

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

**29 AUGUST 2006
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
VINCENT RIVERA, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Suzanne Pentz
Robert Thomas, AIA
Daniela Voith, AIA

Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

ALSO PRESENT

Thomas Witt, Wolf Block Schorr & Solis-Cohen
Carol Facenda, Wolf Block Schorr & Solis-Cohen
Katherine Rabb, Korman Communities
Lawrence Korman, Korman Communities
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Harold Lichtman, GLP Architects
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Cecil Baker, Cecil Baker Associates
Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker Associates
Joe Schiavo, Old City Civic Association
Janet Kalter, Old City Civic Association
Carl Primavera, Klehr Harrison
Ken Smith, Brown Hill Development
Harvey Spears, Centra
Charles Mottershead, Capital Programs Office
Claire Donato, Mark B. Thompson Associates
J. Alban, Fairmount Park Conservancy
Vincent Muller, Friends Center
Mark Ueland, Ueland, Junker, McCauley, Nicholson Architects and Planners
Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission
David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinski
John Bushnell
Mark Monteith, Voith & MacTavish Architects
Steve Pappirt, Clemens Construction
Guy Ginhart, Clements Construction
Paul Drzal, Harman Deutsch
Brett, Harman, Harman Deutsch
Mark D'Alonzo
Liz Zimmers, Zimmers Associates
David Facenda, John Milner Architects
Donna Dirksen

Howard Coowley, Old City Civic Association
Brett Webber, Brett Webber Architects
Michael Mattroni, Mattroni Law
Alisha Dubb
John Devine, Alvin Holm Architects
Adam Laver, Blank Rome
Jim Karmolinski, Kelly /Maiello
Kerry Nolan, Glickman Mayner Architects
Ray Tschoepe, Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust
Tom McPoyle, Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust
Jun Kang, Cubit Real Estate Inc.
Peter Goldring, Arcollage
Steven Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Stephanie Gropp, Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship
Fran Orabano, Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship
Ted Newbold
Helen Cunningham
Julie M. Seda
Brian Szymanik
Colleen Szymanik

CALL TO ORDER

Architectural Committee members Robert Thomas and Suzanne Pentz called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

135 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: 135 S. 18th Street Associates, LP; Korman Communities
Applicant: Thomas P. Witt, Esq.
History: 1913, McIlvaine & Roberts, architects
Project: Replacement of main entrance and exterior illumination

OVERVIEW: This application proposes several alterations to the early twentieth-century residential building at the northeast corner of 18th and Walnut Streets.

It proposes to remove the entrance canopy as well as the main entrance doors, limestone panel, and mezzanine-level windows within the grand entranceway and replace them with a frameless glass door and window system. The canopy and entrance doors are non-historic, but the limestone panel and mezzanine-level windows are original. The application also proposes to replace the light fixtures at the entrance with sleek contemporary fixtures.

The application proposes to add exterior lighting at the top story of the building. No details about the wiring and mounting of the lights have been provided; the number and sizes of wiring and mounting penetrations in the stone façade should be minimized.

The application proposes to remove a non-historic storefront on 18th Street and restore the façade. It proposes to remove awnings, signage, non-historic cladding, and security grates at several storefronts; repair the limestone façade; and restore the bronze frames and surrounds. It proposes to add non-illuminated signage on the 18th and Walnut Street facades.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends the following:

1. approval of the removal of the entrance canopy;
2. denial of the removal of the doors, spandrel panel, and windows and installation of the frameless glass door and window system within the grand entranceway, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9;
3. denial of the light fixtures at the entrance, pursuant to Standard 6;
4. approval of the top-floor lighting, with the staff to review wiring and attachment details;
5. approval of the removal of the non-historic storefront and restoration of the façade on 18th Street, with the staff to review details;
6. approval of the removal of awnings, signage, non-historic cladding, and security grates and restoration of the bronze frames and surrounds at the storefronts, with the staff to review details;
7. approval of the repair of the limestone façade, with the staff to review details;
8. approval of the signage, with the staff to review mounting details.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham explained to the applicants and audience that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. Three members are needed for a quorum; only two were present. He explained that the members of the Committee could proceed without a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Committee. Attorney Thomas Witt and developers Larry Korman and Kathy Ragg of Korman Communities represented the application.

Daniela Voith joined the meeting and formed a quorum.

Ms. Pentz noted her agreement with the staff recommendation. However, she requested more information on the signage. Mr. Witt stated that the application proposed three signs, two on 18th Street and one on Walnut. Mr. Korman stated that he intended to pin the signs into the mortar joints; they would be held about ½" off the wall to avoid trapping moisture against the wall.

Mr. Thomas asked the applicants to comment on their proposal for the main entrance. Mr. Witt explained that his clients planned to integrate the space now used as a camera shop into the lobby. The current lobby is too small. They would like to open up the lobby, making it grander. Ms. Pentz asked if the mezzanine floor extends across the lobby. Mr. Witt stated that presently the mezzanine floor extends across the lobby, but his clients intend to remove it, creating a two-story lobby space. He noted that the large frameless glass entranceway would echo the new, taller lobby space behind it. He asserted that the differences between the historic and the contemporary would be crystal clear. He remarked that his clients would retain the historic residential use of the building, thereby satisfying Standard 1. He also noted that the light fixtures at the main entrance are not original, but are later replacements that are much smaller than the originals. He displayed a photograph showing the mounting holes for the original, larger light fixtures. Mr. Witt contended that the glazed lobby entrance would increase the visibility of the doorway from Rittenhouse Square and signify that the building has been upgraded. The Committee members suggested that a restoration of the entranceway rather than the installation of the contemporary glass entrance would be more appropriate. Ms. Ragg

stated that a restoration was not possible because no documentation of the original entrance has been discovered.

Mr. Thomas stated that developers' goals are laudable, but that he believes that they can both satisfy their goals and the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*. He stated that the developers can build their two-story lobby and maintain the historic exterior appearance of the entranceway. He remarked that retaining the historic mezzanine windows would not preclude a tall interior space.

Mr. Korman asserted that, without the proposed entrance, the entire rehabilitation project would be "killed." He explained that he is investing a considerable amount of money in masonry and window restoration and, therefore, he should be allowed to modify the doorway. He contended that the Commission needs "a sense of fair play"; he has undertaken considerable work to the building and should be rewarded with an approval of the non-historic entranceway. He added that the architecture of the residential building "is screaming out" for a grand, contemporary entranceway. He then reported that he owns and lives in a Louis Kahn-designed house, which he has largely restored. However, he has also added a few contemporary features, which he believes Louis Kahn would have added were he alive today. Similarly, Mr. Korman asserted that the architect of the building at 135 S. 18th Street would appreciate the contemporary alterations added to make it a first-class building. He claimed that he sought to bring prestige to the Rittenhouse Square area.

Mr. Thomas acknowledged the Committee's appreciation of Mr. Korman's stewardship of the building, but he noted that the Committee must judge the proposal based on the Standards; the Committee is constrained to base its review of the application on historic preservation standards. He stated that the proposed doorway would require the removal of historic fabric and would not be appropriately scaled for the building. He stated that the Commission may consider broader issues, but the Committee may not.

