

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
25 February 2003**

Present

Vincent Rivera, Chair
Tony Atkin, AIA
Rudy D'Alessandro
Herbert Levy, FAIA
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA

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

Also

Richard Wesley, Wesley Architects
Lisa Newcome, Wesley Architects
Richard W. Thom, Old City Civic Association
Cynthia Philo, Old City District
Charles Rue, Matrix Residential Properties
Erik Gabell, Matrix Residential Properties
Tom Barton, Matrix Residential Properties
Emily Cooperman, Matrix Residential Properties
Steve Patron, Matrix Residential Properties
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Shawn Evans, Elfreths Alley
Beth Richards, Elfreths Alley
William Rhodes, Elfreths Alley
Craig Scheltor, Scheltor and Associates
Randy Cotton, Preservation Alliance
Adam Zangrilli, Thalhiemer Associates
Siraik Zakarian, 2201 Green Street
J. Poe Leggette, NoMa Association
Allen Rubin, 1918-20 Brandywine Street
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg and Ellers
David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinski Architects
R. J. Pisani, 757 South Front Street
Bernice Hamel, 302 South 2nd Street
Richard Kline, 319-21 South 3rd Street
Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association
James Campbell, Campbell Thomas Company
Lewis C. Manges, Elwyn
Lisa Love, Esq., Love and Long
Andrea Hemmann, GHI
Mark Gallini, GHI
Ron Wilk, 224 South 20th Street
Lance Silver, 224 South 20th Street

Vincent Rivera, Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:40 a.m.

100-04 Market Street, SW corner of Front Street

Michael Yaron, Owner

Richard Wesley, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 100-02: 1882 for George & Albert Ulrich; 104: c. 1790

PROPOSAL: Rooftop penthouse, deck, HVAC and kitchen vent

This development returns to the Committee and Commission for approval of several parts. The development includes the Queen Anne Revival style building at 100-02 Market Street and the Federal style building at 104 Market Street. The entire development requires a new elevator, stairs and HVAC.

The penthouse housing the stairs is situated at the rear of 102 Market and will have brick-colored stucco walls. The penthouse will have two doors, one leading to the rooftop for access to the HVAC and elevator tower and one leading to a small deck. The HVAC will include a single, large condenser unit in front of the penthouse. It may be slightly visible from across Market Street, but will be painted to match the penthouse.

The Committee and Commission previously approved the elevator tower at the cornice-line of 102 Market. The proposal now pushes it back away from the cornice. The final piece is the ventilation system for the restaurant on the first two floors. The kitchen will vent at the rear of the gable on 104 Market Street. This unit may be visible from across Market Street.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and two roofing guidelines.

Richard Wesley, the architect, and Lisa Newcome and Richard Thom attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Wesley said that the footprints of these buildings are small. He said that owing to the need for PECO to place equipment in the basement, 104 Market was added to the proposal. In addition, the clearance from the joists, do not allow for the dropping of the soffits, which means an alternative HVAC system. Mr. Wesley presented plans from the engineer to substantiate this requirement. He noted that the required mechanical equipment, elevator and stairs will use a majority of the space in 102. The proposed material of the penthouse would be stucco to match the brick of the existing building and the chiller would be painted to match. The elevator tower would be pushed back.

Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association, expressed concern about the view from the Market Street overpass bridge and asked if the equipment could be concealed with some type of screening. Ms. Spina said that sometimes the proposed screening becomes more intrusive than the unit itself. She recommended the painting of the chiller, the Committee concurred.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 9 as submitted with the painting of the chiller, with the staff to review details.

109-31 North 2nd Street aka 117-25 Arch Street

National Products, LP, Owner

Stephen Patron, Matrix Residential Properties, developer, Applicant

DATE: 109-11: c. 1880; 115-17: c. 1875; 119-21: 1957-58; 123: c. 1880; 1925: 1957-58; terra cotta façade: 1957-58

PROPOSAL: Demolition of buildings behind façade and new construction in concept

This application comes to the Committee and Commission for approval in concept and is for the development of the National Products building site. The development includes construction at this property as well as across the street. The west and north facades of the historic building will be kept, but the rest of the building will be demolished. The new construction includes a 6-story building behind the façade along 2nd Street with 40 housing units and first floor commercial space, a 15-story tower at 117-25 Arch Street with 91 units, and 17 townhouses on the interior of the site. The development will include underground parking with the ingress and egress from Arch Street. The open space at the corner of 2nd Street and Elfreth's Alley will remain a park.

