswerth, H2L2
James Templeton, H2L2
George Thompson, Civic Visions
William Martin, Fox Rothschild
Marc Stein, Stamper Square
Michael Cooley, Provco
Carl Engelke, Eagle Eye Solutions
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
M.A. Roth, Society Hill Civic Association
Tully Speaker, Logan Square Neighborhood Association
Jessica Resinger, Joseph B. Callaghan, Inc.
Allen Roth, Joseph B. Callaghan, Inc.
Ray Rola, AIA
David Hollenberg, University of Pennsylvania
Anne Papageorge, University of Pennsylvania
Khaled Tarabieh, University of Pennsylvania
Philip Chen, Ann Beha Architects
Ann Beha, Ann Beha Architect
Pal Wheeling

Kevin Creighton, Russell Roofing
Robert Torres, Studio Torres
J. Rosley, Studio Torres
M. Lowry, L.B. Properties
Carolina Pena , YCH Architect
Rachel S. Schade, Schade & Bolender Architects
Joan & Rick Cole

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Pentz called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Ms. Hawkins and Messrs. Cluver and Evans joined her. Mr. D'Alessandro joined the meeting later in the day.

410 S. FRONT STREET

Owner: Bridgeman Development LLC

Applicant: James Templeton, H2L2

History: designated as contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/99 with c. 1973 building;
designation classification amended to non-contributing, 10/13/99

building demolished in 2001 with PHC approval; now a vacant lot,

Project: In Concept - Construct 15-story hotel and condominium building

OVERVIEW: This application in concept proposes to construct a mixed-use residential and commercial complex on the lot that runs from Front Street to S. 2nd Street between Pine and Lombard Streets. The site was originally classified as contributing to Society Hill Historic District, but was amended to non-contributing seven months after the initial designation in 1999. The site was not designated individually before the establishment of the historic district. A building, known as New Market, stood on the lot at the time of designation. In December 2000, the Commission approved the demolition of the New Market building and the construction of a 10-story hotel. The New Market building was demolished, but the hotel was not built. The remnants of the New Market building, a large concrete slab and foundations at and below grade, currently occupy the site.

The applicant has submitted this in-concept proposal primarily to obtain an official ruling on the Commission's jurisdiction over the site. The applicant is requesting that the Commission determine whether it has plenary or review-and-comment jurisdiction over the site. The applicant proposes that the Commission consider this site "undeveloped" and assert review-and-comment jurisdiction only.

Section 14-2007(7)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance defines the Commission's review-and-comment jurisdiction as follows:

The Commission's scope of review of applications for permits for construction, as defined herein, shall be limited to a forty-five (45) day period of comment.

Section 14-2007(2)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance defines "construction" as follows:

Construct or construction. The erection of a new building, structure or object upon an undeveloped site.

The staff suggests that the Architectural Committee and Commission consider the site developed, not undeveloped, owing to the extensive concrete structure at and below grade.

If the site is determined to be developed, then the site would be reviewed according to the Rules & Regulations for non-contributing sites. The Rules & Regulations for non-contributing sites state that the staff may approve the application; if the staff elects not to approve, the application proceeds to the Architectural Committee, which may approve; if the Architectural Committee elects not to approve, the application proceeds to the Commission, which makes the final determination. The Rules & Regulations for non-contributing sites directs the staff, Committee, and Commission to consider the effect of the proposed work on the resource, which is the district as a whole, not the site itself, in this case.

Section 6.5.a of the Rules & Regulations states that:

Section 14-2007(2)(i) of the Philadelphia Code defines a district as a "geographically definable area possessing a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of buildings, structures, site or objects united by past events, plan, or physical development." By implication Section 14-2007(2)(e), defines a non-contributing building, structure, site or object within an historic district as one that does not reflect the historical or architectural character of the district as defined in the Commission's designation. In Section 14-2007(7)(j), the Code also contains a different standard of review for the proposed demolition of contributing and non-contributing buildings, structures, sites and objects within an historic district. Section 14-2007(7)(a) and (c), however, require that the Commission review all permits for buildings within historic districts. Moreover, the very concept of an historic district suggests that the district as a whole constitutes the principal historic resource and possesses greater significance than its individual component parts.

Section 14-2007(k) provides specific directions to the Commission in "its determination as to the appropriateness of proposed alterations...." These include consideration of "the purposes of this section," "the historical, architectural or aesthetic significance of the building, structure, site or object," "the effect of the proposed work on the building, structure, site or object and its appurtenances," "the compatibility of the proposed work with the character of the historic district or with the character of its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape," and "the design of the proposed work."

Additionally, Section 6.5.h of the Rules & Regulations states that:

In the conduct of the review process, the staff, Architectural Committee, and Commission shall address the criteria stipulated in Section 14-2007(k) of the Philadelphia Code with particular emphasis on the compatibility and/or appropriateness of scale, rhythm and materials.