Ms. Voith asked if any historic photographs showing the entrance had been uncovered. Mr. Korman stated that they had not. Mr. Korman and Mr. Witt both asserted that the canopy was not original, but that an earlier awning or canopy stood at the entrance. Mr. Korman noted that the large entablature over the entranceway had shifted out of position and would be restored. He speculated that the limestone spandrel panel above the door and below the mezzanine windows was probably not original. Mr. Korman stated that his consultant, George Thomas, thought that the spandrel panel might be newer. Ms. Pentz and Ms. Voith thought that it would be acceptable to replace the non-historic doors with new but appropriate doors. Ms. Pentz opined that the spandrel panel could be removed, but only if it proves to be a newer addition. However, both Ms. Pentz and Ms. Voith thought that it was important to preserve the original windows above the door and the setback of the doorway in its stone frame. Ms. Voith and Mr. Thomas stated that the proposed frameless glass door system does not meet the Standards. Likewise, frameless glass doors in the historic opening would not meet the Standards. Mr. Thomas explained that he thought it was quite possible to preserve the historic fabric of the doorway while creating an interior two-story lobby. He suggested that the applicants work with staff on the design of new doors that would be more in keeping with the character of the historic building. He thought that they could also work with the staff on some larger but more appropriate light fixtures.

Mr. Korman stated that the contemporary entrance is “driving” the entire project. He explained that the budget had increased from \$2 million to \$12 million.

Ms. Voith reiterated the point made earlier by Mr. Thomas; the developers can achieve their goals and meet the Standards simultaneously.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the following:

1. approval of the removal of the entrance canopy;
2. denial of the removal of the doors, spandrel panel, and windows and installation of the frameless glass door and window system within the grand entranceway, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9; however, the spandrel panel may be removed if it determined to be non-historic;
3. denial of the light fixtures at the entrance, pursuant to Standard 6;
4. approval of the top-floor lighting, with the staff to review wiring and attachment details;
5. approval of the removal of the non-historic storefront and restoration of the façade on 18th Street, with the staff to review details;
6. approval of the removal of awnings, signage, non-historic cladding, and security grates and restoration of the bronze frames and surrounds at the storefronts, with the staff to review details;
7. approval of the repair of the limestone façade, with the staff to review details;
8. approval of the signage, with the staff to review mounting details.

112 MARKET STREET

Owner: Jung Wha Ahn

Applicant: Harold Lichtman, GLP Architects

History: c. 1830; top two stories demolished c. 1910; storefront installed 1988

Project: Construct front façade and three-story addition

OVERVIEW: The Commission reviewed and approved this project in concept in December 2005 (see attached minute). The current proposal for final approval complies with the Commission concept approval. The application proposes demolishing the storefront and second-story brick façade, rebuilding the lost third and fourth stories, adding a penthouse, and constructing a cast-stone storefront and brick façade. The penthouse would be set back 15 feet from the front façade and clad in cast stone. A roof deck would be located between the front façade and penthouse and would be hidden behind a tall front parapet. The rear of the building is completely hidden from any public view.

The extant building is two stories in height. It was originally four stories tall, but was cut down, probably about 1910. The brick at the second-story front façade and the third-story stone window sills survive from the original nineteenth-century building, but nothing else on the exterior is original. The important metal cornice added in 1910, which completed the new two-story building, has been lost. The second-story window openings have been enlarged and the second-story sills are non-historic. The extant storefront, which is in poor condition, was installed in 1988.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to the Commission’s approval in concept.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Committee. Architect Harold Lichtman represented the application.

Mr. Farnham explained that current proposal complies with the Commission's approval in concept of December 2005.

Ms. Pentz expressed significant concerns about the engineering and construction of the new structure presented in the architectural drawings, but conceded that these issues were not within the Commission's purview, but would be addressed during the building permit review conducted by the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal, pursuant to the Commission's approval in concept.

36-46, 48-50 S. FRONT, 103, 107, 111 CHESTNUT STREET, 37-41 LETITIA STREET

Owner: Centra Associates

Applicant: Cecil Baker, Architect

History: 36-46 S. Front Street, vacant lots at time of designation

48 & 50 S. Front, 103 and 107 Chestnut Street built c.1835

Individually designated, contributing to Old City district

111 Chestnut Street, built 1951, non-contributing to district

37-41 Letitia Street, vacant lot at time of designation

Project: In concept - demolish buildings partially and completely, construct twelve-story building with garage

OVERVIEW: This application in concept proposes combining many properties, some vacant and some with structures, into a mixed-use development. The new building would combine several uses, including parking for the residents below ground and the public on the first four floors, commercial spaces at the ground floors, and residential units above the fourth floor.

The application proposes demolishing the non-contributing structure at 111 Chestnut Street as well as some of the rear sections of the contributing structures at 48 S. Front Street and 107 Chestnut Street. The new building would have a stone-clad first story and three stories of brick on Front and Letitia Streets. A tower of metal and glass would rise out of that base to a height of thirteen stories (144 feet) with a roof terrace and mechanical penthouse above (160 feet). This tower would be located on both the site of the vacant lots and the two areas of demolition. Nothing would be built on the remaining sections of historic buildings.

This new application is improved over the previous application; it proposes less demolition of historic buildings and deletes the decks and other new construction from the majority of the roofs of the historic structures. However, the proposed structure is greatly out of scale with the surrounding buildings of the district as well as the buildings to which it is an addition. On Front Street, the portion of the façade that cantilevers out does not respect the plane of the street wall. The Letitia Street façade should set back above the fifth floor to respect the cornice line of the existing streetscape. Most importantly, the height and mass should be reduced significantly; a 13-story building is not compatible with the surrounding four to six-story buildings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 & 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Attorney Carl Primavera, architects Cecil Baker and Eric Leighton, and developers Ken Smith and Harvey Spears represented the application.

Mr. Primavera stated that he had met with the Old City Civic Association; he did not report the conclusions of that meeting.

Mr. Baker, the architect, presented the plans and answered questions for the Committee. He stated that he intends to “fully restore” the historic properties. He noted that the parking had been reduced. They would now offer one-to-one parking for the residents and 100 spaces for the retail. He noted that he had deleted the projecting section proposed earlier for the Chestnut Street façade. Explaining the three-foot projection on Front Street, he stated that he was “trying to create thinness at the edge of the city.” He showed a photograph from a magazine of two thin Richard Meier-designed towers in New York City. He displayed large plans and elevations of the proposed building. The Committee members had several questions about the drawings, which Ms. Voith deemed confusing. They noted that the very large mass near Letitia Street was rendered so lightly that it was barely visible in the elevations. Ms. Voith commented that the large glass walls at the south and west of the interior court were very massive. Mr. Baker conceded that they would be visible from the north.

Mr. Primavera stated that the parking entrances had been moved in the latest revision. They had been on Front and Letitia Streets. They are now all on Front.

Mr. Baker explained that he believes that, owing to the changing real estate market, only a few of the many condominium buildings proposed for the city will actually be constructed. He believes that this will be one that is built. He stated that the development needs at least 100 units to be financially feasible. He also asserted that it must be a “first-class” building to succeed. It also needs one-to-one parking. Mr. Smith added that he will spend \$2 million on the restoration of the historic buildings and needs the 100 units to subsidize this work. Mr. Primavera stated that his clients are attempting “to do something feasible and practical” and therefore need “some leniency” from the Commission. He said that, “realistically,” the project is “not perfect.” He asked for “understanding and variances” from the Committee and Commission. He concluded that the developers cannot reduce the size of the project any more than they have already. He mentioned the financial hardship application that had been submitted. The Committee asked the staff about the hardship application. Mr. Baron replied that the applicants had not submitted a hardship application; they had submitted a report documenting the problems with the historic buildings, but they had not submitted any of the financial information required by the ordinance and the Rules. He concluded that he was awaiting “hard numbers.” He did not consider the material submitted a complete hardship application. Mr. Primavera agreed with Mr. Baron’s assessment.