The façade along 2nd Street will remain, but the proposal calls for cutting the terra cotta in four places to install storefront windows. The developer mentions new openings on the north façade, but no elevations are included. The new construction behind the terra cotta façade will have massing that follows the current façade, but the rest of the 6-story building will have a five-foot setback. The new building will have stucco and brick on the façade and will have a symmetrical configuration.

The Arch Street façade shows the 15-story tower with setbacks at the tower's side at the 6th floor with pergolas and terraces and then again at the 14th and 16th floors.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the demolition of the building and new 6-story building in concept except the openings in the terra cotta. Since the 1950's façade does not relate to the buildings behind it in any way, staff thought the new construction appropriate. For the tower on Arch Street, staff recommends denial as proposed.

Ms. Spina presented the application and remarked that the design of the vehicular access on Arch Street mimics the neighboring properties and that the proposed tower relates architecturally to the surrounding neighborhood.

Mark Brookman, Esq., Thomas Barton, architect, and Charles Rue, Esq., attended the meeting. Mr. Brookman informed the Committee that the design of the tower has been modified to a ten-story tower instead of fifteen stories. Mr. Barton said that he looks at the property as one and believes that the massing of the new construction relates to the streetscape. He also said that he has been working with the community to address their concerns and as a result, Flag Pole Park will be retained as open space for the community and interior pedestrian walkways would be created. Mr. Rue pointed out that all the parking would be underground and stressed the importance of loft space in Old City.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, thought the development to be very impressive. But shared three concerns:

1. The terra cotta façade on the north is an integral part of the building and should not be demolished and retail entrances with signage is undesirable.
2. Owing to the substantial turning radius needed, the alliance would be opposed to emergency vehicular access from Elfreth's Alley.
3. He expressed a height concern. He believes the proposed height is a contrast of that in Old City. He thought that lowering the ceilings to 9 or 10 feet would accomplish the same loft effect without a loss of units.

Cynthia Philo, Old City District, said that her organization thoroughly reviewed the project and is in support of the project. She believes that the interest of the community as well as that of the developer have been balanced.

Beth Richards, Elfreth's Alley Association, supports the project which preserves Flag Pole Park and 128 Elfreth's Alley.

Heather Harris, resident of Appletree Court, said that the Matrix Company was cooperative and considerate of the resident's privacy. She supports the project.

Ellen Curry, resident of Mascher Street, supports the overall design, but expressed concern about the height issues.

Shawn Evans, resident of Elfreth's Alley, thought it possible to decrease the height of the tower on Arch and Bread Streets.

Mr. Barton said that 70 to 80% of the terra cotta on the north façade would be retained and that a one-story projection would allow access on 2nd Street, with the visual access on 2nd Street. He proposes to save as much as possible on the north side. Ms. Spina suggested that the applicant return with plans for just the treatment of the terra cotta façade. Mr. Barton proposes to devise a width on the Arch Street façade for emergency vehicle access.

Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association, said that the association has not taken a position on the development.

Mr. Levy thought that the developers should give some commitment as to what can be done in the future to 128 Elfreth's Alley. Mr. D'Alessandro thought it important not to interrupt Elfreth's Alley streetscape. Mr. McCoubrey inquired if the service access would be from the street; the response was that the service access would be through the garage. Mr. Rivera stressed the importance of sign control and the salvaging of the terra cotta.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept, with consideration to the issues posed by the Preservation Alliance.

128 Elfreth's Alley

National Products, LP, Owner

Stephen Patron, Matrix Residential Properties, developer, Applicant

DATE: 1868

PROPOSAL: Sever from National Products building and demolish rear addition in concept

Currently, the property at 128 Elfreth's Alley connects to the National Products building at 109-31 North 2nd Street. The proposal in concept is to sever this building from the main body of the property and to sell it as a separate property. The severing will include demolishing a rear addition.

The property, constructed in 1868, originally stood as a separate building. It was incorporated into the National Products development in the mid-twentieth century. Severing the building would restore it to a separate entity.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 4 of the Restoration Standards.

Photographs of the 20th-century addition should be given to the Historical Commission for its

files.