The staff opines that the proposed complex is very well designed. The rhythms, materials, sitings of components, and open space are appropriate. Moreover, by locating the tallest components of the complex at the eastern edge of the site and the historic district, the district is, in part, shielded from the impact of the 15-story sections of the complex. However, the staff contends that, even with this mitigation, the tallest sections of the complex are not compatible with the scale of the surrounding streetscape and district; the surrounding historic buildings are three and four stories tall. The staff notes that the south section of the proposed building is 166 feet tall (175 feet to the roof of the penthouse); the building approved for the site in 2000 was 109 feet tall, already three times the heights of the surrounding historic buildings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff refuses to approve the proposal, forwards it to the Architectural Committee, and makes the following recommendations:

- the site is not “undeveloped” and therefore subject to plenary jurisdiction;
- “the proposed work” is not compatible “with the character of the historic district or with the character of its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape” (§14-2007(7)(k)(.4);
- the proposed work does not comply with Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment; and
- the application be denied, pursuant to §14-2007(7)(k)(.4) and Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney William Martin, architects James Templeton and Barry Eiswerth, and developer Mark Stein represented the application.

Mr. Martin disagreed with the staff’s assessment of the proper scope of review. He stated that the historic preservation ordinance does not define “undeveloped”. He asserted that the assessment of the site as developed, owing to the remnants of a garage substructure, does not follow common sense. He stated that, if the concrete slab that remains would have been removed eight years ago with the rest of the debris, then the site would be considered undeveloped in the eyes of the Historical Commission and that such an interpretation does not make any sense. He noted that the concrete substructure will not be incorporated into the new project; it will be completely removed. Mr. Templeton stated that the Historical Commission had set a precedent when reviewing under similar circumstances that involved surface parking lots and had considered those lots undeveloped.

Mr. Cluver inquired whether the decision by the Historical Commission on the previous application for this site included both the demolition of the New Market Structure and the construction of the W Hotel. Mr. Farnham answered that the application included both. Mr. Cluver asserted that the demolition and the new construction on this parcel were linked, and that demolition had been granted based on the review of the new construction, which never took place. Mr. Evans stated that the Committee cannot know the intent of the Commission at that time of that review; in his opinion, this site should be considered “undeveloped” in its current condition. Ms. Pentz stated that she does not believe that there was a specific link between the demolition and the new construction, but that the site should be viewed with common sense. Mr. Martin noted that the site was not individually designated, and that it had only been considered contributing for a short time, then changed to non-contributing. Mr. Cluver reiterated his earlier comment that the currently proposed construction must be related to the previous approval for the demolition even if eight years separates the applications; he asserted that the Commission should have plenary jurisdiction over this site.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Commission has consistently asserted plenary jurisdiction over sites where demolition has taken place after designation. He contended that there is clear precedent differentiating jurisdiction over lots that were vacant prior to designation to those that became vacant after designation.

The Committee decided that it had discussed the jurisdiction question fully and moved onto the review of the design. Mr. Templeton presented the proposal to the Committee. Mr. Cluver inquired about the classification of other residential towers in the district. Mr. Farnham answered that the period of significance for the district dates from the early eighteenth century to the

1970s and that several are classified as contributing or significant. He referred to the inventory for the district and noted that Society Hill Towers is classified as significant; Hopkinson House is contributing; Independence Place, which was constructed after the end of the period of significance is non-contributing.

Mr. Cluver asserted that the renderings are misleading; they do not portray the proposed building's mass accurately. He commented that the building was incompatible with the district owing to its arrhythmic design. He also added that the base and tower along Front Street should be of similar design and materials. Ms. Hawkins stated that Ms. Templeton's analogy linking the design of the towers to the rhythm and pattern of rowhouse development was not compelling. Mr. Evans noted that the pedestrian pathway running through the property was also proposed for the National West development in Old City and it was ultimately abandoned owing to liability issues.

Mr. Farnham asked Mr. Templeton to explain the reason for the cantilever along Front Street. Mr. Templeton explained that the cantilever would contain terraces and create a contrast between the base and the tower. He noted that all cantilevers would be achieved within the property line. Mr. Cluver stated that he would not be opposed to greater lot coverage if the street façade along Front was relocated to the sidewalk line. Mr. Evans praised the design and opined that the proposed height does not impact the historic district negatively. He stated that the Commission must have full jurisdiction over materials and the final design. Ms. Pentz agreed with Mr. Evans. Ms. Hawkins stated that the proposal was well designed, but that she was uncomfortable with the height.

Richard Lush, a resident of Society Hill Towers, opined that the project reminded him of Godzilla in Tokyo. He claimed that the proposal would not fit into the low-scale residential fabric of Society Hill. Bernice Hamel, who has been involved with the 2nd Street Head House for many years, commented that she appreciates the care taken in the design and its relation to the Head House. She opined that her major concern is the proposed height; 10 stories is the absolute tallest building she would endorse. She added that the proposed walkway will not work owing to encroachment onto it from the proposed commercial activities. Mr. Evans noted that, if the proposed tower is reduced to 10 stories, then the mass of the building will migrate west, closer to the Head House, where it would be visually intrusive. Paul Boni remarked that the tall buildings in the district are a memory of the tough decisions that were made in order to bring density to the area. He noted that the tall buildings were deliberately constructed along Walnut Street and Washington Square, not in the heart of the district. He stated that the developer is using the proposed open space and walkway as a bargaining tool. He opined that the developer should propose both the open space and a properly scaled building. He contended that the proposal is wildly out of scale. He noted that the current development patterns in Society Hill are piecemeal and lack a master plan approach. He noted that, if the Penn Praxis plan to expand the grid to the river and bury I-95 is implemented, then this site would no longer be at the edge. He opined that the proposed development is driven by the price paid for the parcel, which was, in his opinion, too high.

