

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

**26 JUNE 2007
CITY HALL, ROOM 578
9:30 A.M.**

PRESENT

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

Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation 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
Bob Hotes, RMJM Hillier Architects
Betsy Caesar, Playcare, Inc
Hope Zoss, Smith Memorial Playground
Eric Baratta, Smith Playground
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Jim Nolen, PPG
Rick Sudam, PPG
Scott Lapnon, PPG
Matt Koenig, JK Roller
Deidre DeAscanis, JK Roller
Kristin Erhard, JK Roller
Tom Witt, Esq., Wolf Block
Alvin Holm
James Garrison, RMJM Hillier Architects
Wesley Wei, Wesley Wei Architects
Martin Jay Tackett, Tackett & Co.
Frank Rapasardi, Tackett & Co.
Becky Stoloff, SHCA
Patrick Rommel
John Andrews, John S. Andrews Architects, LLL
Kerry Polite
Sonali Polite
Michael Hauptman, Brawer & Hauptman
Camille Focacino
Margeux Pelegrin
Mitchell Bach

Brett Feldman, Esq. Klehr Harrison
Susan Erickson
Joe Serratore

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Rivera called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Ms. Pentz and Messrs. Levy, Thomas, and McCoubrey joined him on the Architectural Committee. Mr. D'Alessandro joined the Committee while the meeting was in progress.

1550 N. 33RD STREET, SMITH PLAYGROUND

Owner: Smith Memorial Playground
Applicant: Robert J. Hotes, AIA
History: 1899
Project: Renovate playground

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of an infant and toddler playground at Smith Memorial Playground, a non-profit children's recreation center located in Fairmount Park. This application proposes the third phase of a complete rehabilitation of the Smith facilities. The Commission reviewed and approved Phase I and II in 2004 and 2006 respectively. A similar Phase III application was submitted but then withdrawn in April 2007.

This application proposes the construction of an infant and toddler playground on the lawn at the rear of the historic playhouse in an area know as the "velodrome." The name refers to the Figure-8 tricycle path that traverses the lawn. Owing to safety restrictions, it is no longer possible to allow children to race around the Figure-8 on wheeled vehicles. Therefore, Smith would like to redevelop it as a play area for younger children in a way that would echo the Figure-8. The redevelopment would include playground safety surfaces, play equipment, seating walls, accessible pathways, site furniture, fences, gates, and landscaping. The construction of the play area would require the removal of a dilapidated picnic shelter. The shelter dates to the 1920s, would be expensive to rehabilitate, no longer fits programmatically, and poses safety hazards.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 9. The staff recommends that the removal of the pavilion be considered an alteration, not a demolition; it deems its removal as analogous to the removal of an old but not original shed addition at the rear of a rowhouse.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Committee. Director Hope Zoss, architect Robert Hotes, and landscape architect Eric Pirotta represented the application.

Mr. Hotes summarized the project to create an infant and toddler playground. He explained that the he had addressed the primary issues raised by the Architectural Committee at its previous review. Most importantly, he had retained the historic Figure-8 to a greater extent. He noted that it can no longer be used as a bicycle raceway owing to safety concerns. He also explained that he needs to remove the dilapidated shelter that stands next to the Figure-8. It creates a visual obstruction between the Phase 2 and Phase 3 playgrounds, preventing parents from monitoring their children if they are spread across the two areas. It also does not fit their program and would cost \$35,000 to rehabilitate.

Ms. Pentz asked about the new fence. Mr. Baratta showed its location on the plan, separating the toddler playground from the older children's playground down the hill. He also showed a detail of the simple, black, metal, 4-foot fence on the drawings. The Committee deemed it appropriate.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the trees. Mr. Baratta explained that some are extant and others are proposed. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the new tree proposed for the center of the seating area be eliminated to retain the axial view of the historic building from the lower area. Mr. Baratta noted that it was proposed for shade, but agreed that it could be relocated.

Mr. McCoubrey objected to the strange intersection between the historic north path coming down from the main building, the Figure-8, and, and the new play surface at the north. He suggested that the intersection was unsightly and would cause maintenance problems. Mr. Baratta agreed to rework the design.

Ms. Zoss explained the need to remove the dilapidated shed. She stated that she would document it before its removal.

Mr. Rivera complimented the application team on their thorough and well documented design and presentation. The other Committee members agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 9.

101-221 W. JOHNSON STREET

Owner: Philadelphia Preservation Group

Applicant: Mathew Koenig

History: Presser Building: 1914, Paul & Seymour Davis, architects

Carriage House: c. 1900, unknown architect

Nugent Building: 1896, J. Franklin Stuckert, architect.

Project: In Concept, construct six-story apartment building

OVERVIEW: This application in-concept proposes to construct a six-story building. The Commission granted a conceptual approval in January 2006 of a proposal for this site that included the construction of three identical residential buildings. The Architectural Committee discussed at great length that proposal, specifically the massing, design and placement of the three new buildings and the ratio of open green space versus new paved space for parking.

The applicant now proposes a modified scheme. The new proposal has eliminated the three individual buildings and proposes a single six-story building instead. The previous design paid homage to the two historic buildings by utilizing certain architectural details in their design. The current proposal presents a contemporary design that also picks up on the architecture of the historic buildings, although in much more subtle ways. However, the relationship between the new building and the site can not be assessed based on the documentation provided. The proposed site plan differs from the one previously approved in concept. The most noticeable change occurs at the central open green space. The previous proposal maintained this space undeveloped. However, the current proposal shows a defined paved entrance to the new building and parking spaces on part of this previously undeveloped green space.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The proposed conceptual scheme may have merit. However, it does not include sufficient information to assess its full impact of the new building on the site and its relationship to the three historic buildings.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Developer James Nolen, engineer David Plante, and architect Matt Koenig represented the application.

Mr. Koenig presented a summary of the project. He stated that the current application proposes the addition of a single large building to the five-acre site with three historic buildings. He explained that the proposed building would occupy a footprint that approximates the footprints of the three new buildings approved by the Commission last year. He noted that, although taller, the new building would not stand above the historic buildings owing to the significant change in grade at the rear of the site. Mr. Levy asked about the height of the Upsal Gardens building behind this site. Mr. Koenig stated that it is four stories, but its roofline would approximate that of the proposed building because it sits on higher ground. Mr. Koenig stated that the parking would be under the building and also at grade on the site. He noted that the proposal, like the earlier proposal, retains the green space at the front of the site along Johnson Street. He explained that the design of the new building had been revised recently, centering the entrance on the green space to the south. He stated that it would be a building with contemporary styling clad in brick and panels. It would use colors from the historic Nugent building, but would be differentiated from the historic buildings. It would house approximately 200 units.