Mr. Baron noted that the cornice line on Letitia Street should be redesigned. Mr. Baker agreed to undertake the modification. Mr. Thomas noted that this was a minor detail. He stated the primary question before the Committee: Does this in-concept proposal meet the Standards? He suggested that the Committee limit itself to that question and leave the broader issues to the Commission. He commented that the minor demolition at the

rears of the contributing buildings was acceptable. He also opined that the traffic circulation was acceptable. However, he concluded that the building is simply too large for the historic district; it does not satisfy the Standards. He asked rhetorically: Does a 13-story building in this area meet the Standards? He answered that it does not. Ms. Pentz disagreed. She stated that she would recommend approval in concept if the architect redesigned the Letitia Street façade and deferred to the historic cornice line. Ms. Voith commented that this is a thoughtful and exciting project. She noted the new, large buildings to the south and stated that this proposed building, unlike those, has no large blank facades. However, she rejected the projecting bay at Front Street, which breaks the “powerful edge.” Mr. Thomas concluded that the Committee could work with the applicants if the Commission deems the mass and scale acceptable for Old City. He again noted that he does not believe that they are acceptable for the historic district.

Joseph Schiavo of the Old City Civic Association stated that the proposal has been greatly improved since the previous revision. He attributed the improvements to the comments of the Committee and community. However, he asserted that the project is too big for the site and the neighborhood. It is out of scale and upsets the scale of the historic area. He also noted that the proposal includes no open space and that public parking is not permitted under zoning for this site. He concluded that the Commission cannot disregard the Standards simply because the real estate market has changed; this site may need to wait for another time and development. Ms. Voith posited that the buildings may be lost in the mean time. Mr. Schiavo countered that there are rules prohibiting demolition by neglect; the Commission should enforce them. He contended that the area needs an “upgrade,” but not one that does not fit the historic district.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the applicants have made improvements to the design, but he supports the staff recommendation and the Old City Civic Association. He noted that the applicants have raised the question of economics, but have not presented any numbers to back up their claims. He asserted that this project would be very profitable. He rejected the Front Street façade, which would be lifeless. He stated that the roof terrace was not appropriately scaled for the area. He asserted that the building is “huge.” He remarked that it is not narrow like the others approved for the area, but is enormous. He asked why the Letitia Street section is “barely visible” in the drawings. He stated that the developers are endeavoring to insert “too much program” onto the site. He also commented that there is no unsatisfied demand for public parking in this area. He critiqued the mix of materials and architectural expressions, which are not appropriate for Old City. He suggested that the parking entrance should be moved to Letitia. He concluded that the Committee should not recommend approval of this proposal. Ms. Voith responded that the parking is a necessary evil and added that the appropriate location for the parking entrance is not obvious. Mr. Primavera stated that the property owners on Letitia oppose locating the parking entrance on their street.

Ms. Voith asserted that the building is too big for the site. However, she disagreed with Mr. Gallery’s assertion that the mix of materials and expressions was misguided. She thought that the mix worked to break down the enormous mass. Nonetheless, the building is too large. Mr. Baker presented a photomontage showing the building superimposed on the skyline from the east. In the photomontage, the proposed building receded into the large buildings many blocks to the west.

Mr. Baker offered to slightly reduce the mass of the building on Letitia Street. He also offered to correct the cornice line on Letitia Street. He stated his preference for entering the parking from Letitia, but noted that the community is opposed to that solution. Front Street can better accommodate the parking.

Ms. Voith stated that she is close to recommending approval, but will support the staff recommendation. Ms. Pentz stated that she could support the project if the issues raised are addressed. Mr. Thomas stated that the proposal does not satisfy the Standards; therefore, he supports the staff recommendation. Mr. Baron reminded the Committee that no hardship application had been submitted. Therefore, the Committee members should not assume that there was a hardship. Ms Voith stated that the project was very handsome, but too big.

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

1515-21 CHERRY STREET, 1500-06 AND 1508-20 RACE STREET

Owner: Friends Center Corporation

Applicant: Vincent Muller, Director

History: 1856

Project: Remove historic fence, install new fences and gates

OVERVIEW: This application proposes removing an elaborate historic iron fence from the Race Street façade of the meeting house. The Fairmount Park Historic Trust proposes to purchase the fence from the Meeting, restore it and install it in the South Garden of the Fairmount Waterworks. The funds from the purchase would then be used by the Meeting to erect a new simple metal picket fence at both the Race and Cherry Street facades. The Cherry Street façade is currently open and homeless people have been sleeping on the property.

The Meeting and the Trust originally thought that the fence at the Meeting originally stood at the Water Works but was later moved to the meeting house. However; historic documentation recently uncovered appears to show two very similar fences existed, one at the Meeting house and another at the Water Works. Images from 1860 and 1890 of the Meeting House appear to show that the fence in question stood at the Meeting House long before the fence at the Water Works was removed. Therefore, the fence at the Meeting house probably never stood at the Water Works, but instead was very similar to it. In addition, a photograph shows that the fence historically erected along Cherry Street was largely brick, not metal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz announced that she would recuse because of Keast & Hood's involvement in the project. Mr. Baron explained to the applicants and audience that the Architectural Committee now lacked a quorum. Three members are needed for a quorum; only two can participate. He explained that the members of the Committee could proceed without a quorum. John Gallery objected to proceeding without a quorum.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Vincent Muller, the director of the Friends Center, architect Mark Ueland, Charles Mottershead of the Capital Programs

Office, preservationist Claire Donato, and Jan Alban of the Fairmount Park Conservancy represented the project.

Mr. Ueland presented the proposal. He explained that his firm is undertaking the restoration and renovation of the Friends Center. This is one piece of a larger project. He stated that the Meeting sought to secure the perimeter of its property. He explained that, until very recently, he and his client assumed that the fence along Race Street had originally stood at the Fairmount Water Works. They now know that it is not the actual fence that stood at the Water Works, but is very much like it and may have been cast from the same mold. He explained that, although it is not the Water Works fence, they would like to "repatriate" it to the Water Works to be installed in the south garden. He stated that the proceeds from the sale of the fence to the Fairmount Park Conservancy would fund the new fence around the entire meeting house site. He noted that the daycare in the meeting house requires complete security.

Mr. Muller asserted that his fence was fabricated from the original Fredrick Graff Jr. design, who had designed the Water Works fence. He stated that the important fence is deteriorating and, if left in the care of the Meeting, will soon be lost. He asserted that his sacred site is being "desecrated" by "unfortunate people." He declared that the Friends Center is the "Vatican" for Quakers. He spoke in great detail on the nightly defecating and urinating. He stated that his institution faced significant security and liability risks if the proposed fence was not installed. He stated that the discovery that the Meeting had the Water Works fence provided it with a great opportunity. Without the proceeds from the sale of the historic fence, the important fence would be allowed to "waste away." He stated that his institution will not maintain the fence. Ms. Voith objected and stated that the failure to conserve the important fence was a matter of priorities, not funding. Mr. Muller stated that he has already signed an agreement of sale for the fence with the Conservancy. He asked Ms. Donato to speak of the fence. She restated the history of the Graff-Water Works fence of 1847 and displayed a drawing of it by Graff. She also displayed a photograph of the original Graff fence still standing at the Water Works in 1936. The Meeting's fence has stood along Race Street since about 1860. She noted that the Meeting's fence can be restored to a sound condition. Ms. Alban of the Fairmount Park Conservancy voiced her approval of the sale of the historic fence and its movement from its original site to the Water Works.