Shawn Evans noted that 128 Elfreths Alley was built as an addition to an adjoining property which burnt. The house was rebuilt as a loading dock and 123 North 2nd Street was incorporated into 128 Elfreths Alley.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, thought it a generous gesture of the developer to give 128 Elfreths Alley to the Elfreth's Alley Association.

Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association, thought that this consideration by the developer is a cleaner resolution to the issue of 128 Elfreth's Alley.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept.

110-22, 128-34 North 2nd Street and 113-33 North Bread Street

National Products, LP, Owner

Stephen Patron, Matrix Residential Properties, developer, Applicant

DATE: 110-12 North 2nd Street: 1893 for Arthur Colburn; 128 North 2nd Street: c 1965; rest are empty lots

PROPOSAL: Demolition of 128 North 2nd Street, rehabilitation of 110-12 North 2nd Street, new construction in concept

The proposed development on the west side of North 2nd Street includes: rehabilitation of 110-12 N. 2nd Street into 7 residential units, construction of a 6-story building housing 27 units at 114-22 N. 2nd Street, demolition of 128 N. 2nd Street and construction of 6-story building with 26 housing units at 128-34 N. 2nd Street. Along Bread Street the development includes a 13-story tower with 95 housing units and 28 townhouses.

114-22 N. 2nd Street are the only properties that currently appear on the Philadelphia Register; however, they suffered an arson fire in 1998 and are now vacant lots. Also, pursuant to the new ordinance pending before City Council, the demolition of 128 N. 2nd Street comes to the Historical Commission for review. The developer also wishes to have the Committee and Commission's comments on the development since it is part of an overall package including the east side of 2nd Street.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the rehabilitation of 110-12 North 2nd Street; approval of the demolition of 128 N. 2nd Street; approval of the buildings on N. 2nd Street. On the Bread Street elevation, the staff recommends approval of the townhouses. The 13-story tower should have a cornice line that matches the neighboring buildings and then a setback from the front façade to lessen the impact the height will have on the streetscape.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal and noted that 128 North 2nd Street is listed as a non-contributing building in the inventory of the proposed Old City Historic District. The design of the new construction would differ from the original, but it is compatible with the surrounding streetscapes.

Mr. Tyler said that the Ordinance prohibiting demolition in Old City is still pending; however, at the direction of the Law Department, the Department of Licenses and Inspections enforces such ordinances as soon as they are voted out of Committee.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, noted that the vacant lot is still designated; the Commission denied the application for recission of the property. He believed that the action by the

Commission has created an unusual situation.

Mark Brookman, Esq., described the denial of the recission by the Commission as a control issue over the review process.

The Architectural Committee recommended conceptual approval.

224 Market Street

Scott Stein, Owner

Adam Zangrilli, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1820; storefront – c. 1865; upperstories removed and 2nd floor window installed- c. 1920; storefront window altered-c. 1975

PROPOSAL: Alter storefront

This application calls for demolishing the extant first floor façade and installing a new one. The current façade has the historic configuration of entrances at the ends and a central storefront window. The proposed façade will have a single-leaf door to one side and two sets of coupled, casement windows. There are no details of the proposed material for the new front wall. A partial photograph of the original façade with the cast-iron pilasters, some of which remain, exists in Commission files. If the owner's goal is to have operable windows, these may be installed in the existing openings.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standards 2 and 10. The symmetry of the façade should be retained.

Adam Zangrilli and David Stein attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Mr. Zangrilli stated that although they are appealing egress requirements they may be required to include a second door in the new storefront, as suggested by the staff. Mr. Atkin asked about the proposed materials. Mr. Zangrilli responded that they are proposing smooth unarticulated stucco between and below the new windows. Mr. Baron suggested larger windows and less solid wall and observed that the historic storefronts had large windows with transoms above and panels below. Mr. Zangrilli thought that the storefront could be redesigned with larger operable windows and stated that he was willing to work with staff on developing the design. Committee members commented that the existing original piers and any other surviving original fabric should be retained and incorporated into the new design. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the applicant undertake some exploration to determine if any additional original fabric survives.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal as submitted pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10; however, it encouraged the applicant to withdraw the proposal and work with staff on a new design.

JB

144-46 North 3rd Street

J. Poe Leggette, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830; storefront in 144- c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Alter storefront windows

The proposal involves rehabilitating two c. 1830 commercial buildings for residential use. The owner plans to restore the building at 144 N. 3rd to the period of about 1860 when cast iron piers were installed in the storefront. He will replace the current aluminum windows with wood two-over-two sash.