Mr. Rivera objected to the parking space to unit ratio. He asked about the previous application, which had proposed some offsite parking. Mr. Nolen explained that he had been unable to reach an agreement with the neighboring property owner for additional parking.

Mr. Pentz asked about the grade changes at the rear of the site and the use of the proposed driveway from Cherokee Street. Mr. Koenig stated that the land drops off very steeply to the west of the carriage house. He noted that the drive in this area would not be used daily by residents, but would be a fire lane.

Mr. Thomas noted the historical importance of green space at this site. He reminded everyone that the area between the Presser and Nugent buildings had historically been used as a garden. He suggested that the planning of the green space reflect this use. He noted that walkways from Johnson Street to the new building could be added to the design. He stated that, in general, the retention of green space was commendable. He applauded the siting of the proposed building, which sits back subtly and allows for the appreciation of the historic buildings. He noted that zoning may require a setback of the parking from the property line, but added that including a Philly Car Share pod may reduce the required number of parking spaces. Mr. Nolen stated that he would be supportive of including a Philly Car Share pod. Ms. Pentz asked about the plaza in front of the carriage house. Mr. Plante explained that it is an existing feature and promised that it would not be used for parking.

Mr. Levy asserted that the building did not include enough elevators. He contended that the residents would be inconvenienced if one of the elevators was shut down for maintenance. Mr. Koenig assured Mr. Levy that he designed several similar buildings and had a great deal of experience estimating elevator usage. Mr. Levy insisted that the proposal did not include adequate elevators. Mr. Koenig offered to study the matter. Mr. Levy again stated that additional elevators should be included in the building. Mr. Baron steered the discussion back to historic preservation, noting that the vacant buildings are at great risk and will only be adequately protected when work begins at the site. He explained that the prominent copper cornice had

been stolen from the building recently by scrap salvagers. He asked if the cornice would be replaced. Mr. Nolen stated that it was stolen and his architect is looking into its replacement. Mr. Koenig reported that they had hired a preservation consultant to analyze the rehabilitations. Mr. Baron suggested that the approval of the new construction and rehabilitation of the historic buildings should be a package.

Responding to Mr. Koenig's opening statement, John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance contended that the newly proposed building does not stand in the footprints of the three approved new buildings. He asserted that the parking intrudes and objected to the loss of green space. He opined that the new site plan is worse than those already proposed. He also objected to the interior layout of the apartment building, stating that the lobbies are too small and the corridors are too narrow. He approved of the contemporary styling as well as the conception of the building as a backdrop for the historic buildings. However, he asserted that the facades are over-designed and too complex; he suggested simplifying them. He stated that the proposed massing and height are acceptable. Mr. Koenig noted that the proposal is in concept and that the details would be refined.

Mr. Rivera objected to the size of the proposed building. He contended that the developer was "overdoing it." He noted that it would have 55 more units than the approved scheme. He accused the developer of being "greedy" and "not preservation-minded." Mr. Nolen responded, stating that the market had changed significantly since the earlier design was approved. The current plan proposes apartments, not condominiums. Although there are more units in the proposed building, the units are smaller than those planned in the earlier scheme. Mr. Thomas disagreed with Mr. Rivera, asserting that the number of units has grown, but the overall project is not much larger. He also stated that the added density may be a benefit for the area, especially shopping and transportation. Mr. McCoubrey suggested additional study of the facades and parking.

Mr. Thomas summarized the Committee's conclusions. The Committee approves of the general massing of the building as well as its conception as a background building. The elevations need improvement. The parking should be studied further to reduce the impact on the historic green space. The pedestrian connections between the streets and new building should be predicated on the historic garden paths. The rehabilitation of the historic buildings should be tied to the new construction at final approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept.

316 S. 21ST STREET

Owner: William Hozack

Applicant: Alvin Holm, AIA

History: c. 1860, main block refaced in 1949

Project: Construct two-story rear addition, alter side façade.

OVERVIEW: This is the fourth permit application submitted for this project. The applicant submitted the first in March 2006. The Historical Commission reviewed that application in April 2006 and tabled it for a period not to exceed six months to allow for a review of the inventory regarding the classification of this property. In June 2006, the Commission reviewed the inventory classification and classified the property as Contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. The applicant withdrew the permit application tabled by the Commission in April 2006 and submitted an application in July 2006, which was also

subsequently withdrawn and not reviewed by the Historical Commission. The applicant returned to the Commission in November 2006 and received an approval for a two-story rear addition with garage and the addition of two new openings in the side façade with small balconies.

The applicant now proposes a revised elevation. The two-story addition and garage have not changed from the scheme previously approved by the Commission. The new application proposes changes to the side elevation of the rear ell. This is the only portion of the building that maintains its original appearance. The previous approval allowed two new openings between existing windows. The current proposal moves the new openings further east on the façade altering two of the original openings. The applicant proposes three schemes. Scheme B proposes a pedimented three-sided balcony that extends two floors. Scheme C proposes the same pedimented balcony as a small rectangular balcony, rather than three-sided. Scheme D proposes French doors that open on to the deck over the loggia and a separate balcony at the second set of French doors with balcony at the second floor. The application also proposes to construct a new brick parapet and to paint the rear ell white. The rear ell is currently painted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Alvin Holm and attorney Thomas Witt represented the application.

Mr. Holm presented four different schemes to enhance the already-approved side elevation at the second and third floors. He would like to add French doors and other features to emphasize the entrance bays. Although it would require moving historic window openings, he noted very little original fabric survives on the façade.

Mr. Rivera remarked that Scheme D is the least intrusive and closest to the approved plan. He stated that the other schemes call for unduly grand gestures. Mr. Thomas concurred, stating that Scheme D plan respects the history of the building; the others are too aggressive.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Scheme D.