The discussion turned to the new fence design. Mr. Ueland explained that the brick retaining wall along Cherry Street was added fairly recently. It is not historic. He would like to add a fence atop it and a gate at the southeast corner of the site. Mr. Thomas stated that he found the proposed fence acceptable, owing to the many changes already made in the area. He returned to the removal of the historic fence. He stated that he could not support the removal and sale. Ms. Voith agreed and adamantly opposed the removal of the important, historic fence. She also objected to the design of the new fence for Cherry Street. She suggested basing it on the historic fencing along Cherry, not on the non-historic retaining wall. Mr. Ueland explained that he had considered that, but had rejected it because the meeting would like to install a waste-water treatment facility along Cherry Street. He stated that the Friends are "forward-looking" and would like to be a model for the future; they are not concerned with recreating the past. Ms. Voith stated that the proposed wall and fence along Cherry is "overblown, historicist, and unfriendly." She suggested again that Mr. Ueland take his cues from the historic configuration and "make a nod to the original."

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance declared that the Friends Center is not a “sacred” building as Mr. Muller had asserted. He acknowledged that he is a Quaker and asserted that Mr. Muller’s statement that it was the “Vatican” was offensive. He declared that George Fox, the founder of Quakerism, decried the belief that spaces could be sacred. He stated that Mr. Muller’s assertion was in opposition to the fundamental tenet of Quakerism. He stated that he was also offended by Mr. Ueland’s assertion that waste water is more important than history. He also rejected the notion of selling historic artifacts. Others noted that this proposal was equivalent to the proposal to sell the Tiffany *Dream Garden* sculpture. Mr. Gallery agreed with Ms. Voith that it was not a question of funding but of priorities. Mr. Ueland noted that the overall project would cost \$16 million. Mr. Gallery opined that the new fence is “appalling.” He likened this proposal to the disliked proposal to fence Independence Square.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the removal of the historic fence and denial of the proposed fences as submitted, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

832-38 LOMBARD STREET

Owner: Masada Custom Builders

Applicant: David Amburn, architect

History: 1846, William Johnston

Project: Convert former church to single-family dwelling, construct side and rooftop additions

OVERVIEW: The Commission approved a similar proposal in concept to convert the long-vacant property to a single-family house. The earlier approval in concept included a very similar rooftop addition at the rear. Other than that, the project was largely a restoration. Although the applicant had previously applied to remove the stucco from the side walls, testing revealed that this would severely damage the brick. The applicant now wishes to re-stucco with a smooth finish on the sides. Two additions on the side would follow the general design in a taller format than additions which existed in an historic photo.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Architect David Amburn represented the application.

Mr. Amburn noted that he was the architect of the prospective buyer of the property, not the current owner. He stated that the proposed design would restore elements that have been altered or eliminated, such as the two side wings. In addition, certain elements would not be restored, such as the side walls, which were originally exposed brick. Mr. Amburn noted that, owing to the strong bond of the stucco on the side facades, he is proposing to restucco the sides with a smooth finish, not restore the brick.

Mr. Baron requested that Mr. Amburn clarify the proposed location for the glazed wall of the addition. Mr. Amburn stated that the elevation of the addition that would be largely glazed would be located along the west façade of the building. It would be minimally visible from Lombard Street. He noted that a new townhouse had been built on the lot to the west, obstructing views of the side of the building.

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

1620 NORTH STREET

Owner: Spring Garden Community Development Corporation

Applicant: John Bushnell, architect

History: carriage house c. 1855, Contributing to Spring Garden Historic District

Project: Enlarge approved penthouse and deck, add rear bay window, alter side window openings

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for alterations to the visible side façade and roof of this carriage house. The Commission previously approved a renovation of the building which included a rear roof deck with a stair house. During construction, a contractor error resulted in the demolition of the front façade, which has now been rebuilt. This application proposes altering the window pattern on the side façade, adding a rear bay, and expanding the stair house into a penthouse with an additional bedroom. The deck already approved for the rear would be shifted forward on the roof, but would probably not be visible from the street.

To meet the Standards, the bedroom section of the penthouse should be set back six feet from the side of the building, preserving a sense of the original height of the building and minimizing the visibility of the penthouse.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Architect John Bushnell represented the application.

Mr. Thomas requested clarification on the visibility of the addition. Mr. Baron stated that the addition would be visible from North Street. Mr. Bushnell noted that the proposed extension to the stair house follows the same footprint as the previously proposed roof deck. He also stated that a large building would block all visibility from the rear and that the addition would only be obliquely visible from North Street.

Mr. Thomas and Ms. Pentz agreed that the proposed addition would not be any more visible than what was previously approved.

Ms. Pentz asked how the front façade had been lost. Mr. Bushnell answered that contractor negligence had led to the accidental collapse of the façade. Mr. Baron noted that the removal of the floors and ceilings had promoted in the instability of the façade.

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

326 S. 24TH STREET, A.K.A. 2404 DELANCEY PLACE

Owner: Razak Buhn

Applicant: Mark Monteith, architect

History: house built c 1885, garage c. 1980

Project: Alter rear façade, rebuild garage with false second-story and deck, add garden gate

OVERVIEW: This application proposes modifications to an L-shaped property including changes to a gate along 24th Street, the cutting and installation of new windows on the rear façade of the house, and the demolition of the garage on Delancey Place and its replacement with a new garage and deck. The garage on Delancey Street will have a second-story faux façade to provide the deck with privacy. It is detailed with Queen Anne Revival inspired details based on the house and the adjacent structure to the east. Two of the new windows on the back of the house would have distinctive Queen Anne inspired pane configurations where we have no evidence that any existed historically.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval provided that the second-story, rear windows and the face of the garage are modified to avoid creating a false sense of history, pursuant to Standard 3.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Voith recused because her firm is the architectural consultant for this project. Mr. Baron explained to the applicants and audience that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. Three members are needed for a quorum; only two were able to participate. He explained that the members of the Committee could proceed without a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Architect Mark Monteith represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that the staff agreed with most aspects of the proposal, but deemed the second-story rear windows and the facade of the garage too historicist. Mr. Monteith stated that he had drawn on vernacular elements from the neighborhood for the garage façade. Mr. Thomas stated that the historic elements of the garage façade were still in use today. He found the design acceptable. He suggested that the new façade could be differentiated from similar, older facades through the detailing. Mr. Monteith explained that the second-story rear Queen Anne windows were replicas of the extant historic windows, not falsely historic additions.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal as submitted, with the staff to review details.

228 RACE STREET

Owner/Applicant: Frank White

History: c. 1750; Individually designated; Significant in the Old City Historic District

Project: Legalize stucco on Bread Street façade

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for legalizing the partially completed stuccoing of the Bread Street façade of this very old structure. The owner contends that the stucco will repair the brick wall. This building is extremely old and significant and together with other

adjacent historic houses on this block makes up an important streetscape similar to Elfreth's Alley and Cuthbert Street. The owner has already removed the character-defining two-stage brick beltcourse with a hammer and chisel. He has also removed the wood windows and replaced them with vinyl units. This application proposes legalizing the masonry work only; it does not address other illegal work

The façade is in need of repair. It has not been properly maintained. Large volumes of water from an air conditioner have been allowed to run down the wall. However, stucco will not repair the problems and certainly never remediates structural problems.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6

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

Ms. Pentz stated that "the last thing this building needs is stucco." She stated that it is entirely inappropriate for this early building and would not solve the maintenance problems. Ms. Voith and Mr. Thomas agreed. Mr. Thomas stated that the applicant should rebuild the beltcourse with old, salvaged brick. He should also replace the lintel where the wall is failing and rebuild that section of the wall with salvaged brick.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6.