The similar building at 146 N. 3rd Street will be restored to the same period except that at that time the original stone piers and six-over-six windows still remained. New small pane windows will fill the upper floor openings with staff to review details.

Mr. Leggette will have the paint removed from the façade of both the buildings. The storefronts will receive new transoms based on the design of a remaining mid 19th-century transom over one middle bay, but will receive new paneled doors of two-leaf design in the center bays. The owner does not wish to restore the windows in the flanking bays, but rather to recess new windows to the line of the old doors and install new panels below in order to retain an open show window for display purposes.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standard 3.

J. Poe Leggette attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Baron presented the proposal and summarized the history of the changes to the two facades. Mr. Levy questioned the window details, as submitted, for the upper floors. Mr. Baron responded that the staff is working with the applicant on the window details. They intend to match the historic wood windows and replicate the details for staff review and approval. The Committee discussed the differences between the two buildings and agreed that the proposed window types helped to distinguish the two facades. Mr. Baron observed that there are some atypical details on these buildings and the storefront treatment, as proposed, is not a true restoration. The applicant prefers storefront windows, where they exist, but set back in line with the existing transom windows. Although double doors would have been original to these openings, the storefront windows existed at the time of designation. Mr. Baron explained that the applicant contends that the storefront windows are more appropriate for the proposed use of the space. The Committee found the compromise storefront treatment acceptable.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the project as proposed pursuant to Standard 3, with the staff to review details.

JB

158 North 3rd Street

Brad Meyers, Owner

Mark Kaman, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1910

PROPOSAL: Rooftop deck

The proposal involves constructing a roof deck on top of this converted industrial building. The deck will have high visibility since it will be placed close to the front cornice and because the buildings to either side are lower. Because of the proximity to the neighbor's chimney, the proposal also calls for extending that chimney with a metal B-vent.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 9 and roofing guidelines.

Marc Kamen, contractor, attended the meeting to represent the project. The Committee discussed the proposed extension of the chimney on 156 N. 3rd Street. Mr. Baron observed that the applicant would need the permission of the owner to undertake any work to the neighboring property. Mr. Kamen agreed that the chimney alteration at 156 N. 3rd Street is not part of this application. The Committee discussed the location of the proposed railing in relation to the hatch and the chimney. Committee members expressed concern over the visibility of the railing with the minimal setback as proposed. Mr. Kamen stated that they could set the entire deck and railing farther back on the roof.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of a deck with railing set back in line with the chimney at 156 N. 3rd Street.

JB

113 Chestnut Street, NE corner of Letitia Street

Michael Samschick, Owner

Joel Spivak, Applicant

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: New windows, doors and awnings

This proposal involves restoration and alteration to the first floor storefront on both the Chestnut and Letitia Street frontages. The building will now accommodate a restaurant use on the first floor and residential above. Most of the first floor openings had been blocked up prior to designation and will now be reopened. On the Chestnut Street façade the two wider openings will receive windows based on existing transoms and documentation from the Baxter survey. Two doors will be installed in the narrower openings, one a four panel door and the other door featuring one large glass light. On the Letitia Street façade, the applicant proposes to reopen two doorways to be used as windows, matching the design of the former doors. A former window will be reopened as a doorway into a new elevator lobby serving the upper floors.

Staff recommendation: Approval, subject to the redesign of the two front doors to match the double leaf design featured on the Letitia Street façade, the awnings narrowed to fit between the columns and with staff to review all details, pursuant to Standard 6.

No one attended the meeting to represent the proposal.

Mr. Baron presented the application. He said that this application is for alterations to the first floor only. The applicant proposes to install the awnings at the location where hooks already exist. The Committee thought that the awning should be reduced in size to fit between the columns. It also concurred with the staff recommendation concerning the proposed door design. Committee members noted an additional element seen on the plans of a ramp in the front with railings, which the Committee thought appropriate. The Committee recommended that the bulkhead under the front windows, which is currently stucco, should be painted out or replaced to match the historic doors in the photograph.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, subject to the two front doors redesigned to match the double leaf design featured on the Letitia Street façade, the awnings narrowed to fit between the columns and the bulkhead under the front windows painted out, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

2201 Green Street, NW corner of 22nd Street

Siraik Zakarian, Owner/Applicant

DATE: Bergdoll Mansion, built 1890, architect attribution James Windrim

PROPOSAL: Side demolition, addition and fencing

The proposal involves demolition and additions to the visible west side of the house. The mansion, probably the grandest within the Spring Garden Historic District, features a number of ornamental features on the west façade that would be impacted by this work. The owner plans to demolish the curved copper clad conservatory as well as the carved brownstone spandrel panels of the curved bay. The area would be covered with several one and two story rectangular additions that would hide much of the original side façade.