1919 WALNUT STREET

Owner: Imaging Properties of Philadelphia, LP

Applicant: Jeffrey C. Heaton

History: c. 1870

contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Legalize front steps, sidewalk and planters

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the demolition of brownstone steps and non-historic pavement and the subsequent construction of brick steps, brick pavement and planters. The applicant received a violation, which was appealed directly to the Board of License & Inspection Review. The Board scheduled a hearing for the appeal twice. The appeal was continued both times. At its last hearing the Board advised the applicant to submit an application to the Historical Commission. On the appeal form, the applicant states that the demolished steps were brick and cement rather than brownstone and that the work was carried out as an “emergency basis” and that the owner was not aware of any historical requirements. The applicant stated at the Board of Licenses & Inspections Review hearing that the new steps were constructed within the existing foot-print and at the same height. However, the Historical

Commission files contain photographs that show that the new steps are taller and extend beyond the footprint of the previous steps. In addition, the applicant also stated that the planters on the sidewalk were an existing condition. These planters however, do not appear in any of the designation photos and furthermore the City of Philadelphia's official aerial photography records show that as of 2003 the sidewalk did not have planters. Lastly the herringbone brick paving was also installed at the same time as the steps. This paving material is not historic nor is it appropriate for a building of this style.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. No one represented the application.

Mr. Thomas noted that there are no records of permits in the file for the construction of the steps and planters. Mr. Danta noted that the applicant had stated that the work was done on an emergency basis, yet conceded that the materials sat at the site for approximately two weeks before the work began.

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

225 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: Rittenhouse Regency Affiliates

Applicant: James B. Garrison, AIA

History: 1925, Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects

major alterations in 1957, Cronheim & Weger, architects

contributing in Rittenhouse/Fitler District, 2/8/1995

Project: Alter parapet, install glass railing

OVERVIEW: The Commission has already approved the rehabilitation of the former Penn Athletic Club into condominiums. That approval includes the construction of a penthouse as well as major restoration and reconstruction work to the facades, which were unsympathetically altered in the middle of the twentieth century. This application proposes to alter an original parapet on the 18th Street façade. The parapet is composed of ten courses of brick, a terracotta cap, and a non-historic metal railing. The applicant proposes to lower the parapet by removing five courses of brick and to reinstall the original terracotta cap at the new height. The non-historic metal railing would be replaced with a glass railing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect James Garrison represented the application.

Mr. Garrison explained that the units elsewhere in the building are selling very well, but the units on this floor behind the very tall façade have not sold. He noted that the condominium market has become very competitive. He noted that many of the floors were relocated in the 1950s when the building was converted from an athletic club to an office building. He stated the outside terrace wall was approximately five feet above the inside finished floor in the units in question. Mr. Garrison explained that Joseph Dugan Masonry has undertaken the complicated façade masonry work already approved by the Commission and remove and reset the terra

cotta wall cap without damaging it. He stated the reduction of five courses would be nearly imperceptible from the ground; it would have an insignificant impact on the public view, but would greatly enhance the salability of these units. He explained that the brick would be retained and reused. He also reported on the major restoration of the facades now underway. He stated that missing terra cotta balconies and other important decorative features have been replicated at great expense.

Mr. Thomas stated that he is very sympathetic to this application because of the overall project is not a restoration but an adaptive reuse. Mr. Baron stated that the change will allow the public to see objects on the terrace. He also stated that the solid wall would provide a sense of security for the occupants, but the glass wall would not. Mr. Garrison demonstrated with section drawings that the change to the public view would infinitesimal because of the distance below and away from the terrace, but the change to the occupants' views would be very significant owing to their proximity to the terrace. He explained that the tops of the doorways and windows to the terrace are barely visible to the public now and the removal of five courses of brick would not change that view in any perceptible way. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Rivera agreed that the change would be nearly imperceptible. Mr. Levy noted his opposition and stated that the new rail should be mounted to the top of the relocated terra cotta cap. Mr. Garrison and the other Committee members sharply disagreed and contended that mounting any railing to the cap would irreparably damage the terra cotta. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the floor level could be raised in the units. Mr. Garrison stated that it could not because the ceilings are already low. Mr. McCoubrey then agreed that the proposed solution is the best solution. Messrs. Thomas and McCoubrey suggested that glass was not the best choice for the railing because it is always reflective. They suggested a simple metal picket that would satisfy the building code. Mr. Garrison stated that a simple metal picket made from 1/2 " bar stock would be acceptable. Mr. Levy suggested that the applicant remove less brick and not reinstall the entirety of the terra cotta cap. His fellow Committee members strenuously objected to the suggestion.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided all of the terra cotta is retained and reused and a simple metal picket railing painted a color that recedes, not a glass railing, is installed to the inside of the brick parapet, with the staff to review details.

7048 GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Owner: Hedgebank Partners, LP

Applicant: John Capoferri

History: 1836, Thomas U. Walter, architect, Greek Revival country villa

c. 1850 Italianate addition

designated 1/3/06

Project: Alterations and additions to villa and barn.

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission reviewed an application for the construction of townhouses on this large site on June 2006. The Commission approved the new construction at that time and granted an approval for the restoration of the villa and barn with the staff to review the restoration details.

The applicant returns with a revised proposal for the villa and the barn. This current application proposes a restoration with minor alterations and an addition at the villa and a rehabilitation of the barn. The applicant proposes to introduce three new openings at the northern façade of the villa. This portion of the building is the oldest and most significant owing to its association with

Thomas U. Walter; however, it is not in an original condition but rather presents several layers of modifications. The proposal would retain the historic window and create three new openings to match it. At the ground floor, the applicant proposes to swap a door with a window, neither of which appear to date from the original time of construction, but might date from the Italianate remodel. The applicant also proposes to construct a new addition at the rear. This addition would take place of a derelict non-historic rear addition. The new addition would occupy the same foot-print as the rear ell and its design is respectful of the historic villa building. The south elevation would have a garden wall that has not been drawn in elevation, but it is shown in plan.

The barn building would be rehabilitated rather than restored. This structure presents extensive damage to its roof structural members and has been punctured with unsympathetic additions on two facades. The applicant proposes to demolish and reconstruct the roof with the addition of dormers. The front façade would be slightly altered with the enlargement of windows over the doors and the relocation of a doorway. The other two facades would receive new openings for windows. The application proposes to construct a townhouse addition on the west elevation of the barn. This townhouse would not be internally connected to the historic barn, but would share a wall with it.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Developer John Capoferri and architect Lawrence McEwen represented the application.

Messrs. Capoferri and McEwen provided an overview of the project. Mr. Capoferri explained that the Commission had approved the overall proposal to construct several townhouses at the rear of the site and rehabilitate the historic buildings for condominium units. He stated that the current application proposes the rehabilitation details for the historic house and barn. The overall site plan and townhouse designs have not changed.