105-117 S. 7TH STREET

Owner: L-A Liberty Square Associates

Applicant: Guy Gindhart

History: built 1923 for Beck Engraving Company, Contributing to the Society Hill District

Project: Legalize reconstruction of parapet and cornice

OVERVIEW: This proposal seeks to legalize work done on an emergency basis without a permit. Last winter a portion of the parapet and cornice collapsed into 8th Street and upon inspection it became apparent that other portions were in a precarious state as well. The applicants rebuilt sections of the parapet and cornice, salvaging the marble cornice where they could and using new cast stone and brick in place of the old along 8th Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, because this cornice is a secondary feature and it is almost impossible to distinguish between the original and replicated cornice pieces from the public right-of-way.

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

Ms. Pentz noted that the fabrication of the cast stone replacements pieces would have taken a great deal of time. She questioned that this work was performed on an emergency basis. Ms. Voith agreed and noted that the board of the Charter High School for Architecture and Design, which occupies the property, is very knowledgeable about the City's permitting processes. Despite questioning the failure to obtain the proper permits, the Committee agreed with the staff recommendation and deemed the repair

appropriate. Ms. Voith questioned the brick choice, but agreed that it would be difficult to differentiate the old and new brick from the street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend legalization of the repairs.

1636 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: George Bochetto Esq.

Applicant: Mark D'Alonzo

History: Built c. 1875. Designated on 2/8/1995

Project: Fourth-floor addition with roof deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rooftop addition and deck. The property sits on a corner parcel and is terminated by a prominent mansard. The proposed rooftop addition would be a copy of the historic mansard, thus creating a double mansard. This addition would require the demolition of a chimney. The roof deck would be located on the southern end of the historic mansard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 1, 2, 5, and 9 and the Addition Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application. Architect Mark D'Alonzo represented the application.

Mr. D'Alonzo stated that his client lives on the third floor and seeks to increase his living space with the addition of a fourth floor and deck.

Ms. Voith asked whether the proposed addition would be visible. Ms. Pentz, Mr. Thomas, and Mr. D'Alonzo all agreed that the addition on the corner building would be highly visible.

Mr. D'Alonzo mentioned that a similar application had been reviewed several years ago. Mr. Danta clarified that a previous owner had presented an application for a rooftop addition with deck, which was reviewed by the Architectural Committee. The Committee recommended that a mock-up be built; however, the applicant withdrew the application before the mock-up was constructed or the application reviewed by the Commission.

Mr. Thomas noted that a mansard on a mansard does not meet the Standards. Ms. Pentz agreed. Mr. Thomas mentioned that a deck with a stair house pushed towards the party wall with black railings might be acceptable, but asserted that he could not recommend approval of this proposal. Owing to the narrowness of the building and the mansard, he doubted that any significant addition would be appropriate.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 1, 2, 5, and 9 and the Addition Guidelines.

236 S. 21ST STREET

Owner: Craig Sokolow

Applicant: Harmon Deutsch

History: Built c. 1870, contributing resource in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District.

Designated on 2/8/1995

Project: Alterations to front façade and construction of two story addition

OVERVIEW: This building is a contributing resource in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. The property, although altered, retains its original massing, scale and considerable historic fabric, much of which is hidden by non-historic additions and accretions.

The Architectural Committee reviewed an application for this property in June 2006. The applicant proposed to demolish the front façade and reconstruct it with a fourth-floor addition. The Architectural Committee recommended denial and the applicant withdrew the application before a review by the Historical Commission.

The current proposal retains the historic façade. The applicant proposes to “restore” the second and third floors. However, many of the “restoration” details are incorrect or conjectural. However, the applicant still includes the previously-proposed inappropriate Greek Revival inspired storefront. In addition the new application proposes to add a two-story addition. The new additions would be set back ten feet from the mansard at the fourth-floor and fifteen feet at the fifth-floor. The proposed set backs would be insufficient to hide the additions from the public right-of-way; they are grossly out of scale with the historic building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 1, 2, 6, and 9 and the Addition Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Owner Craig Sokolow and architects Brett Harmon and Paul Drzal represented the project.

Mr. Drzal stated that the proposal included a storefront for the first floor, four windows on the second floor based on existing physical evidence, restoration of the mansard on the third floor, and fourth and fifth-floor additions set back from the façade. Ms. Voith asked if the building would multi-family. Mr. Sokolow, the property owner, said that it is now and would remain multi-family. Ms. Voith added that that the addition overwhelms the façade and does not meet the Standards. She stated that the two-over-two windows at the second floor are inappropriate and that the applicant should undertake more research to restore the mansard. She continued that the first-floor design should either be contemporary or related to the historic architecture at the upper floors. She rejected the falsely historical proposal for the storefront. Mr. Harman stated that they had been working with the staff to find historic details of the building. Mr. Farnham suggested that the architects should meet with the staff for guidance. Mr. Harman stated that his main goal was to determine whether the massing of the additions were acceptable.

Ms. Voith asked if the door locations at the first floor were historic. Mr. Danta replied that this issue was addressed that last time the project was before the Committee, when Mr. Rivera suggested that the building may have originally been a carriage house. Mr. Thomas stated that Sanborn research could help determine the original use of the building. He asserted that the lintels on the second floor are original. Mr. Sokolow stated

that it had been a delicatessen for more than sixty years. Mr. Thomas stated that he thinks that the proposed height of the building would not receive a zoning approval. Mr. Thomas stated that the application was deficient. He suggested that the applicant prepare a sight-line study with a section through the street and views from Locust and other streets.

Mr. Sokolow stated he would like an approval for the fourth-floor addition. He stated that the entire project depended on the income it would generate. Ms. Voith responded that he should restore the façade, that there should be one design approach for the entire façade, and that the roof addition should be set back so as not to be visible or have minimal visibility from the street. Mr. Thomas stated that whatever is being added should not be visible, set back from the façade, and have a simple finish.

Mr. Sokolow asked if he demolish the mansard and build straight up from the second floor. Ms. Pentz responded that the shape of the mansard roof is important. Mr. Farnham stated that the staff has counseled the architects, but they have not incorporated any of the suggestions. He asserted that building could be restored; the architects must examine the physical evidence that exists at the building. An addition may be possible, but the architects must develop and present a complete definition of their proposal to the Committee. He noted that the Committee cannot evaluate the addition with only a façade elevation. He continued that, to meet the Standards, the roof addition must be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. Ms. Voith noted that the surrounding buildings were inaccurately depicted. She and Mr. Thomas stated that the application was incomplete. Ms. Voith suggested the development of sight-line studies. Ms. Voith stated that the second and third floors should be accurately restored. She opined that the applicants had not adequately studied the project. Mr. Farnham suggested that the applicants apply for a permit to remove the aluminum siding to see if the historic features of the mansard have survived. The owner agreed that his architects should investigate the project further. Mr. Farnham noted that the Committee had categorically rejected the Old City-style storefront during the last review, yet, it was again proposed. Mr. Sokolow stated that he was glad that he had attended the review and would work with his architects to prepare a more appropriate proposal. Mr. Harmon stated that he would withdraw the proposal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 1,2,6 and 9 and the Addition Guidelines.