Mr. Gallery urged the Committee not to approve the proposal. He quoted from the guidelines in the Society Hill Historic District manual and asserted that the project should not be approved. He opined that the presentation was misleading, and did not address the deep shadows this building will cast. He contended that the guidelines do not counsel that tall development should be pushed to the edges of a district. He added that the St. James tower was a good example of how random development negatively affects a historic district. He also noted that the proposed

design is incompatible with the surrounding historic fabric. He described the proposed overhang and terraces as a cage.

Harry Schwartz opined that the proposed development presents inappropriate height. He stated that the Bacon plan sought to remove inappropriate buildings from the district and create an eighteenth-century ambiance. He added that, when the plan was created, height was not an important issue because the zoning codes protected the scale of the neighborhood; the exemptions from the code, such as Society Hill Towers, were carefully designed to fit within the overall plan. He asserted that the Commission used to defer to the Zoning Board in matters of height, but that is no longer the case.

An unidentified woman stated that she owns a bed & breakfast in Society Hill and visitors constantly remark on the human scale of the district. She noted that heritage tourism is an engine of the local economy and that inappropriate projects could damage that industry.

The applicants stated that they had decided not to bring any supporters of the project to the meeting.

Ms. Pentz stated that the Commission should have plenary jurisdiction over the site. She noted that she would vote to recommend approval in concept; however, she suggested further refinement of the design. Mr. Evans stated that the project was intelligently designed and he appreciated the careful massing to protect the historic resources of the district. He noted that he would vote to recommend approval in concept, provided the design is improved before the final review. Mr. Cluver stated the Commission previously approved a 10-story development for the site and that height should not be exceeded.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Commission assert plenary jurisdiction over the site. It split on the proposal itself. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Evans recommended approval in concept. Ms. Hawkins and Mr. Cluver recommended denial, pursuant to §14-2007(7)(k)(.4) and Standard 9.

6918-6926 RIDGE AVENUE

Owner: Michael S. Kershaw

Applicant: Dominic Aspite for Wachovia Bank

History: Christopher Ozias House, c. 1805, demolished 2007

Project: Construct bank building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a branch bank building on a vacant lot at 6918-6926 Ridge Avenue in Roxborough. At its February 2008 meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed two applications related to this site; one application proposed to rescind the designation of the site; and a second application proposed the construction of a bank building. The Historical Commission voted to deny the rescission of its designation of the site. The Commission approved, in concept, the construction of a bank building. At that time, the Commission advised the applicant to revise the design and resubmit it. The applicant now proposes two revised designs. Both designs have the same footprint, massing, and location within the site as the design approved in concept by the Commission. The location of the bank building is roughly the same as the location of the historic house that once stood on that parcel. Design One proposes a one-story bank building with pediment. The building is clad in Wissahickon schist stone and capped by a prominent stucco band and cornice. The façade openings have metal sun shades with cable attachments. Design Two proposes a one-story

building with pediment. This design is entirely clad in Wissahickon Schist Stone and capped by a cornice. The main entrance facing Ridge Avenue is accentuated by an entrance hood, reminiscent of one that adorned the entrance of the residence that was demolished. The sun shades are not included in Design Two.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of Design Two, pursuant to the Historical Commission's approval in concept.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Michael Cooley represented the application.

Mr. Cluver objected to some of the design choices. He opined that the building was poorly designed and scaled. Ms. Hawkins and Mr. Evans agreed with Mr. Culver. Mr. Evans opined that both pediments should be removed, since they make the building look like a Western false front façade. Mr. Cooley stated that the bank prefers the design with the metal awnings. Mr. Danta presented photographs of the previous proposals to the Committee members and explained that the applicant had received many comments from the staff, Committee, and Commission on the design. He counseled the Committee, advising that the Commission had remanded the application to the Committee to improve the details, but not to reject the project completely. He stated that the Commission had already approved the overall concept and was seeking guidance from the Committee on the height, materials, windows, and other details.

Ms. Pentz inquired whether finding archeological artifacts had been considered. Mr. Danta stated that the Designation Committee had recommended the amendment of the designation to include archeological potential, but that the Historical Commission had rejected that notion.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the lintels over the windows be designed as supporting lintels and not in the exaggerated manner that is currently proposed. Mr. Evans suggested that the stone be brought into the pediment.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the applicant has received guidance from the Commission and Committee. He asserted that the proposed design follows all the comments the applicant has received. He suggested that the pediment be treated as a gable end and clad in schist. He urged the Committee to approve Design Two.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Design Two, provided the lintels are modified as noted, a metal roof is substituted over the pediments, and stone clad is added in the pediments.