Mr. McEwen reported that he is proposing to demolish non-historic additions on the house and barn and construct new additions on the old footprints. He noted that the Commission has already approved this work. Ms. Pentz asked if he planned to reuse the existing foundations. Mr. McEwen stated that his engineer has advised against it, but the new footprints would match the additions to avoid zoning problems. Ms. Pentz asked about the proposed garden walls at the rear of the house. Mr. McEwen stated that they would hide mechanical equipment. Ms. Pentz noted a labeling error on one of the drawings. Mr. McEwen promised to rectify the problem.

Mr. Baron asked about the proposed configurations of the double-arched windows at the rear. Mr. McEwen replied that they are historic and would be retained and restored; they are currently covered on the exterior, but visible from the interior.

Ms. Pentz asked about the intersection of the new rear addition with the T.U. Walter section of the building. Mr. McEwen explained the intersection and reported that the new addition would meet more sympathetically with the important historic portion of the building than the non-historic addition slated for demolition; hidden T.U. Walter, now obscured by the non-historic addition, would be revealed with its demolition and the construction of the new addition.

The discussion turned to the north façade, along the driveway. The Committee inquired about the extent tripartite window that would be removed. Mr. McEwen stated that the new fenestration at the second floor was based on the one surviving window. Mr. Farnham informed

the Committee that he and Mr. Danta had visited the site to discuss the proposed elevation with the developer and his architect. He stated that the north wall has been altered many times below the pediment; it is a mélange of Greek Revival, Italianate, and non-historic features. Moreover, the interior has been altered numerous times as well, producing an unusual assortment of floor levels and window locations. The two windows in the pediment are original; the architect proposes a third. None of the pediment windows are or would be visible from the ground. The second-floor to the left is the only original Walter-era window at that floor. The tripartite window is a very later addition, probably from the 1920s and probably replaced two Walter-era windows. Another may have been infilled. The first floor is a mix of Italianate and non-historic windows and trash shed additions. The additions would be removed and a door and window swapped. Mr. Farnham concluded that the proposal for the north façade would retain all historic features and would replace non-historic features with replicas of the missing historic features. He also noted that the historic features on the east, south, and west facades of the house would be restored or replaced in kind.

The discussion turned to the barn. The applicants noted that the non-historic wood and CMU additions would be demolished. A new townhouse would be built at the rear of the barn. It would share a wall with the barn, but the spaces would not be interconnected. The applicants also explained that they must demolish and rebuild the entire roof structure of the barn owing to the degradation of its structural members. Mr. Farnham verified the claim. Ms. Pentz opined that the proposed dormers on the barn are not appropriate. Mr. McEwen stated that the dormers are intended to appear as contemporary additions. He stated that the only reasonable means to adaptively reuse the barn was to make the upper story into inhabitable space. Other Committee members stated that the alterations to the barn were acceptable if they made its preservation feasible. Mr. Baron commented that the window pane proportions above the barn doors should be revised to better match the extant panes. The Committee inquired about the stone and stucco on the barn. Mr. McEwen stated that the barn is now stuccoed. He would like to remove the stucco if possible. The drawings show the stucco removed from the lower section, but retained above. It will all be removed if possible. Mr. Capoferri pointed out the slit ventilation windows in the barn, which they plan to retain and glaze.

Ms. Pentz objected to the fact that the addition at the rear of the house will extend to the north beyond the plane of the north façade of the Walter portion of the building. She suggested that the addition be shifted to the south so that it does not impose upon the Walter façade. Mr. McEwen explained that the new addition will be built on the footprint of the old addition. He also noted that he studied this question and determined that the addition would encroach more significantly on other sections of the historic building if it were shifted to the south.

Mr. Rivera suggested that the dormers on the barn be pitched down slightly, giving them shed roofs.

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

307-309 CHERRY STREET

Owner: Rachael Hoffman Wei

Applicant: Christina David

History: c. 1930

individually designated 12/31/84

non-contributing within Old City Historic District

Project: Add third story with roof deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a third-story addition to two early twentieth-century, two-story, industrial buildings. The addition would extend the length of the existing structures and would be set back about four feet. A terrace covered by a cantilevered sun shade would be located in the setback area. The shade would extend out to the plane of the front façade and would be supported by a metal column. The front façade of the addition would be constructed of glass and metal frame and the sides would be stuccoed. A green roof, deck, solar panels, and HVAC units are proposed for the roof of the addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect and property owner Wesley Wei represented the application.

Mr. Wei stated that the building at 307 had been rebuilt after a fire in 1945. Ms. Pentz asked for a clarification on designations of the buildings. Ms. Sell responded that both were individually designated but were classified as non-contributing in the Old City Historic District. Mr. Farnham stated that these buildings are classified as non-contributing in the Old City Historic District because they were constructed after 1929, the endpoint of the period of significance for the district. Mr. Farnham also stated that the Commission has no record of the vote to individually designate these buildings, but, because they appeared on the official pre-1985 Register, they are considered designated.

Mr. Wei stated that the addition is set back to the rear of an existing elevator tower. He stated that the elevator tower was built to the roof in anticipation of the addition of a third floor at some point. The interior space would be located to the rear of that tower; a terrace would be located in front of the tower. Mr. Rivera deemed the addition a benign intervention.

Ms. Pentz stated that she was confused about the designation status of the buildings and the level of review that should be conducted. Mr. Levy suggested that the Committee ignore the non-contributing classifications because these are industrial buildings. To explain the overlapping designations, Mr. Baron noted that, generally, commercial buildings within the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District are listed as non-contributing because the district was defined as a residential enclave in the Statement of Significance; however, some of those non-contributing buildings are individually designated in their own right. Mr. Baron opined that the individual designations and non-contributing classifications are not contradictory in this case. He advised the Committee to conduct a full review. The Committee members deemed the proposal acceptable for this industrial building with elevator penthouse.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval.

100-102 MARKET STREET

Owner: ESK Ventures

Applicant: Jason Brinker

History: 1882 by owners George and Albert Ulrich as a cigar manufactory and store designated individually, 10/7/1976

contributing to the Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Install mechanical rooftop equipment.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of equipment on the roof of this five-story corner building. The equipment would include mounted ductwork, exhaust fan, and air units to service a kitchen on the first story through a mechanical shaft in the southwest corner of the building.

The staff has requested additional photographs and mock-up installation for more information pertaining to visibility.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: No recommendation pending additional information.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. Architects Jay Tackett and Frank Rapisardo represented the application.