The owner proposes a security fence that will have twelve and eight foot high sections and will cut across the side and front lawn for security. The design will follow other sections of fence on the property.

Staff recommendation: Denial of both the demolition, additions and the fence per Standards 9 and 10. The additions demolish and cover too much significant historic fabric and the fence in scale and placement is inappropriate to the property.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and noted that the proposed alterations are visible from Green Street. He noted however, that in the *Standards* that visibility or lack thereof is not the determining factor, but rather the significance of the facades being altered.

Siraik Zakarian, the owner, and Allen Rubin representing the Spring Garden Civic Association, which supports the proposed alterations, represented the application. Ms. Zakarian noted the importance of this building and that it is expensive to maintain. The addition would allow for additional rental space, as well as space for the owner's unit. The installation of a kitchen and bath in this addition will allow an additional rental unit which will help subsidize the maintenance expense. She gave a lengthy discourse about the restoration that she has undertaken as a result of a fire to preserve the splendor of the interior. Mr. Rubin disputes the allegation of visibility because the owner proposes to plant trees on the portion of the property that was not restored after the fire. She noted that the proposed addition would be scored stucco to match the brownstone on four sides, which would not be disturbed by the addition. She also pointed out that the Commission requires that an addition should not mimic the historic feature, which she believes that her alterations accomplish. In regards to the proposed fence, Ms. Zakarian said that the existing fence along 22nd Street is in poor condition, and owing to the many burglaries, the fence is needed.

Mr. Rivera stressed the importance of not blocking the historic fabric of this one-of-a-kind building. Mr. Atkin believes that the porch is an important feature to this structure and that it should not be removed. Mr. Levy suggested an interior connection with the fire stair. Mr. McCoubrey said that the demolition of the conservatory would be hard to justify. Committee members informed the applicant about the Financial Hardship Committee as a possible avenue to approach. Mr. Atkin told the applicant that he believed that there exist options for compromise, and that the one addition would be acceptable; however, the demolition of the conservatory would be inappropriate. Ms. Zakarian strongly argued that she has spent a lot of money in the restoration of this property, and believes that she should not have to make compromises with regards to the alterations.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial as submitted, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

It offered the applicant recommendations for a revised design, which would minimize the removal of historic fabric.

757 South Front Street, SE corner of Fitzwater Street

Jean Vidi, Owner

R. J. Pisani, Applicant

DATE: c. 1800

Four-story side addition

This proposal involves very large side and rear additions to this Federal Style house. The house, which sits on a former corner of Front and Fitzwater Streets has received a single story addition in the past on ground vacated by the City and sold to Mr. Vidi. The side façade, historically exposed, features bands of glazed header brickwork in a design almost unique in the City. The new addition will cover that façade and remove it from public view, although it will be visible from within the restaurant. The new addition, featuring an elevator modeled on the Campanile from the Piazza San Marco in Venice, is out of scale and incompatible with the architecture of the building to which it attaches. The rear addition also is out of scale and incompatible with the historic building. The applicant also proposes to demolish and alter the roofline and dormer of the existing building to add a raised roof and deck.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standards 9 and 10. and site guidelines.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. He noted a site visit by the staff. The plans call for raising the historic gable roof. He also said that the height of the two-story proposed addition is taller than the third-story of the existing structure. He believed that there is room in the rear to accommodate the elevator.

Frederick Vidi, the owner, Robert Pisani and Brett Feldman, counsel for the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Feldman asked the Committee to give some type of guidance as how to proceed. Mr. Pisani pointed out that the building is small with a small kitchen and seating for 90 to 100 people. Mr. Vidi commented that the business is primarily for private functions and the addition would allow for a second means of egress with an elevator on the 2nd floor. He proposes that the 2nd floor addition's material is all glass with the retention of the brickwork on the 1st floor.