1910 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: Robert D. Harvey

Applicant: Liz Zimmers

History: Built c. 1886. Individually designated on 06/29/1971; Designated as a contributing resource within the Spring Garden Historic District on 10/11/2000

Project: Construct five-story building with underground garage.

OVERVIEW: The historic resource that stood on this parcel partially collapsed on September 2005 owing to the site excavation at 1904-08 Spring Garden Street. The remaining main block and partial rear ell were declared Imminently Dangerous by the Department of Licenses & Inspections and demolished soon after.

The applicant proposes to construct a five-story building on this parcel. The new building would relate to the newly constructed building at 1904-08 Spring Garden in scale and massing. The proposed building would have a cast stone base, brick upper floors, standing seam mansard with full-width dormer and vinyl windows and doors. The rear facade would be stuccoed. The building would have a partially sunken garage with an entrance from Nectarine Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the windows and doors are clad, not vinyl, and the retaining wall along Nectarine Street is rebuilt in schist, with the staff to review brick samples, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Owner Michael Harvey and architects Liz Zimmers and Michael Esposito represented the application.

Ms. Zimmers agreed to incorporate the changes suggested in the staff recommendation.

Ms. Voith stated that the proposed building is compatible with the new building to the east but not compatible with the historic building to the west. She expressed concern for the security and maintenance of the bay on the historic building to the west. She opined that the proposed design has overblown elements incompatible in massing and scale with the building to the west. She said that the proposed building looks like an historic building that has been “pumped up.” Ms. Voith and Ms. Pentz suggested that they reconstruct the lost historic building.

Mr. Harvey explained that a contractor working on the project to the east had undermined his building, leading to its collapse.

Discussion turned back to the bay on historic building to the west. Ms. Voith asked about the distance that would separate the bay from the proposed building. Ms. Zimmer stated that it would be only a few inches. The Committee members noted that the owner to the west would no be able to maintain the historic bay once this building is erected. Mr. Thomas and Ms. Voith asserted that this problem needed to be addressed. They suggested that Ms. Zimmers develop flashing or some other system to protect the historic bay.

Ms. Voith stated that the scale of the openings is not sympathetic to the surrounding historic buildings. She continued that the neighborhood is more vertical and more delicate. Mr. Thomas stated that the proposed building is compatible with the varied elevations on the street. He added that it is a contemporary but compatible design.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, provided the windows and doors are clad, not vinyl; the retaining wall along Nectarine Street is rebuilt in schist; and the bay at 1912 Spring Garden Street is adequately protected; with the staff to review brick samples and other details; pursuant to Standard 9.

501 S. 33RD STREET (WEIGHTMAN HALL)

Owner: Trustees, University of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Richard Russell

History: Built 1924. Designated on 2/7/1974

Project: Replace wood windows with aluminum clad windows.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the windows at Weightman Hall, University of Pennsylvania. The building retains its original wood true divided light windows. The applicant proposes to replace them with Jeld-Wen Custom Collection aluminum-clad units with simulated muntins. The proposed replacement window would copy the dimensions of the original almost exactly, except for a ¼ inch increase on the frame dimension.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Thomas and Ms. Voith excused themselves from the meeting. Mr. Rivera arrived. Mr. Danta explained to the applicants and audience that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. Three members are needed for a quorum; only two were present. He explained that the members of the Committee could proceed without a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the members of the Committee. David Facenda of John Milner Architects represented the application.

Mr. Rivera asked if the applicant met with the staff before submitting an application. Mr. Danta replied that there was a preliminary meeting and added that the reason for denial is that the original windows still exist. Mr. Facenda stated that the proposed windows are aluminum in material for maintenance purposes.

Ms. Pentz stated that the Committee had consistently recommended that wood windows be replaced with wood windows. She would make that recommendation in this case as well. Mr. Rivera added that if the aluminum windows were to be approved for this elevation then there would be nothing to prevent the approval of aluminum for the remaining windows on the other elevations.

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

113-25 CHURCH STREET

Owner: Church Street Associates

Applicant: Stephen Maffei

History: Designated on 12/12/2003, vacant lots, non-contributing in district

Project: 45-day review and comment - construction of six-story building on vacant lot

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a six-story building on an empty parcel in the Old City Historic District. The parcels were parking lots at the time of designation and listed as non-contributing to the district. Therefore, the Commission has 45-day review and comment, not plenary jurisdiction.

The building would have a ground floor garage and five stories of residential units. The proposed front façade has a brick veneer ground floor and largely glazed upper floors. The façade would be accentuated by exposed concrete and wood-like “Wenge” panels. This treatment would also be used along the side facades with blue azurite panels. The front facade is accentuated by two protruding bays facing Church Street and balconies and terraces throughout.

The massing and scale of the building respects and responds to its surrounding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff comments that the proposed new five-story building is a compatible addition in massing, scale and design to the Old City Historic District, and complies with Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta explained to the applicants and audience that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. Three members are needed for a quorum; only two were present. He explained that the members of the Committee could proceed without a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the members of the Committee. Architect Leore Barazani and attorney Michael Mattioni represented the application.

Mr. Barazani stated that the proposal is considered two buildings to comply with Zoning and that the applicant has already acquired a zoning permit. Ms. Pentz asked about the building materials. Mr. Barazani produced two samples of the materials.

Donna Dirkson voiced her concern for her easement that provides access to her property adjacent to the proposed building. Mr. Barazani assured her that the easement area would remain open and paved. She questioned access to the easement during construction. Mr. Barazani was unable to answer the question as he did not know specific construction details around the easement. The Committee members stated that these concerns were outside the Commission's purview. They also commended the design.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee commented that the proposal was compatible with the historic district.

505 N. 21ST STREET

Owner: Abraham & Alisha Dubb

Applicant: Emily Freeman

History: Built c. 1855 with c. 1890 additions, designated on 10/11/2000

Project: Rear addition with roof deck, window replacement.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace or repair all windows throughout this building. The original building dates from c. 1855, but has two additions dating from the 1890s. The applicant proposes to replace most of the windows with two-over-two true divided wood windows in the 1855 section of the building and clad one-over-one windows in the rear portions of the property. The building currently has various types of windows from different eras. The staff has encountered evidence on the building that leads it to believe that a two-over-two configuration might have not been the original

configuration, but rather six-over-six windows with structural plank frames. However, further research needs to be conducted to determine the validity of this configuration.

There is currently a multi-light single door that opens out to the porch along 21st Street, which would be replaced with a more compatible wood door to match the original configuration of the floor to ceiling window as seen on the next door property. An exposed CMU chimney in one of the late nineteenth-century additions would be stuccoed.

Along the side elevation, mostly invisible from a public right-of-way, the applicant proposes to alter two openings to accommodate triple sliding glass doors, as well as to restore a bay window. At the rear of the property, the applicant proposes to construct a roof deck with a dormer-type access, which would have sliding doors. This dormer would involve the removal of a large section of the roof trusses as well as the rear cornice and third-floor wall.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the roof deck and dormer as submitted, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. Approval of the replacement of the windows, with the staff to review muntin configurations and shop drawings; approval of the restoration to the bay, with the staff to review details; approval of the stucco on the chimney; approval of the enlargement of ground-floor side openings; pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta explained to the applicants and audience that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. Three members are needed for a quorum; only two were present. He explained that the members of the Committee could proceed without a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the members of the Committee. Architect Brett Webber represented the application. Mr. Danta explained that the reason why the staff would like to research the window configuration further is because the staff discovered a photograph displaying a plank frame on the window which most like would have had a six-over-six configuration.

Mr. Webber explained that the roof deck would not be visible. He stated that it would be hidden by the existing cupola on the bay of the house.

Mr. Riviera asked if the neighbor, who owns the adjacent twin, gained approval for the roof deck. Mr. Danta explained that the neighbor's roof deck went before the Commission and the Commission approved a single door between two existing brackets to access the deck. The neighbor's deck was not constructed to comply with the Commission's approval.

Ms. Pentz asked why the staff recommended denial of the dormer and roof deck. Mr. Danta replied that the reason for denial was not visibility, the deck would not be visible, but because of loss of too much historic fabric. Ms. Pentz stated that the proposal leaves some of the roof; it does not obliterate the roof. She stated that, owing to the lack of public visibility, she deems it appropriate. Mr. Rivera commented that the proposed deck is too large. He suggested that the scale of the opening should be half the size of what is being proposed. He thought that the opening should be reduced. Mr. Webber added that scale of the opening is driven by interior use and layout. Mr. Rivera stated that the proposed opening is too wide.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the replacement of the windows with the staff to review muntin configuration and shop drawings; the restoration to the bay with the staff to review details; the stucco on the chimney; and enlargement of ground-floor side openings; pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

One Committee member recommends approval of the proposed dormer and roof deck as submitted. The other Committee member recommends denial of the proposed dormer and roof deck as submitted, but approval of the dormer and roof deck with a narrower opening, with staff to review details.

218 S. DELHI STREET

Owner: D. Buriak & J. Chandler

Applicant: Alvin Holm

History: Built c. 1830. Designated on 1/31/1961

Project: Roof deck stair enclosure, bathroom addition

OVERVIEW: The Architectural Committee reviewed an application for a large deck for this property in January 2006. The Committee recommended denial as submitted, but approval of the deck provided that it was placed solely on the rear ell and with a railing height not to exceed three feet above the ridge of the gable. The applicant withdrew the application. A small deck on a new construction part of the rear ell and not visible from the street was subsequently approved at the staff level. That approval also met the Committee's recommendation. The deck access approved at that time included a spiral stair on the side.

The applicant now proposes a small bathroom addition, hidden from the public right-of-way. This addition will not involve the removal of the rear façade. However, the application now proposes to enclose the spiral stair with a penthouse. The deck has not changed placement or dimensions from the previously approved.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, unless a mock-up on site proves that stair penthouse will not be visible from public right-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta explained to the applicants and audience that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. Three members are needed for a quorum; only two were present. He explained that the members of the Committee could proceed without a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee members and stated the applicant had set up a mock-up for review. Mr. Danta confirmed that the proposed stair house would not be visible a public right-of-way. Adam Laver, the applicant's lawyer, stated they have received approval from the Planning Commission and the neighborhood association.

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

1214 ARCH STREET (MERSHON BUILDING)

Owner: Clint Swingle

Applicant: Marion Stroud Swingle

History: Designated on 6/13/1990. Milligan & Webber, architects, 1907

Project: Alterations to fourteen-story building

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission approved an application for significant alterations to this building in February 2006. The building changed ownership, and the new owner proposes to convert the building into gallery space.

The application proposes to restore the front façade of the building along Arch Street, with some minor changes. The storefront currently has a single door with blocked transoms. The applicant proposes to install a double door in place of the existing single door and reglaze the storefront exposing the original transoms. However, the storefront details appear flawed and some details need refinement prior to final approval.

The application proposes a new curtain wall system, a new garage roll-up gate, removal of a/c units and the infill of the open fire stair with an aluminum glazing system. All these changes would be at the rear façade, which faces an alley.

The application also proposes the addition of two mechanical penthouses on the roof. It would expand an existing penthouse towards the rear of the property and would build a new elevator/stair penthouse towards the front of the building. Neither mechanical penthouse would be visible from Arch Street, but they would be visible along the eastern party wall elevation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the historic double transom over the door along Arch Street is retained and the railing at the fire stair shaft is retained with the proposed glazed panels set back behind them; pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz recused because her firm, Keast & Hood, is involved in the project. Mr. Danta explained to the applicants and audience that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. Three members are needed for a quorum; only one was present. He explained that the member of the Committee could proceed without a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee member. Mr. Riviera asked if the doors to the right still exist behind the plywood. Architect James Karmolinski stated that the door was lost and that a fully-glazed element was proposed instead of double doors. Mr. Rivera asked if the staff thought that the central display window was originally a single sheet. Mr. Danta replied that it did because of the divisions in the transom. Mr. Rivera asked what the proposed material was for the door. Kerry Nolan stated that it would be wood. Mr. Rivera stated that he would like to see doors with a higher base. Mr. Karmolinski said that he had no objection to raising the base of the doors. Mr. Rivera asked about the height of the doors. Mr. Karmolinski responded that they would be approximately eight feet in height.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The member of the Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided that the doors be made taller without a transom; that the glazing in the door starts at the base level; and that the railings at the

fire stair shaft are retained with the proposed glazed panels set back behind them; pursuant to Standard 9.

3801 MOUNT PLEASANT DRIVE, ROCKLAND MANSION

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Tom McPoyle

History: Built c. 1800, Designated 5/31/1960

Project: Add new door hood at side elevation

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a hipped-roof door hood over a basement level entrance on the east elevation of Rockland Mansion. The hood would be supported by two brackets and roofed with gray asphalt shingles. The hood would extend about four feet from the building and under two feet above the door. At its widest the hood would measure about six feet.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote explained to the applicants and audience that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. Three members are needed for a quorum; only two were present. He explained that the members of the Committee could proceed without a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum.

Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee members. Ray Tschoepe and Tom McPoyle of the Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust represented the application.

Ms. Pentz expressed concerns about the attachment, alterations required for flashing, and the weight of the proposed hood. She also commented that the hipped hood may be confused for an historic feature. She suggested that an awning or canopy might be preferable. Mr. Rivera asked if the opening was original or a later addition. Mr. Tschoepe explained that, to the best of his knowledge, the opening was historic, but that it had been reconfigured as a door when the building was rehabilitated for the current tenant in 2004. He noted that the land around it had been regarded and an asphalt walk to the door added in 2004.

Mr. Farnham reported that he had recently visited the site with Lucy Strackhouse, the director of the Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust. He explained that the tenant, a psychoanalytic institute, had requested the hood to prevent rain from entering its office space through the exposed entrance. The basement entrance provides the primary access to the office space, which is just inside the door. He also noted that the Trust is very eager to appease the tenant because it is funding significant restoration work in the historically significant house. He noted that he did not especially like the introduction of a non-historic feature to the important house, but considered it an acceptable trade-off if it promoted the continued restoration. He asked the Committee members if a simplified shed-shaped hood would be preferable. He noted that it would simplify the flashing, precluding the need to cut across the façade on diagonals. The applicants and Committee discussed the façade material, which is scored stucco. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Rivera agreed that a shed shape was preferable to the hipped shape. They then discussed the brackets and decided that a minimal metal bracket would be less intrusive than a larger wood bracket. Finally, they reviewed the roofing material and agreed that a flat metal roof would be more compatible with the historic building than the proposed

asphalt shingles. Mr. Rivera concluded that “buildings are always improved over time to solve weather problems.” He presented the applicants with a sketch of the revised hood. The applicants accepted the Committee’s conclusions and agreed to revise their design to comply with them.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of a door hood with a simple shed shape, closed sides, metal supporting brackets, and a flat-seam metal roof.

653 N. 16TH STREET

Owner/Applicant: Jun Kang

History: Vacant lot with in the Spring Garden Historic District

Project: 45-day review and comment - construct of four-story single-family dwelling

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story residence on a vacant lot within the Spring Garden Historic District. The lot sits between a c. 1853 Greek Revival church and a c. 1875 Italianate Rowhouse. The building would be constructed of red brick. The first floor of the front façade would hold the main entrance, with a six-panel door and transom, and a garage. A two-story bay would span the second and third floors over the garage entrance. The bay would have four two-over-two windows one each floor. Two two-over-two windows would be placed at the second and third story levels over the main entrance. A fiberglass cornice would cap the front elevation. The fourth floor is set back from the façade and will not be visible from the street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff comments that, in general, the proposed building is compatible with the historic district, but objects to the garage on the front of the building.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote explained to the applicants and audience that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. Three members are needed for a quorum; only two were present. He explained that the members of the Committee could proceed without a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum.

Ms. Cote explained that the Committee lacked a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum. Ms. Cote presented the 45-day review-and-comment application to the Committee members. Jun Kang represented the application.

Mr. Kang explained that he had worked for one year to satisfy the requirements of the Spring Garden Civic Association. He reported that there is no vehicular access to the rear of the lot; therefore, the garage must be located at the front. He noted that there are several other garages in the fronts of buildings in the immediate area.

Ms. Pentz stated that she deemed the proposal compatible with and appropriate to the district. She objected to the front garage, but acknowledged the reason for it. Mr. Rivera asked about the garage door. Mr. Kang explained that it is a standard roll-up door, but offered to revise the design to suit the Committee. Mr. Rivera suggested a transom for the garage door, which he deemed squat. Mr. Kang stated that he had proposed a transom for it, but the civic association had rejected it. Mr. Rivera also suggested that simple panels replace the vertical board of the garage door.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to transmit their comments as noted in the minute to the Commission.

250 S. 16TH STREET (HANNAH PENN REPUBLICAN HOUSE)

Owner: Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships

Applicant: Stephanie Gropp

History: Built 1903, T. M. Rogers, Architect, Designated individually, 6/7/1973, and contributing within the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District.

Project: New openings along partywall

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to create five new openings for windows and to replace existing fire escape doors with fire rated ceramic glazed doors along the south party wall. Three of the new windows will be one-over-one fire rated steel windows, two on the second floor and one on the third floor. The two other openings will be to decorative arched windows with applied muntins. The new windows are to be located towards the rear of the building with minimal, if any, visibility from the street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote explained to the applicants and audience that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. Three members are needed for a quorum; only two were present. He explained that the members of the Committee could proceed without a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum.

Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee members. Architect Peter Goldring and Stephanie Gropp and Fran Orabano of the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship represented the application.

Ms. Pentz and Mr. Rivera agreed that the project was appropriate. The applicants asked if they needed an additional review if they reduced the scope of their project; because of cost, they may delete one or more of the new windows. The Committee members stated that their recommendation of approval would cover any or all of the proposed windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

221 S. JESSUP STREET

Owner/Applicant: Modesto Bigas-Valedon and Julie Seda-Agrait

History: Built 1814, Designated 2/28/1961

Project: Alter non-historic openings at rear ell

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alter non-historic openings of the rear ell. It proposes to remove an existing wall mounted air conditioning unit on the east façade and second floor of the ell and create a new opening for a new casement window to match the existing casements on the south façade of the ell. The bricks removed to create the opening will be relocated in the existing opening of the air conditioning unit and at the sides of the two proposed casement windows on the first floor. The proposed casements on the first floor would be replacing the two non-historic jalousie windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the two proposed casements on the first floor provided they fit within the historic window openings evidenced by existing seams; denial of the second floor rear casement, but approval of infilling the air conditioner opening with toothed-in brick, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote explained to the applicant and audience that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. Three members are needed for a quorum; only two were present. He explained that the members of the Committee could proceed without a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum.

Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee members. Owner Julie Seda-Agrait represented the application. Ms. Pentz stated that the drawings were very confusing. Ms. Seda-Agrait stated that she would like to add the windows for light and air as well as for the safety of her new baby, which will be born soon. Mr. Rivera stated that the proposal was acceptable because the openings had been significantly altered and because the removed brick would be reused to infill non-historic openings and repair the façade. The Committee members also noted there is little public visibility of these facades.

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

112 CUTHBERT STREET

Owner/Applicant: T. T. Newbold and Helen Cunningham

History: Built c. 1760, Designated individually 04/09/1957 and 01/06/1977; and as significant to the Old City Historic District 12/12/2003

Project: Construct rear two-story addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story addition located at the rear of the historic building and to the side of an existing addition. It proposes to extend the slope of the roof of the existing addition and add a dormer with double six-over-six windows. The addition would be constructed of new CMU block with stucco. The dormer and portions of the rear of the proposed addition would be clad in wood siding. A four-over-four window on the first floor and a French door and side light with an ironwork railing on the second floor are proposed for the north elevation of the addition. The dormer windows and a French door with side light and transom on the first floor are proposed for the east elevation. No openings are proposed for the south elevation of the addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote explained to the applicant and audience that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. Three members are needed for a quorum; only two were present. He explained that the members of the Committee could proceed without a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum.

Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee members. Owners Ted Newbold and Helen Cunningham represented the application.

Ms. Cunningham explained that this will be an addition on an addition. Ms. Pentz asked if the project included any demolition. The applicants replied that a non-historic garden wall would be demolished to allow for a new foundation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

309 N. 3RD STREET

Owner/Applicant: Brian Szymanik

History: Built c. 1855, Designated individually 12/31/1984 and as contributing to the Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: roof deck, rear balconies

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add new doors and windows in the existing opening at the fourth-story rear of the building. Also at the fourth floor a new steel balcony is proposed to replace and existing concrete ramp spanning Bodine Street. This application proposes to enlarge the existing door opening at the fifth-floor rear of the building to accommodate a new door and window. A new steel balcony is proposed to replace and existing steel balcony. Also at this level, the application proposes to add a spiral stair within an existing abandoned elevator shaft to access the proposed roof deck. The elevator penthouse would be extended approximately four feet with brick to accommodate for the spiral stair. The proposed roof deck would measure approximately 16 by 18 feet and would not be visible from any public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote explained to the applicant and audience that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. Three members are needed for a quorum; only two were present. He explained that the members of the Committee could proceed without a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum.

Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee members. Owners Colleen and Brian Szymanik represented the application.

The Committee members deemed the proposal acceptable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADJOURNMENT: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Section 14-2007(7)(j): No permit shall be issued for the demolition [as defined in Section 14-2007(2)(f)] of ... a building ... located within a historic district which contributes, in the Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Commission finds that issuance of a permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

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 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.

Building Site Guidelines: Recommended: Designing ... adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserves the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Jonathan Farnham, Randal Baron, Jorge Danta, Erin McGinn-Cote