1918 DIAMOND STREET

Owner/Applicant: Todd Joseph

History: c. 1885, façade altered in late nineteenth century

Project: Legalize front façade alterations

OVERVIEW: This project has a long and complicated history with the Historical Commission. The applicant demolished the rear ell of this row house and started construction of a CMU addition of roughly the same design and footprint as the historic rear ell. This work was performed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The applicant submitted a building permit application on 13 June 2007 to legalize this work. This application was rejected by the staff of the Historical Commission as

incomplete. The staff then conducted a site visit to gain a better understanding of the work that had been done and advise the applicant on the restoration details of the front façade. The applicant submitted a second building permit applicant after this meeting, which was also rejected by the staff as incomplete. The Executive Director wrote a letter to the applicant explaining to him the design review process. This letter is dated 28 June 2007. The applicant then submitted shop drawings for windows, which were rejected by the staff as incomplete; at this time, further and clear guidance was given to the applicant in writing in a letter dated 2 July 2007. Finally, the staff approved plans for the reconstructed rear ell and the restoration of the front façade on 27 August 2007. This approval required the review of shop drawings for windows and doors and also masonry samples. The applicant did not fulfill those requirements. The staff conducted a field inspection and noticed non-compliant work on the front façade. On 12 February 2008, the staff requested a violation for façade alterations that did not conform to the approved plans. These changes include the installation of 8-over-8 vinyl windows with snap-on muntins within built-down subframes; glass block in the basement window opening; a metal six-panel front door and a metal security door, both installed within a built down subframe; 1-over-1 vinyl window at ground floor, within a built down subframe, and masonry work without a prerequisite field visit for final approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Todd Joseph represented the application.

Mr. Joseph stated that the windows were installed as a temporary measure, and that once the neighborhood improved he would change them in accordance with the Historical Commission's regulations. He predicted that the neighborhood would likely improve within the next 10 to 15 years, but stated that he could not be certain of the time frame.

Mr. Joseph stated that bricks had been thrown through the windows, which prompted him to replace them. Ms. Hawkins noted that, one reglazes the window if glass is broken rather than replacing the entire unit. She stated that building down masonry openings is inappropriate. Mr. Cluver advised that one can use tempered glass or interior bars to address security concerns. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the Commission bases its decisions on preservation guidelines. Mr. Baron noted that if security was the concern, the staff could have approved a security grate on the basement window, which would have been there historically. Property owners cannot simply ignore the Commission's legally mandated jurisdiction and, for example, install glass block in a basement opening without an approval. Mr. Evans asked if the windows and door were the only inappropriate alterations to the façade. Mr. Danta stated that the applicant had undertaken masonry repairs without a sample review. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the alterations do not meet the Standards. The Committee members decided that they could not condone this illegal work, especially in light of the fact that the developer was fully aware of the Commission's jurisdiction, had met extensively with the staff, and had had plans approved.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9.

2420 GRAYS FERRY AVENUE

Owner: Toll Naval Associates

Applicant: Chuck Breder, Toll Brothers

History: 1830s, William Strickland, architect

Project: Construct townhouses and condominium block.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of six townhouse blocks and one condominium building on the rear grounds of the former U.S. Naval Home. The Historical Commission approved the construction of Phase One of this project, which included the restoration of the Biddle Hall and two historic residences and the construction of several blocks of townhouses and a condominium block. The proposed design follows the architectural and design standards established by Phase One. The proposed new construction would not be visible from Grays Ferry Avenue; it would be most visible from the South Street Bridge.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to the Historical Commission's approval of Phase One.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application. Developer Charles Breder and attorney Brett Feldman represented the application.

Mr. Feldman explained that Phase Two of the project will follow the same design and development scheme as Phase One. He reported that the Commission had previously approved a condominium building on this location; the developer now proposes to construct townhouses on the site owing to changing market conditions. Mr. Cluver opined that some of the architectural features were awkwardly designed. He suggested some changes to make the design more historically accurate. Others noted that the Commission had commented extensively in the past on these designs and had approved them despite their maladroit detailing.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details.

1701-1709 ARCH STREET

Owner: 1701 Partners, LP

Applicant: Leo Addimando

History: Built c. 1915, Ballinger & Perrot, architect/engineers

Project: Repair terracotta, alter storefronts, replace revolving door, cut windows.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a combination of restoration and alterations to the Robert Morris Building. The applicant proposes repairs to the terracotta cladding this Gothic Revival building. The material has experienced typical weathering and deterioration, such as cracking, fire-skin failure, and deterioration of previous repairs. The applicant proposes to use a line of Conproco terracotta restoration products. The masonry work includes two items that can are not considered restoration. The applicant proposes to eliminate all failed terracotta lips at horizontal elements and repair them with a flush patch. These elements are mostly found on window sills, cornices and other horizontal bands of the façade. The applicant also proposes to remove obsolete ventilation louvers and replace them with solid caps of the same color as the adjacent terracotta units.

The application also proposes some façade alterations at ground level; these include the replacement of all storefronts at ground floor with new aluminum display storefronts to match the original configurations. The ornate stained-glass transoms would remain undisturbed. Two individual storefronts along Arch Street would be altered into display windows. The main entrance to the building has a non-historic revolving door; however, a historic oak door in the Gothic Revival Style survives in an Arch Street entrance. The applicant proposes to replace the revolving door along 17th Street with a two-leaf aluminum door in a custom color. In that same elevation, a chain link gate is proposed for a side alley. Lastly, the applicant proposes to puncture new windows in the west party wall of the commercial annex to the Robert Morris and to enclose an open fire-escape with windows in the west elevation of the building. The proposed windows would be 1-over-1.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the fire-escape alterations; new windows in the blank party wall; terracotta restoration, and vent covers with the staff to review the details; approval of the storefront changes along 17th Street, but denial of the storefront changes along Arch Street, pursuant to Standards 2, 7 and 9. The staff does not offer a recommendation on the new entry door on the 17th Street façade, but will conduct additional historical research.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Engineers Allen Roth and Jessica Resinger represented the application.