Mr. Atkin inquired about the roof addition, and it was determined that the 3rd and 4th floor is the owner's apartment and that a kitchen is needed at this location for the restaurant. He thought that a 2nd floor addition may be appropriate, but the mezzanine should be eliminated because it destroys the view of the brickwork. He also believes that the Venetian motif is inappropriate for this building and that any alterations should be sympathetic to the character of this building. Committee members thought the sloped roof problematic. Mr. Pisani argued that a flat roof is not acceptable since the current addition sits back. Mr. Atkin and other Committee members thought that the elevator should be put on the interior. Mr. Rivera remarked that this is a unique site and the proposed motif is very busy. He believes that an airy and simple design is better. The Committee concurred that the elevator should not be located on the front, the Venetian motif inappropriate and the rear addition which includes the raising of the roof as problematic.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial as submitted pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

109 Queen Street

Tim Montague, Owner

David Amburn, Architect/Applicant

HISTORY: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Demolish rear roof and dormer, raise roof, new rear door and windows, rear deck

This application for the row house at 109 Queen Street proposes demolishing the historic rear dormer, raising the rear half of the gable roof on the main section of the building, and erecting a deck on the 2-story rear ell. Additionally, a paired window and double-leaf glazed deck access door would be installed at the 3rd-story rear of the main section of the building.

Staff Recommendation: The staff did not concur on a recommendation. Some recommend approval as submitted; others recommend denial for reasons of visibility and loss of historic fabric, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofing guideline.

David Amburn, the architect, and Tim Montague, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Amburn said that the rooftop addition is only minimally visible through an entrance doorway to a parking lot several houses away. He noted that all the new work would take place behind the existing ridge of the roof on the front, main section of the building and would therefore be invisible from Queen Street. Mr. Amburn said that he is flexible with regards to the new fenestration and proposes to use wood clapboard with a shingled roof on the new construction for differentiation.

Mr. Levy said that he was troubled by the horizontal orientation of the windows and thought that they should be a two-over-two configuration. The applicant stated that he would work with the staff to determine the details.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal, with the staff to review details.

319-23 South 3rd Street

Lisa Colton, Owner/Applicant

HISTORY: 1788-1795; addition by Wallace, McHarg, Roberts & Todd, c. 1968

PROPOSAL: Demolition and new construction in concept

This application in concept proposes the demolition of an addition and construction of a new addition. The single parcel at 319-323 S. 3rd Street includes a late eighteenth-century row house at 323 S. 3rd and an addition at 319-321 S. 3rd. The addition was erected in 1968 as part of the redevelopment of Society Hill. The redevelopment era is included within the Society Hill Historic District's period of significance. The entirety of the property at 319-323 S. 3rd Street is classified as "significant" in the District's inventory.

This proposal, the fourth for this site by this owner, has a history that warrants recounting. In January 2001, the Commission denied an application by the current owner to erect a new addition atop the 1968 addition that would appear to be two eighteenth-century row houses (proposal 1). At that time, the Commission did approve in concept adding to the extant addition to create a 3-story addition to the eighteenth-century row house. This approval in concept was not renewed and therefore expired in January 2002. In February 2002, Commission denied a second application for a new addition (proposal 2). Like the first, it would have mimicked the neighboring historic structures. In May 2002, the Commission approved a proposal to build a 2-story addition at the rear of the 1968 addition (proposal 3). This proposal would not have altered the S. 3rd Street façade of the 1968 addition. Although the project was approved, the owner has not yet sought a permit for this work.

The current application proposes the complete demolition of the 1968 addition and the construction of a large, brick, 3-story, 3-bay addition with an automobile entrance.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the concept of the demolition, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

Richard Kline, the architect, attended the meeting on behalf of the owner. He contended that the proposed design would clearly read as new, not historic. He stated that 25% of the sixty-foot deep lot is open space.