Mr. Rapisardo explained that he has endeavored to create a mock-up since submitting the application, but has not been to coordinate it with the owner. Mr. Rivera asked him if he had drawings of the roof plan. He noted that a proposed roof plan was provided. He displayed several panoramic photographs. He noted that the corner of 2nd and Market Streets provided the best view of the roof. He noted the area from which the roof can be seen from 2nd and Market is very small. Ms. Pentz agreed that the roof is not very visible from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Levy asked if the ductwork could be lowered toward the roof. Mr. Rapisardo responded that, because it is a grease duct, it must be 18 inches above the roof. Mr. Rapisardo stated that the duct is visible because it is close to the edge of the building.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if it could be painted to be camouflaged. Mr. Rapisardi responded that it stainless steel but could be painted. Mr. Rivera suggested a skirt to screen the equipment. Several Committee members objected, stating that a screen would be worse and more visible than the equipment.

Mr. Tackett stated that a slightly smaller system could be installed, but it was very expensive, perhaps \$10,000 to \$15,000 more than the proposed system. He also explained that the locations of the ductwork cannot be adjusted owing to the inflexibility of the kitchen plan. Mr. Tackett suggested painting the equipment to recede.

Mr. Baron asserted that the most important view is from the west because the neighboring house to the west is a very old, shorter building with a gambrel roof. He contended that the problem with the proposed ductwork is that it rises above the parapet. Mr. Rapisardi corrected him, stating that it is designed to follow the parapet.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the equipment is painted to recede, with the staff to review details.

226 AND 228 S. 4TH STREET

Owner: Michael Farman

Applicant: Allison Fritch

History: 226: c. 1804 by Edward Bonsall and William Shoemaker
designated individually, 04/30/1957

contributing Society Hill Historic District, 03/10/1999

228: c. 1805 by Isaac and William Paxson

designated individually in 04/30/1957

significant to the Society Hill Historic District, 03/10/1999

Project: Repair and replace doors, cornices, roof framing, and downspouts.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to repair and replace doors, cornices, roof framing, and downspouts on both buildings. The cornice and roof framing of 228 S. 4th is deteriorated and requires repair. Great care must be exercised in this repair because the cornice is an extremely rare and valuable example of hand-carved wood ornament. Owing to its great historic value, the cornice should be repaired rather than replaced wherever possible. No portion of the cornice should be removed to accommodate the downspout; the downspout should accommodate the cornice. The proposed cornice for 226 is inappropriate. It is not acceptable for either the original Italianate building or its 1960s Colonial Revival adaptation.

The front and side doors of 226 will be replaced. The proposed side door appears to replicate the extant side door, but some details of the framing must be verified. Further research should be undertaken to verify that the proposed front door, which would match the extant but non-historic door, is historically accurate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the proposed side door, pursuant to Standard 6. Staff has no recommendation regarding the front door and cornice at this time, pending more information about condition and historic configuration.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Architects Jay Tackett and Frank Rapisardo represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the building at 226 has undergone many alterations. It was constructed as an Italianate rowhouse, was significantly altered when its roof was removed and a storefront added, and was rehabilitated in the Colonial Revival style in the 1960s. Mr. Baron stated the proposed cornice is inappropriate; is not based on any point in the building's long history. A simple box cornice is appropriate to the Colonial Revival makeover. If an Italianate cornice is installed, other façade features should be restored to their Italianate appearances as well. Mr. Levy asked about the age of the Colonial Revival rehabilitation. Mr. Baron stated that it was completed by 1973. He added that Carl Massara had been the architect.

Mr. Baron commented that he had never seen a cornice like the one proposed, which has three steps. Mr. Tackett stated that the house at 226 may have been like the one at 228, but that it was significantly altered after a fire; he cited evidence at the party wall to bolster his assertion. Mr. Baron stated that the façade at 226 must post-date the original building. Mr. Tackett stated that his client is looking to create a cornice of a more appropriate scale for 226; the extant cornice is "puny." Mr. McCoubrey objected to the proposed cornice and stated that it should have two, not three, steps.

Mr. Tackett stated that he would like to replace the front door at 226, which he recently discovered is only 20 years old. He will work with the staff on an appropriate design.

Mr. Pentz asked about the roof and structural work proposed for 228. Mr. Tackett replied that he needs to replace deteriorated joists. He will remove the roof and replace the joists, but will restore the roof profile and cornice.

Mr. Baron reported that the Commission has already approved extensive work to the rear including the demolition of the rear ell at 228. He noted that the applicants are proposing to continue the rear cornice across the area cleared with the demolition of the rear ell. He asked that the applicants provide detailed photographs of this area of the building and work with the staff to develop an appropriate plan.

Mr. Baron addressed the design for the side door. He stated that the design of the door itself was appropriate, but that it appears that new details are proposed for the frame and transom bar. He asked the applicants to provide more information and work with the staff to develop a restoration of this doorway.

Mr. Tackett noted that he would like to rebuild a chimney using the salvaged brick.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the specific cornice proposed for 226, but approval of a revised cornice and all other proposals, with the staff to review details.

2030 PINE STREET

Owner: Patrick Rommel

Applicant: Patrick Rommel

History: c. 1860

Contributing to Rittenhouse/Fitler Historic District, 2/8/95

Project: Legalize first-story shutters and third-story windows and install shutters on second and third-story windows.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize third-story windows. The Commission has no information on the date of installation. The applicant claims that they were likely installed in 1988, seven years before the designation of this building. The applicant has provided no information on the type or configuration of the windows.

This application also proposes to legalize the two-panel shutters installed without the Commission's approval at the first-story windows. A Commission photograph dating to 1986 shows first-floor wood shutters with three panels. The designation photograph for the property dating to January 1996 shows that there were no shutters on the front façade of the building at the time of designation. Commission photographs dating to 10 September 2002, 27 June 2003, and fall 2003 and a Pictometry photograph dating to 2 October 2003 all show no shutters on the front façade of the building, contradicting the applicant's claim that he installed the two-panel shutters in 2001. Note as well that, according to the Department of Records, the applicant did not purchase the property until 1 April 2002. A postcard supplied by the applicant and postmarked 1 March 2005 shows the two-panel shutters installed at the first-floor front. Therefore, the two-panel shutters were installed at some point between the fall of 2003 and the spring of 2005.

The applicant proposes to install two-panel, louvered shutters at the second and third-story windows. The 1986 photograph shows three-panel, louvered shutters at the second story and

no shutters at the third story. The designation photograph for the property dating to January 1996 shows that there were no shutters on the front façade of the building at the time of designation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the installation of two-paneled second and third-story shutters and the legalization of the first-story shutters, pursuant to Standard 6. Denial of the third-story windows, owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. Patrick Rommel, the owner, represented the application.

Mr. Rommel stated that the third-floor windows were extant when he purchased the house in 2001. He stated that they were installed in 1988, several years before the designation, by the previous owner. He stated that he installed the two-panel, first-floor shutters in 2001. He proposes to install two-panel louvered shutters for the second and third floors to complete the façade. Mr. Rommel stated there was no evidence of three-panel shutters when he purchased the property. He also claimed that three-panel shutters are not available. Ms. Sell stated that the Commission's file includes photographs showing three-panel shutters at the first floor in 1986. She noted that manufacturers still produce this type of shutter.

Mr. Baron stated he visited the site and noted the windows at the third floor have sandwiched muntins with an energy panel. Mr. Rommel stated that the windows were in place at the time of purchase.

Mr. Baron explained that he witnessed painters working at the property. He stated that, when he questioned them, they explained that new windows were being installed. Mr. Baron reported that he then spoke to the applicant's mother, who explained that the new shutters had been made to match those on a building across the street. Mr. Baron checked the Commission's photographs and determined that the installed shutters differed in design from those in the 1986 photographs. Mr. Rommel stated that the painters removed the parts of the windows to paint; the language barrier may have resulted in Mr. Baron's misunderstanding of the explanation given to him at that time. Mr. Rommel stated that the third-floor front windows were not new, but were being repainted when Mr. Baron visited the site. Mr. Rommel explained that the painters removed the muntin grids on the third-floor windows to paint them. He stated that his painters speak no English; they speak Spanish. Mr. Rommel noted that he is fluent in Spanish. Mr. Levy asked Mr. Baron to explain. He stated that the windows were non-historic and were out when he visited the site.

Mr. Baron stated that the applicant had the new shutters made to match an inappropriate set of shutters. Mr. Rommel stated that he had copied two-panel shutters that were in the basement when he purchased the house. He stated that the shutters were installed "six, seven years ago." He stated the first-floor shutters were deteriorated and he was unaware a permit was necessary because he was replacing exactly what had been on the building. He explained that he commissioned an architect to design the shutters.

Mr. Rommel stated that he is now proposing to install two-panel, louvered shutters at the second and third floors to coordinate with those already installed first floor. He stated that he has already spent \$2,000 on shutters. He also noted that several vernacular houses like his in his neighborhood feature two-panel shutters.

Mr. Baron stated that there are extenuating circumstances. He suggested that the Committee recommend a compromise between complete denial and complete approval. Mr. Rommel stated that he would like to retain the expensive two-panel shutters, which he again claimed have been hanging for "about six years." Mr. Rommel stated that he is seeking to beautify the neighborhood. Mr. Baron stated that the Committee must be consistent because this building and the building to the west are identical; the neighbor to the west may seek to install inappropriate shutters if Mr. Rommel's shutters are legalized. Mr. Rommel replied that the building to the west is an apartment building which is unlikely to be improved. Mr. Rommel stated he had gone to a great effort to preserve the historic windows at the first and second floors when his neighbors have replaced them.

Mr. Rommel stated that the shutters are cypress and copper-lined. He would like to retain them. Mr. Baron objected and suggested that the Committee deny the legalization of the first-floor shutters. Mr. Rommel again stated that the third-floor windows were installed before the date of designation and are therefore grandfathered. He also stated again that he installed the first-floor shutters "five or six years ago."

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the legalization of the third-floor windows; denial of the legalization of the first-floor shutters; and approval of either no shutters on the building or three-panel shutters at the first floor, three-panel louvered shutters at the second floor, and two-panel louvered shutters at the third floor, with the staff to review details.

100 NEWTON STREET

Owner: Reed Shuldiner and Cynthia Frank

Applicant: John S. Andrews

History: Designated 9/28/1971

Project: Construct two one-story additions

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct two one-story additions on the side wing, demolish a one-story porch with a balcony, and construct a multi-level terrace and wood deck by the pool. One addition is proposed for the front of the wing and would serve as an entrance. This addition would be sided in stucco to match the existing building and roofed with standing seam copper. The other addition is proposed for the rear of the wing and would provide access to the terrace, deck, and pool. This addition would be a bay of fixed and operable glazed and wood paneled doors, columns, and a standing seam copper roof. Two-over-two simulated-divided-light windows are proposed for the older side wing and proposed front addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the windows in the historic openings in the side wing are wood, six-over-six, with true-divided-light and the windows in the proposed front addition are either six-over-six or one-over-one, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect John Andrews represented the application.

Mr. Andrews stated that the windows recommended by the staff were acceptable to the property owner. He stated his intent was to increase the living space and make the addition feel as though it were part of the historic house.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for clarification on the windows. Ms. Cote stated that the application proposes to replace historic true-divided-light six-over-six windows in the early twentieth-century wing and with simulated-divided-light two-over-two windows, which is inaccurate and will create confusion with the historic two-over-two windows in the main house. She also explained that the architect is proposing simulated-divided-light two-over-two windows for the openings in the new addition. The simulated-divided-light is acceptable, but the two-over-two is not because they will create confusion with the historic two-over-two windows in the main house. The staff suggests that the wing, which is old but not original, retain its character rather than mimic the original house.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the windows in the historic openings in the side wing are wood, six-over-six, with true-divided-light and the windows in the proposed front addition are either six-over-six or one-over-one, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

240-242 CHERRY STREET

Owner: Maritime Exchange

Applicant: Jack Glass

History: c. 1875

designated individually 12/31/1984

contributing to the Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Legalize installation of one-over-one vinyl windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of vinyl one-over-one wood windows, which were installed without the Commission's approval. The designation photograph, taken in 2004, shows wood, true-divided-light, two-over-two windows in the openings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Jack Glass, the window contractor, represented the application.

Mr. Glass stated that he never gotten a permit for a window installation if the size of the window opening was not changing in 39 years. He became aware of the historic designation only after the owner received the violation. The windows that he removed were deteriorated. Mr. Glass noted other non-historic windows in the neighborhood. He asked if he could install two-over-two vinyl windows in the openings.

Mr. Baron explained why vinyl windows are inappropriate; he stated that, for example, they have no depth and they have altered the symmetry of the façade. Mr. Glass stated that he did not change the frames. Mr. Baron stated that appropriate wood, two-over-two, true-divided-light windows are available even with the wider muntin. Mr. Glass claimed that the only difference between the historic sash and the sash he installed is the color. He intends to paint the sash he installed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the legalization, pursuant to Standard 6.

2116 LOCUST STREET

Owner: Kerry and Sonali Polite

Applicant: Kerry Polite

History: c. 1875, designated 2/8/1995

Project: Construct third-floor addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a third-floor addition, which will be set back almost 10 feet from the façade of this 1870s carriage house. Roof decks are proposed at the rear and front of the addition. This application also proposes renovations to the front façade. New storefront windows and a door as well a new aggregate material at the base of the windows are proposed for the first floor. Replacement two-over-two arched double-hung sash windows are proposed on the second floor. New French doors, which would eliminate the historic arched transom, are proposed for the central opening at the second floor.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the two-over-two arched double-hung sash windows and approval of a full length French door that clearly replicate the configuration of the historic arched transom, but denial of the remaining aspects of the proposal, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Owners Sonali and Kerry Polite represented the application.

Ms. Cote distributed copies of an e-mail received from Kiki Bolender, the owner of 2118 Locust Street, relaying her concerns.

Mr. Polite summarized the proposal in two parts. He first discussed the construction of the third-floor addition; he noted his growing family and need for additional space as well as the lack of a basement. He stated the building has been modified over the years. It is an 1870s carriage house with a 1920s storefront. He stated the proposal responds to the Committee's comments made during a previous review. Mr. Polite noted that the positioning of the existing stair case impacts the design of the addition. He also cited plumbing and other issues as considerations in the design. He then discussed the second part, the improvement of the front façade. He noted that cross ventilation and energy efficiency were considerations in the design of the segment.

The Committee reviewed its earlier recommendation, which stated the addition should not be visible from the public right-of-way. Ms. Voith had suggested that it be pulled back from the front façade for less visibility. Mr. Levy had asked if the ceiling height of nine feet could be reduced to lower the roof of the addition. Ms. Polite noted the 35-foot height limit and asked why Mr. Levy would request a lower ceiling. Mr. Levy explained that the 35-foot height limit is a zoning requirement, not a historic preservation requirement. Ms. Polite stated that their movement of the addition away from the front façade would render it inconspicuous from the front façade. Mr. Polite stated that the ceiling height of the addition had been reduced and the additional would not be highly visible. Seven feet of the front façade of the previous addition would have been visible. Only two-and-one-half feet of the addition would be visible from the street in this design. Mr. Levy stated that the bedroom proposed for the addition was too large and could be reduced in size. He remarked that the ceiling height was still too great.

Camille Focarino, a neighbor, interjected comments, stating that the applicants had not shown her their plans. Mr. and Ms. Polite rebutted the claim, stating Ms. Focarino's husband had been shown the plans and had no objections. Ms. Focarino stated that she was concerned about the integrity of the shared roofline and that access to her property would be required during the

construction. She also stated that she maintained the shared drainpipe. She also asked the utilities on the roof be considered, contending that her skylights would be impacted. She stated that the addition would reduce the integrity of her building. She also asserted that the rooftop deck would pose a fire risk. She also suggested that the applicants could use their existing interior space more creatively and noted that they should not be adding space for a child who will move out in ten years. She also noted that Ed Bacon's house is across the street and its surroundings should be preserved. Mr. Polite stated that she had shown the plans to Ms. Focarino's husband, who approved of them. The Polites also spoke to the neighbor at 2114 Locust Street, who said he had no concerns with the proposal. Ms. Focarino was adamant that her husband did not speak to the Polites. Ms. Pentz interrupted the discussion, which was out of order, and stated that it was inappropriate for this forum.

Ms. Polite offered several examples of additions on carriage houses approved by the Commission in recent years. Ms. Focarino continued to interrupt.

Mr. Levy recommended shifting the front wall of the addition back further away from the historic façade. He suggested that the bathroom in the addition could be reduced in size. He stated that it was very large and asserted that it was inappropriately scaled for a child's bathroom.

Ms. Sonali noted that the Commission had as recently as June 2007 approved an addition on a carriage house very similar to the one that they are now proposing. Mr. Levy advised the applicants to reduce the ceiling height and shrink the child's bathroom to make the addition less visible. Mr. Sonali asked how the Committee could justify recommending denial of his proposal when it had recently recommended approval of several similar proposals.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial.

2423 PINE STREET

Owner: Kevin & Margaux Pelegrin

Applicant: Dennis Torres

History: c. 1835, designated contributing in Rittenhouse/Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Add two-story rear addition, partial demolition of rear ell and rear gable with dormer.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to partially demolish the rear ell and rear slope of the roof with dormer. In its place the applicant proposes to construct an enlarged second-story master bedroom and an enlarged third-floor bedroom. The side yard has a small non-historic addition at the ground floor. The application proposes to rebuild that addition and extend it up to the second floor. The rear slope of the roof would be altered with an enlarged dormer with French doors that would access a deck over the new two-story rear ell.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Margaux Pelegrin, the owner, and Dennis Torres, her designer, represented the application.

Mr. Baron objected that the demolition would destroy character-defining features of the building such as the dormer and rear roof. He acknowledged that the Commission had approved many rear additions in the past, but asserted that those approvals usually were granted for projects

that proposed retaining rear walls and roofs of the main blocks. He stated that the amount of demolition caused concern in this case.

Ms. Pentz asked if the applicant could work with the existing dormer, rather than enlarging it. Mr. Torres replied that his client was seeking the additional space and headroom that the enlarged dormer would provide. Mr. Baron stated that the building appears to be a standard trinity rowhouse from the front, but is twice as deep and therefore twice as large as a standard trinity.

Several on the Committee remarked that the drawings were of very poor quality. They were both poorly drawn and poorly reproduced. Both Messrs. D'Alessandro and Levy opined that they were very confusing.

Ms. Pelegrin stated that she would not change the front façade. Mr. Torres explained that he would not disturb the party wall.

Ms. Pelegrin stated that the Commission had approved very similar addition design for the adjacent house. The staff stated that it was unaware of the approval, but could research it.

The Committee suggested that the applicant return with better architectural drawings. The Committee also suggested that the applicant consider retaining the dormer. The Committee directed the staff to research applications for the adjoining property, which is a mirror image of the building in question.

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

418-430 SPRUCE STREET, SOCIETY HILL SYNAGOGUE

Owner: Society Hill Synagogue

Applicant: Michael Hauptman, AIA

History: Synagogue

1829-1830, First Baptist Church of Philadelphia, T.U. Walter, architect

1851, enlarged, new front façade, T.U. Walter, architect

1910, Congregation Beth Hamedrash Hagadol Nusach Ashkenaz

c. 1911, steeples demolished with conversion to synagogue

1978, exterior restored, Herbert Levy, architect

1985, south addition, James Oleg Kruhly & Associates, architects

Significant in the Society Hill Historic District

Rowhouse

c. 1775

Significant in the Society Hill Historic District

Project: In concept – Demolish rear of rowhouse, construct addition and link

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes the conversion of an eighteenth-century rowhouse at 430 Spruce Street to an administration and classroom building and its connection to the Society Hill Synagogue building to the east. The rowhouse is currently a rental residential building. A narrow alley separates the rowhouse and synagogue.

The project would require the demolition of the rear ell and piazza of the rowhouse. A three-story addition would be constructed to the south and east of the remaining section of the rowhouse, infilling the alley and linking to the west façade of the synagogue.

The linking of the converted rowhouse to the synagogue would require alterations to the west façade of the synagogue. The northernmost bay of the west façade, nearest Spruce Street, continues the decorative treatment of the front façade. It is granite at the tall base and scored stucco above and includes a very large window with a highly ornate window surround. The remainder of the façade is brick with large windows. The application provides only floor plans, but not elevations or sections, regarding the proposed alterations to this important façade to achieve the link. The decorative window surround would be preserved within the interior of the link, but the lower sash would be removed and the sill lowered. At the front façade, the addition would be clad with frameless glazing.

The rear of the synagogue and rowhouse are visible from S. 5th Street, across a supermarket parking lot.

Additional information about the current conditions of and proposed alterations to the west façade of the synagogue as well as a demolition plan and a section through the link are required to fully evaluate this in-concept proposal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: No recommendation until additional information is provided.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Michael Hauptman, attorney Brett Feldman, and Mitchell Bach, the immediate past president of the synagogue, represented the application.

Mr. Hauptman noted for the record that he is not proposing the demolition of the rear wall of the main block of the rowhouse. Mr. Baron then offered new information regarding the rear ell of the row house. It has been significantly altered over time. The various types of brick indicate the many changes to the rear ell. Mr. Farnham noted that the current rear ell is about 20 feet longer than the rear ell depicted in early twentieth century insurance maps.

Mr. Feldman stated that the synagogue is seeking to purchase and alter the rowhouse to upgrade its services. Mr. Bach explained that a school that now occupies space in the synagogue building would move to the rowhouse. He explained that the school is named for its first teacher, whose descendants own the rowhouse. The synagogue has an agreement to purchase the rowhouse and is conducting its due diligence.

Mr. Hauptman stated this application proposes approval in concept. The synagogue has a time-limited contingency to buy the property and must determine whether the proposal will receive zoning and Historical Commission approval. He stated that he must determine a footprint for the joined buildings to seek zoning approval. He noted the changes in brick mentioned by Mr. Baron. He explained that the ell has been lengthened and then shortened. He reported that it was significantly altered when the supermarket was constructed on 5th Street, at the rear of this property. He explained that he attempted to adaptively reuse the rear ell, but it is too narrow for the program and cannot be made ADA compliant. He stated that the new back wall of the rear ell would be located in the same location as the extant back wall of the ell. Mr. Hauptman explained that he is proposing to retain all windows in the synagogue facing the alley and would reopen one that has been closed.

Mr. Hauptman suggested a canopy at the entrance to the link. Committee members objected to a canopy because it would draw attention from the historic facades. Mr. Hauptman said that he had included it as a last-minute thought, but is will to remove it from the proposal. Mr. Bach agreed.

Mr. Baron suggested moving the main connection between the synagogue and new link from the ornate window in first bay on the side to a new opening cut in the synagogue wall immediately south of that window. This would still allow for a connection at the lobby and allow the ornate window to remain an exterior feature. Mr. Baron asserted that it was important to allow the corner to continue to read as a three-dimensional object. Mr. Hauptman objected to the suggestion and stated that it would be better to alter the existing window slightly than to cut a new hole in the façade. Several Committee members agreed. Mr. Hauptman noted that the front of the building would retain its three-dimensional sense because the return of the cornice would remain visible. He stated that the link would be frameless and glassy. Becky Stoloff of the Society Hill Civic Association asked how far the link would be set back from the front façade of the synagogue. Mr. Hauptman responded three feet. Mr. Levy suggested that Mr. Hauptman reconsider Mr. Baron's idea to cut a new opening in the side façade. Mr. McCoubrey responded that he thought a new hole would be inappropriate.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked for a confirmation that the rear wall of the main block would not be demolished. Mr. Hauptman stated that it would not. The Committee noted for the record that the rear ell has been altered many times and is not entirely historic fabric.

The Committee also concluded that it was split on the question of use the window or cutting a new opening for access from the synagogue to the link. The members agreed that that question could be decided with the final review. Mr. Hauptman asked if the footprint was acceptable; he needs to establish a footprint to submit a zoning application. The Committee stated that it deemed the footprint acceptable with the question of the opening from the synagogue to the link to be reexamined later.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept.

227 MONTROSE STREET

Owner: Susan Erickson

Applicant: Joseph Serratore

History: c. 1840, designated 5/31/1966

Project: Construct third-floor roof deck and dormer door access

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a third-floor roof deck at the rear, supported by columns extending from the first-floor rear ell. To access the deck, a dormer with a door is proposed. It would require cutting into the existing gable roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Owner Susan Erickson and architect Joseph Serratore represented the application.

Mr. Serratore explained that the proposed deck would be located on the addition to the house, which is not original. He also stated that the deck would be cut away in plan to allow light into

the back. He stated that the owner has limited yard space and would like the additional outdoor space offered by the deck. He asserted that the existing dormer cannot be seen from the street. He proposed to use the existing rear window opening cut upward to create a roof peak that mimicked the existing house peak. He showed photographs of the low ceiling in the room. Mr. Serratore stated that the room is cramped because it is under the eaves. He proposes to create the new dormer for head room. Mr. Serratore acknowledged some visibility from the street and offered to amend the design to make it more transparent. Mr. Levy asked for a description of the second floor. The owner stated that the bathroom was newly renovated. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with the staff's recommendation that the deck would be better if located on the roof of the addition. This would preclude the necessity to break the cornice line and create a dormer. It would only require a minor alteration to a window.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

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.