Mr. Roth elaborated on the terracotta restoration details and reported that the same restoration was undertaken at the Benjamin Franklin House. Ms. Pentz inquired whether the vent retrofits could be done in brick for those areas of the wall that had exposed brick. Mr. Roth answered that it could be done in brick. Mr. Evans asked what percentage of the terracotta lips at the horizontal joints have failed. Mr. Roth answered that 30% of the lips are currently deteriorated or have failed. Mr. Culver opined that the lips add a rhythm to the façade and are a significant design element. Mr. Roth noted that only the lips on the lower floors are visible from the street; they are largely invisible at the upper floors. Mr. Evans suggested that Dutchman repairs be considered for the lower floors. Mr. Roth acknowledged that those repairs could be considered. Mr. Evans opined that, given the significance of this building, the repair samples should be reviewed by the staff. Mr. Danta suggested instead that the applicant present the results of those sample repairs to the Committee.

Mr. Culver noted that the storefronts should retain their original design with the recessed entrances. Ms. Hawkins seconded the comment. Mr. Danta noted that the staff had conducted a site visit and found remnants of an original storefront. He added that exact measurements could be taken in order to recreate the storefronts. With this information, a faithful restoration is possible. Ms. Pentz asked the applicant the reasons for replacing the revolving door with a double-leaf door. Mr. Roth answered that the building is being converted to student housing; the 17th Street façade would be the only access to the residences and the revolving door does not meet ADA accessibility regulations. Mr. Danta distributed photographs of the building and observed that the revolving door appears to be an original design feature. It would be a very early example of a revolving door. He noted, however, that the existing revolving door is not the original door; it seems to have been installed in the 1950s, but the surrounds and jambs are older.

Mr. Cluver opined that the open fire escapes are part of Philadelphia architecture and should be preserved. He objected to enclosing the fire escape.

Tully Speaker of the Logan Square Civic Association voiced his approval of the proposal, and agreed with the recommendations suggested by the Committee members. He handed out a copy of the neighborhood plan for Logan Square.

John Gallery noted that the Preservation Alliance holds an easement on the property. He stated that no formal application for the exterior alterations had been submitted to the Alliance. He suggested that the applicant not undertake any exterior work or samples without the Alliance's approval. He opined that the revolving door should be kept if it is an original design feature. He also expressed concern over the removal of the terracotta lips.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of fire escape enclosure, storefront alterations, and the removal of the revolving door; approval of the installation of then vent covers or brick where appropriate, with the metal plates to match the terracotta; and approval of the windows on the west party wall aligned with the frame work of the wall.

611 LOMBARD STREET

Owner: Robert Roth

Applicant: Robert Roth, AIA

History: c. 1810, individually designated, contributing to Society Hill Historic District

Project: Legalize rear addition facing residential courtyard constructed without a permit

OVERVIEW: This proposal involves an application to legalize the construction of a third story on the rear ell of this rowhouse. The rear faces onto a residential courtyard. Another house faces the construction.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Mr. Evans inquired whether this rear façade was significant enough to merit a denial. Mr. Baron stated that the Historical Commission has always treated courtyards as significant. He also noted that the property owner is an architect and, yet, erected this very large addition without a building permit or the Commission's review.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

2052 LOCUST STREET

Owner/ Applicant: Matthew Black

History: c. 1895, contributing to Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District

Project: Legalize vinyl windows

OVERVIEW: This proposal seeks to legalize the installation of vinyl windows on the front façade of this rowhouse. The owner claims that he bought the property in this state. The staff received a call from a window installer, who, at the request of the current owner, inquired whether he could install vinyl windows in this building. The staff explained that they are not appropriate. The

installer, who did not replace the windows, claims that he explained to current owner that these windows were not appropriate for a building designated as historic.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Window Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

The Committee members agreed that the windows do not satisfy the Standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Window Guidelines.

512 AND 514 S. 3RD STREET

Owner: Charisma Properties

Applicant: Raymond Rola, AIA

History: 512, constructed as firehouse c. 1855; significant to Society Hill Historic District

514, refaced mid-twentieth century; contributing to Society Hill Historic District

Project: This project calls for reinstalling windows in the façade of 512 S. 3rd and refacing the garage front at 514 with greater fenestration.

Architectural Committee Recommendation:

OVERVIEW: The application proposes converting two adjacent structures for residential use. The first floor of 512 would retain its retail space. An additional floor would be added internally to 514. The window infill would be removed and the new fenestration would restore a sense of the historic windows while using a widened spandrel to conceal the floor level change. A new garage door and windows would be installed at 514.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Ray Rola represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked how the new floor would impact the façade. Mr. Rola stated that the design is driven by a desire not to alter the storefront. He added that the front façade would not be dramatically changed; only the spandrel glazing would be significantly altered. Mr. Baron noted that this approach is not historically accurate; however it is a sensitive compromise.

Mr. Cluver inquired whether the applicant had considered creating a two-story loft side by side, rather than splitting the second floor into two separate floors, which would require the addition of the spandrel glass. Mr. Rola answered that it had been considered, but that the current design was driven by the owner's preference. Mr. Evans inquired whether there are any historic photographs to substantiate the design of the windows. Mr. Baron stated that none have been found thus far, but that, in his professional opinion, the original windows would have been very similar to the ones proposed.

Ms. Pentz asked about the proposed car elevator. Mr. Rola stated that it is a system widely used in the West Coast. He added that it would be internally operable without any exterior components.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

210 S. 34TH STREET

Owner: University of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Richard Russell

History: 1890, Cope & Stewardson architects, additions in 1912, 1966, and 1967
individually designated

Project: Demolition of rear ell and additions, construction of three-story rear addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the demolition of the rear ell and non-historic rear additions and the construction of a three-story rear addition. The firm of Cope & Stewardson designed the building for the Foulke Long Institute, an orphanage for daughters of fallen firefighters and Civil War soldiers. It was converted in the early twentieth century for use as a science building for the University of Pennsylvania and eventually for use by the Music Department. The applicants propose the demolition of the c. 1960s accretions and the older rear ell and the restoration of the main block of the building. In August 2006, the Historical Commission voted to “approve the application in concept, provided the addition connects to the main block below the projecting eave, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.”

The current proposal for final approval is very similar to the proposal that the Commission approved in concept. It varies from the directive of the Commission to attach the new construction under the cornice; rather it cuts through the cornice at certain locations and incorporates the cornice as an interior element in others. The design of the north and south facades has also been changed. The architect has followed suggestions to add more fenestration to the ground floor of the east façade. The application proposes restoration work to the historic building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Commission’s approval in concept.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz recused owing to her firm’s involvement in the project. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. University architect David Hollenberg, architects Ann Beha and Phil Chen represented the application.

Mr. Hollenberg noted that the applicant will provide samples of all proposed materials for the staff’s review. Mr. Baron asked if the roof would be restored. Mr. Chen answered that they planned to retain its existing rubber simulated slate. Mr. Evans asked if a similar addition might be constructed at the adjacent Morgan Building. Mr. Hollenberg answered this project seeks to reexpose the rear of Morgan, which is finished and of great beauty. This rear façade is currently hidden by a later building of no historic value.

Ms. Beha gave a detailed presentation of the project. She noted that this project is of great importance owing to the program and the benefits it would provide to the Music School. Ms. Beha discussed the historic documentation and conservation work proposed for the Music School building.

Mr. Chen stated that the original rear façade would be preserved as much as possible, except where the rear ell currently connects to the building. Mr. Chen noted that the proposed

terracotta panels would match the color of a cleaned terracotta area on the historic building. He mentioned that the color would not be a perfect match, but a compatible shade. Mr. Baron asked if the cornice brackets on the rear facade would be removed. Mr. Chen answered that the brackets would not be removed; some would be visible in the interior; others would be encased.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Commission's approval in concept.

4806 TRINITY PLACE

Owner: Phyllis Kaniss and Paul Wheeling

Applicant: Phyllis Kaniss and Paul Wheeling

History: c. 1890; individually designated 1/28/1969

Project: Reroof slate mansard with asphalt shingles

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove existing slate and install asphalt shingles on the mansard roof. The asphalt shingle would simulate the slate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Paul Wheeling and roofer Kevin Creighton represented the application.

Mr. Wheeling described the existing damaged slate and gutter. He explained that water penetrates failed seams in the slate and wind blows water up into the slate, causing leaks in the roof. He stated that replacing the existing slate with asphalt shingles would cost about \$20,000; installing new slate would cost more than three times as much.

Mr. Creighton proposed a Grand Manor or Centennial Slate asphalt shingle with squared corners as a replacement. Mr. Baron explained the Commission's policy about roofing on mansards. He noted that the Commission has approved replacing slate with rubber simulated slate on mansards with a finding of financial hardship. Mr. Evans encouraged the owner to contact the Preservation Alliance regarding the city grant program for restoration. As a compromise, Ms. Hawkins suggested real slate be installed on the façade elevation of the mansard and Grand Manor asphalt on the side and rear.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application as submitted, pursuant to Standard 2, but approval of the installation of authentic slate on the mansard's front elevation and Grand Manor asphalt on the side and rear, with copper ridge rolls, with the staff to review details.

1714 WALNUT STREET

Owner: Jerome and Ruth Rosoff

Applicant: Julia DelCollo

History: c. 1870, altered in 1945 by architect Armand Carroll
contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District

Project: Alter storefront

OVERVIEW: This application proposes two options for altering a second-story steel storefront window. The first option proposes to repair the existing steel window and install four operable steel casements. The second option proposes to demolish the existing window and install an aluminum window system matching the original mullion design, but adding four operable casements. The existing storefront window was designed by architect Armand Carroll in 1945 in the Art Moderne style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Anthony Tsirantonakis and Julia DelCollo represented the application.

Mr. Tsirantonakis stated that they are planning to renovate the second story of Pietro's restaurant and use it as additional restaurant space. He is proposing to restore the existing window and add four casements within the large glass openings for ventilation for the second floor. He mentioned that the change may reduce the original glass size due to subframe, but he make the change as minimal as possible. He added that the casements are now proposed as in-swing rather than out-swing shown in the drawings.

Mr. Cluver asked if the casements were required by the building code. Mr. Tsirantonakis replied that there were not, but rather for additional ventilation. He added that there are existing awning windows in the smaller sections of the window. Mr. Cluver stated that he was concern that the proposed casements would not appropriate drain rain water. Mr. Tsirantonakis stated he would address that concern in the shop drawings. Mr. Cluver opined that this design appears to be in flux. Ms. Hawkins stated that the new casements will thicken the framing system, creating overly wide verticals. Mr. Culver summarized that there are two issues with this proposal: the change in the fenestration pattern and the details of the casements. Mr. Evans stated that this is a unique window in the city; it should not be changed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

106-10 GRAPE STREET

Owner: Maximum Properties

Applicant: A. Robert Torres

History: Within the Main Street Manayunk National Historic District; 106-110 Grape Street are contributing, 108 Grape Street is listed an intrusion.

Project: In-Concept – demolish two buildings and construct four-story building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish two buildings within the Manayunk Historic District.

The structure at 106-108 Grape Street is an early twentieth-century one-story brick garage with gabled parapet. It is listed as an intrusion in the National Register Historic District. The building at 110 Grape Street is a three-story row house, constructed in the 1830s, and listed as contributing within the district. The house retains its cornice and storefront moldings at the first story, chimney, and original window frames and sills. The Manayunk ordinance does not allow for the demolition of contributing buildings.

This application proposes to construct a four-story building. The building would be constructed of brick with a center two-story bay and 2-over-2 windows. The first-story would have commercial storefronts.

Although the design of the new building is contemporary, the scale is not compatible with contributing buildings in the historic district. The contributing buildings in this area are mainly three-story row houses with brick and stucco facades. The overall massing is out of character in the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Manayunk Ordinance, Section PM-704.2.7: “Design: Additions, alterations, and new construction shall be designed so as to be compatible in scale, building materials, and texture, with contributing buildings in the historic district.”

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Robert Torres represented the application.

Mr. Torres described the proposed new construction as a four-story building with retail on the first floor and offices on the second through fourth floors. He explained that the primary material would be brick with pronounced center columns of brick. He stated the materials and façade design were changed in response to the comments from review by the previous Architectural Committee. He provided photographs of the interior, which he described is in deteriorated condition. He submitted a letter from a structural engineer that asserted the structural integrity and foundation are in poor condition and could not sustain an addition, as suggested by the previous Committee.

Mr. Baron commented that the proposed building is out of scale with the neighborhood and added that the ordinance does not provide for demolition of these buildings. He asserted that reuse or additions would be optimal alternatives. The Manayunk ordinance does not allow for the demolition of contributing buildings.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested the applicant work with the existing building. He stated that the Committee could not recommend approval of the demolition of a contributing building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Manayunk Ordinance, Section PM-704.2 of the Philadelphia Code.

1836 GREEN STREET

Owner: 1836 Green LLC

Applicant: Michael Loonstyn

History: Built circa 1859, mansard installed circa 1880, refaced with brownstone circa 1887, designated 11 October 2000 in the Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing.

Project: Rehabilitate the façade, demolish rear bay, construct four-story addition.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes several restorations and alterations to this property.

On the front façade, the applicant proposes to install a four-panel wood door, single-pane transom over the front door, 1-over-1 wood windows on the first, second, and the third stories, and 2-over-2 true-divided-light wood windows at the fourth story. Repair to the brownstone façade and wood cornice are also proposed. This application proposes to replace existing slate on the mansard with synthetic slate. On the rear, the applicant proposes to demolish a bay and construct an addition. The rear bay and shed have been greatly altered. An engineer's report recommends the rear shed be demolished. The new addition would incorporate a paneled-bay design in a tiered plan with decks on the second, third and fourth levels. The entire rear façade would be stuccoed. The fourth-story addition would destroy the cornice line. The staff suggests a three-story addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of façade rehabilitation and demolition of rear bay, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9; denial of a four-story rear addition pursuant to Standard 9; denial of stucco on the rear façade, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9; denial of the removal of the slate and the installation of synthetic slate on front mansard façade, pursuant to Standard 2; denial of the installation of a four-panel front door, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Michael Loonstyn represented the application.

Mr. Loonstyn described the proposed front door as a two-panel door, glass in the two upper panels, and a vertical astragal bar in the center to give the perception of a double door. He explained that the existing transom bar would be retained. Mr. Baron suggested inspecting the transom bar for evidence of a double door. Ms. Hawkins inquired about the proposed use of synthetic slate instead of authentic slate on the mansard. Mr. Loonstyn explained it would not be economically feasible to use authentic slate. Ms. Hawkins suggested using authentic slate on the front façade and synthetic slate on the rear.

Mr. Loonstyn proposed the restoration of a sill that was removed for an oriel window. Marks on the brownstone show where the oriel window was at the easternmost second-story window. Mr. Baron explained that it the evidence of this historic alteration should not be erased.

Mr. Loonstyn proposed patching discolored areas on the brownstone. Ms. Hawkins suggested cleaning the façade prior to patch proposals.

Mr. Evans asked about the relationship of the new addition to the cornice in the rear. Mr. Loonstyn stated that the new addition would not affect the cornice. Mr. Evans asked for a detail of this connection. Ms. Hawkins agreed that the Commission needed more information on the impact of the new addition on the cornice. Mr. Loonstyn stated he would provide a rendering of the connection with the cornice to Commission.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of façade rehabilitation, except for sill restoration and façade patching, and approval of demolition of the rear bay, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9; approval of the installation of synthetic slate on the rear mansard, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of a rear addition, pursuant to Standard 9, denial of stucco installation on the rear façade, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9; denial of synthetic slate installation on front mansard façade pursuant to Standard 2.

117 N. 15TH STREET

Owner: J.A. Reinhold, Residential

Applicant: Rachel S. Schade, AIA

History: YMCA Armed Forces Building Built: 1928 Architect: Louis E. Jallade, Designated 8/6/81

Project: Install new storefront with canopy

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install an internally-illuminated canopy, storefront doors and glazing wrought iron gates, light columns, bollards and a concrete sidewalk along 15th Street. The canopy would be cantilevered from steel installed at the plane of the recessed storefront windows and would be stabilized by cable supports attached to the limestone. The canopy would be held three inches away from the façade but would obstruct views of the decorative stone work. The storefront would be shifted back six inches and replaced by a black anodized aluminum storefront with the two doors and sidelights. The two wrought iron gates would be placed at the north and south of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the proposed canopy, but approval of all other aspects of the application, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Rachel Schade represented the application.

Ms. Schade distributed renderings of the proposed lighting. She also presented a photograph that she found in the lobby of the building. The photograph was taken in 1983 and shows a large awning that, although not attached the building, obstructs views of the decorative stonework. Ms. Cote stated that the building was locally designated in 1981 and that most likely the awning was in place prior to the designation. Ms. Schade then presented an approved awning drawing from 1997 showing an awning with a width of 192", wider than the entrance opening. Mr. Baron clarified that the approved drawings for the awning also included an elevation showing the awning within the opening.

Ms. Pentz was concerned that the proposed canopy would obscure the ornamental stone. Mr. Evans suggested that the canopy be glass so as to see the stonework through it. Ms. Schade stated that the reason why the canopy looks the way it does is to provide lighting both up and down, which will highlight the decorative stonework.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the spacing and number of lights and bollards. She opined that there were too many. Ms. Schade stated that there could be fewer, but the reason for the number and spacing was to prevent cars from parking on the sidewalk in front of the building. Ms. Hawkins suggested that this could be accomplished with fewer bollards and lights.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that this building has a strong entrance and a canopy is not necessary. Ms. Schade replied that the canopy would also serve as weather protection. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the canopy fit within the opening and be anchored to the jamb.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the bollards have a visual impact on the building. Mr. Evans and Ms. Hawkins concurred, but agreed that the lights are appropriate.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the canopy and the bollards, but approval of the sidewalk lights, concrete sidewalk, and gates, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

256 S. 3RD STREET

Owner: Gail Newman

Applicant: Richard M. Cole

History: Built: c. 1960 Designated: as contributing to the Society Hill Historic District 3/10/1999

Project: Construct rear one-story addition, add front first-floor windows, replace metal and windows on mansard.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a one-story addition at the rear of the property. The addition would be brick. A brick garden wall is also proposed to enclose a patio off the addition. This application also proposes to replace the existing sloping windows in the mansard with new vertical windows to match, and replace the standing seam metal to match the existing metal on the mansard. Lastly, a new window is proposed to be cut into the front façade at the first floor.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the first-floor front window cut, but approval of all other aspects of the application, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Property owners Joan and Rick Cole represented the application. Mr. Cole is also the architect.

Mr. Cole stated that this building is one of four in the row built in 1968. He observed that the floor plan is very small. He is proposing the addition for more space. He stated that he has four parking spaces now and the addition would be built where the current patio is and the new patio would occupy the site of two of the four parking spaces. He noted that the Preservation Alliance's *Guidelines for New Construction* suggest windows at the first floors of new buildings. Mr. Evans found it hard to argue with Mr. Cole's points. Others noted that this is an historic, not a new, building; the guidelines do not apply. Mr. D'Alessandro asked the Committee to consider the precedent that an approval would set.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the applicant had presented the project to the neighbors. Mr. Cole responded that he had presented it to the Society Hill Civic Association.

Ms. Pentz asked why he wanted to change the sloping windows. Mr. Cole replied that the windows are failing.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the fortified fronts of these buildings are important and that they say something about the time when they were constructed. She suggested glazing the door would be a better alternative than cutting a window. Mr. Cole then presented a drawing, labeled A-1a, showing fully glazed door in the front façade and a new rectangular window spanning the rear of the main block above the addition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the first-floor front window cut, but approval of the addition, rectangular window, patio, glazed door, and mansard windows and metal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

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.

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.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

Window Guidelines: Not Recommended: Changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which noticeably change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of glazing; or the appearance of the frame.