The Committee remarked that the proposed design is significantly different from the design that the Commission approved in May 2002. Mr. Baron pointed out that the previous design did not include a garage opening. Mr. Atkins claimed that the proposed design would not be appropriate in the context. Bernice Hamel of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that the 1968 addition is significant because it was erected during the redevelopment era. She presented a sketch of the proposed rear addition to the extant addition approved in May 2002 and contended that the current proposal was in no way like the approved proposal.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

5208 Germantown Avenue

Elwyn, Incorporated, Owner

Richard Stange, Architect/Applicant

HISTORY: Baynton House, late eighteenth century

PROPOSAL: Modify existing railing and install new railings

This application proposes modifying the existing railings and adding new railings at the front steps at 5208 Germantown Avenue. Two alternatives are presented. Both stipulate raising the existing pipe railing six inches. The first calls for diamond mesh to be installed on the raised railing. The second calls for pickets to be installed on the raised railing. Both alternatives also stipulate new hand rails and lower pipe railings, some of which are very curvilinear.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of both alternatives, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application.

James Campbell, the architect, Lewis Manges, the owner's representative, and Randy Cotton of the Preservation Alliance attended the meeting. Mr. Cotton noted that the Alliance owns a facade easement on this property. Mr. Campbell, the applicant, confirmed that he had revised the design, eliminating Alternate 1 with the mesh material because the Alliance did not approve it. Mr. Campbell also confirmed his and his client's willingness to further revise the design to meet the requirement of the Commission.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the new railings match the existing, given that some original fabric remains. Mr. Rivera remarked that a simple picket railing would be more appropriate. In addition, he thought that the existing pipe railing should be removed rather than retrofitted and replaced with a traditional handrail moulding, square posts and ½" spindles, and lamb's tongue fittings, painted black. Mr. Atkin suggested that it should correspond to the railing next door at 5214 Germantown Avenue. The applicant stated that he would happily redesign the railing to meet the requirements of the Committee.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of redesigned railings with a traditional handrail moulding, square posts and ½" spindles, and lamb's tongue fittings, painted black.

5218 Germantown Avenue

Elwyn, Incorporated, Owner

Richard Stange, Architect/Applicant

DATE: Howell House, late eighteenth century

PROPOSAL: Modify existing railing and install new railings

This application proposes adding new railings at the front steps at 5218 Germantown Avenue. Two alternatives are presented. The first calls for pipe railings with diamond mesh. The second calls for pipe railings with pickets. Both are very curvilinear.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided that the inappropriate flares are eliminated and the railings are painted black, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application.

Owing to the similarities of the two applications for handrails at 5208 and 5218 Germantown Avenue, the Committee consolidated the reviews into one. The Committee reached the same conclusions for 5218 as it had reached for 5208 Germantown Avenue.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of redesigned railings with a traditional handrail moulding, square posts and ½" spindles, and lamb's tongue fittings, painted black.

1522 Pine Street

Lisa Love and Reginald Long, Owners

DATE 1849, Thomas U. Walter, architect

D. Lucas Landis, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Rear stairtower and HVAC

This application proposes several alterations to the brownstone rowhouse at 1516 Pine Street. Famous Philadelphia architect Thomas Ustick Walter, the architect of the dome and Senate and House wings of the U.S. Capitol, designed this rowhouse. It is an important example of the Italianate style. The application proposes: removal of the fire escape at the junction of the main building and rear ell; addition of a 2-story brick stair tower at the junction of the main building and rear ell; addition of gas meters on the south façade of the rear ell; addition of electric meters of the west façade of the rear ell; addition of vents on the west façades of the rear ell and stair tower; removal of a kitchen vent and brick infill of the opening on the south façade of the rear ell; replacement of 3rd-story west rear ell windows with double-hung, wood, TDL windows, and addition of a light fixture above the front door.

The owners are renovating this building to include offices and residences. The 2-story stair tower in the side yard would allow entrance from the rear. The stair tower would be faced with brick and roofed with asphalt shingles to match those on the mansard. The stair tower and vents would be minimally visible from Waverly Street, which runs along the property at the south. The utility meters would not be visible. The opening from an old kitchen vent on the south façade of the rear ell would be infilled with brick to match. The infill may be minimally visible. The 3rd-story windows on the west façade of the rear ell would be replaced with historically appropriate double-hung, wood, true-divided-light windows. A recessed light fixture would be installed above the front door. Staff should verify that the fixture can be installed without damaging the

lintel.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application.

Committee members contended that, without comprehensive elevation drawings of the stair addition, the submission was incomplete. Lisa Love, the owner, attended the meeting. She stated that she believed the submission to be complete. Mr. Farnham informed the Committee that, after reviewing the initial submission, he had sent a fax to the applicant detailing the many missing elements. He further explained that the applicant had supplied supplementary drawings and information but that the application remained disorganized.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, owing to the incompleteness of the submission.

311 South Chadwick Street

Mark Gallini, Owner/Applicant

HISTORY: c. 1845; addition by Frank Weise, 1991

PROPOSAL: Extension of existing third-story addition in concept

This application for approval in concept proposes to extend an addition on the roof of a carriage house at 311 S. Chadwick Street. The Commission approved the original addition in April 1991. The Commission's approval included two provisions, that the addition be set back 16 feet and the deck railing 2.5 feet from the front facade. Although the original addition appears to meet the Commission's restriction, the deck railing does not. It was erected at the plane of the façade; the stipulated setback was not provided. Also, the railing is much less transparent than that approved. Thin pickets were approved, but the extant railing consists of wide boards. Owing to a parking lot running along Pine Street from Chadwick to S. 17th Streets, the carriage house and any rooftop additions are highly visible from the south and west. At the time of the approval of the original addition, the Committee and Commission discussed the visibility of the addition, which they sought to reduce, and the above-noted compromise was reached. The addition currently proposed would be much more visible than the original addition.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofing guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Committee members commented on the material of the existing deck railing. Mr. Baron asserted that the historic character of the row of carriage houses should be preserved; the proposed alterations, he contended, would significantly and negatively change the character of the row.

Andrea Hemmann and Mark Gallini, the owners, attended the meeting. Mr. Gallini thought that the existing deck railing could be set back and replaced with a metal railing to reduce its visibility. He claimed that the proposed addition would not be visible from Chadwick Street, but would, however, be visible from Pine Street, owing to a parking lot. He then contended that the visibility from Pine Street across the parking lot should not be considered significant because structures would eventually be constructed on the lot.

Mr. Atkin said that the visibility across the parking lot should not be the condition for denial. Both Mr. Atkin and Mr. Rivera expressed concern about the addition, which would be too prominent, they argued. Committee members stated that the proposed addition should not mimic the unique residence of architect Frank Weise, which stands to the north of this property. They

suggested that the west façade of the current addition be replicated on the new addition because the dark quality created by overhang causes the rooftop structure to recede. Mr. Levy thought the deck should be set back from the plane of the main façade to the plane of the west façade of the proposed addition and that the railing should be reconstructed in a lighter, less visible material. Mr. Gallini noted that the proposed addition would not extend across the entire width of the front façade; the proposed addition would only occupy the southern half of the remaining rooftop.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept of the proposed addition provided that its west façade is redesigned to be less conspicuous and that the deck and a more transparent railing are set back to the plane of the west façade of the proposed addition.

224 South 20th Street

Ronald G. Wilk, Owner/Applicant

HISTORY: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Legalize rear HVAC platform

This application proposes legalizing an HVAC platform at the rear of 224 S. 20th Street. It was erected to provide room for parking in the small rear yard. A violation was issued on 14 February 2003. The property is bounded by S. 20th Street on the east, Chancellor Street on the north, and Woodstock Street on the west. The platform is visible from Chancellor and Woodstock Streets. The applicant has not provided any information about the equipment that will be installed on the platform. It seems possible that the HVAC equipment could be located in a position that would both allow for parking and be invisible from all public rights-of-way.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application and noted that a violation was issued for this work. Mr. Atkin inquired about the reason for the platform, which he contended was very large.

Lance Silver and Ronald Wilk, the owners, attended the meeting. In response to a query by Mr. Atkin, Mr. Wilk responded that the platform is needed to accommodate two air conditioning units, which would allow for the removal of the window units.

Committee members noted the visibility of the platform from Chancellor and Woodstock Streets and contended that the platform had been constructed of materials inappropriate to the setting. They also disapproved of its placement across a first-story window. They then discussed better locations for the HVAC units. Mr. Wilk claimed that the placement of the units on the ground would hamper parking. Committee members disputed this claim. Mr. Atkin recommended situating the units in the shed and installing louvers; however, it was determined that this location would not allow for space to maintain the units. Mr. D'Alessandro strongly opposed the legalization of the platform. Committee members asserted that the HVAC units, which weigh only 138 pounds each, could safely be placed on the roof. The Committee concurred that enough area exists on both the ground and the roof to locate the units without adversely impacting the streetscape.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary