

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

**27 NOVEMBER 2007
CITY HALL, ROOM 578
9:30 A.M.**

PRESENT

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Herb Levy, FAIA
Dan McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz
Robert Thomas, 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 II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

ALSO PRESENT

Mike Gavin, Gavin Law LLC
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Bret Feldman, Klehr Harrison
Aron Feferkorn
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Craig Slater, SRK Architects
Michael Frattone
Heather Frattone
Jeff Wyant, Wyant Architects
Robert D'Alonzo, D'Alonzo & Associates Architects
Matthew Burks, Stimulant Design
Jack Dundon, Alesker & Dundon Architects
Rob Beeman, Roman Industries
Jonathan Fitt, Equity Development Corporation
Paul White
Christopher Geslani
Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker & Partners
Cecil Baker, Cecil Baker & Partners
Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr Ingersoll & Andrews
Bob Downs, Berger Development/Yaron Properties
Joe Schiavo, Old City Civic Association
Janet Kalter, Old City Civic Association
Kafi M. Lindsay
Francis Kilson, KIG
Sonya Bistak
Ken Jawts, RMJM Hillier
Robert Scully, Tinto Restaurant
John Gallante, Jr.

Jason Capano
Alec Monaghan
Charles Goodwin
Gary Vernick
Nicole Galli
Edward Fink

CALL TO ORDER

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

315 N. BROAD STREET

Owner: JAR Packard Property LP

Applicant: Michael Gavin

History: Built: 1910 Architect: Albert Kahn Designated: 5/7/1981

Project: Install cellular antennas, add penthouse screen

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install 12 antennas behind a proposed 15 foot by 15 foot antenna screen, with a faux stucco finish, on the upper penthouse of the Packard Motor Corporation building. The screen would be visible from the public right-of-way. The associated equipment compound would be housed within the lower penthouse and not visible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Michael Gavin represented the application.

Mr. Gavin stated that the building was chosen because it is the tallest building in the area and therefore can provide the necessary coverage. He reported that there are already many antennas on the building. He noted that the new antennas would be installed behind a stealth screen, which is like a Styrofoam board that allows the transmissions to pass through it. Ms. Pentz questioned if the existing antennas on the building could be relocated behind this screen. Mr. Gavin responded that he does not have the authority to reconfigure the other equipment, which is owned by other telecommunications companies. He explained that the panels of the screen could be manufactured to match the existing penthouse. He conceded that the new penthouse would be visible from the public right-of-way, but would be inconspicuous. He showed photomontages with the new penthouse in place as well as a sample of the screen material. Mr. Farnham noted that the photomontages show the proposed penthouse with a cornice and other features that appear to match the existing penthouse. He noted that the architectural drawings do not include the cornice and other features. He asked Mr. Gavin which was accurate. Mr. Gavin responded that the penthouse would include details replicating those on the existing penthouse. He explained that the screens can be manufactured with any shapes. However, the features would not be as detailed as those on the original penthouse. He added that the lack of detail would be imperceptible from the street.

Mr. Rivera stated that the proposed screen penthouse would be inconspicuous on the large building. He added that there is no reason to replicate the details of the existing penthouse. Mr. Thomas disagreed and asserted that the new penthouse should include the details of the old as

proposed. Mr. Thomas stated that he would recommend approval with the staff to review details, if the cornice and other features were replicated. Mr. Gavin stated that that was his intention. He noted that the color of the screen panels could be customized to match. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the staff should review material samples for color and detail. Mr. Gavin stated that the color and texture would match those of the existing penthouse.

Mr. Levy opined that the “cure is worse than the disease.” He observed that Americans have recently learned to accept the presence of “telegraph poles” in the environment. They should learn to accept unmasked antennas as well. Mr. Gavin stated that he could face mount the antennas, but they would protrude four feet from the plane of the façade. Mr. Levy stated that the false penthouse would be as absurd as the “fake pine trees” used to disguise antennas. He asked rhetorically if we would next be requiring fake acorns made of burlap on the pine trees. Others pointed out that acorns do not grow on pines.

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

1215 SPRUCE STREET

Owner/Applicant: Aron Feferkorn, 1215 Associates L.P.

History: c. 1830, individually designated

Project: Legalize stuccoing of chimney and modified door

OVERVIEW: The Commission reviewed and approved a project to renovate this row house as condominiums. The current proposal involves legalizing two aspects of the project that deviate from the Commission’s approval. The owner had the rear portion of the main chimney stuccoed without the Commission’s approval. He says it was in poor condition. The Commission approved a door with a glazing configuration to match the original window that was cut down to allow access to a deck. The owner installed a single-light transom and a multi-light door at the second-floor rear that does not match the door approved by the Commission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Commission’s previous approval.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Property owner Aron Feferkorn represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the initial rehabilitation of the building had been approved at staff level. Mr. Feferkorn’s previous contractor installed inappropriate windows and an illegal deck. Architect Jay Tackett applied to the Commission to legalize the illegal work. The Commission legalized some of it; Mr. Feferkorn corrected the rest including the windows, deck and dormer. While undertaking that corrective work, Mr. Feferkorn determined that the chimney was bowed and had it partially rebuilt and stuccoed. Mr. Feferkorn explained to the Committee that he is not a developer. He stated that he was unaware of the designation when he purchased the property and simply wanted to improve it. He stated that his first contractor had made many mistakes and he has spent a great deal of money correcting them. For example, he removed and discarded \$10,000 worth of windows and installed \$27,000 worth of historically appropriate windows. He acknowledged that he stuccoed the chimney, but noted that it is only minimally visible from a service alley. He explained that it would be very costly to undo the stuccoing and noted that the neighboring properties also have stuccoed chimneys. Mr. Farnham agreed that the chimney is barely visible from the public right-of-way. He reported that Manning Street,

which runs at the rear of the property, is truly a service alley, with no front facades facing it; it is lined with garages and dumpsters. Mr. Thomas questioned the visibility of the chimney. Mr. Baron replied it is somewhat visible from Camac and Manning Streets.

Mr. Baron explained that the applicant had explained that he would have the funds to correctly repair the chimney at a later date, after he sold some condominium units. He asked if the applicant could be given an interim approval of the stuccoing. Mr. Baron also noted stucco does not usually make an unsound structure sound. Mr. Thomas noting the leaning and bowing of the chimney and stated that the stucco would not repair it. Mr. Farnham cautioned the Committee about interim approvals for two reasons. First, they are difficult to administer. Second, as recent litigation has shown, they open the Commission to claims that it is arbitrary and capricious. If an alteration is appropriate now, then it should be considered appropriate five years from now. Mr. Thomas agreed. He noted that the chimney will need significant repairs in the relatively near future. He suggested removing the stucco and repairing or replacing the chimney in brick at that time.

The Committee members considered the door, which is at the rear and barely visible from the public right-of-way, acceptable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend legalizing the chimney and rear door, provided that, if rebuilt in the future, the chimney is rebuilt in brick.

62-66 N. 2ND STREET

History: Built: 1942 Designated: 12/12/2003 as non-contributing to the OCHD

Owner: Purana Shahr, LP

Applicant: Craig Slater, SRK Architects, Vincent Rivera, principal

Project: Construct four-story addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story addition on a two-story non-contributing building in Old City. A new storefront opening is proposed for the first floor and cutting two windows down for balconies is proposed for the second floor. The façade of the addition would be clad in brick and metal panels, with two bays of balconies with glass and aluminum railings running from the third story to the roof. The rear façade is articulated the same as the front however, a one-story elevator with an open deck on the roof is proposed for access to parking in the basement. The historic street paving on Little Boys Way will be rehabilitated.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, especially for Little Boys Way, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Rivera recused owing to his firm's involvement in the project. He moved to the audience section of the Committee meeting room. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance suggested that it would be appropriate if he left the room. Mr. Rivera complied and left the room.

Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Attorney Brett Feldman and architect Craig Slater of Schlosser Rivera & Krumholtz Architects represented the application.

Mr. Feldman presented a general overview of the project. He recounted the history of the property. He displayed a photograph of the fire that destroyed the upper floors of the building

many years before designation. He reminded the Committee that the building is non-contributing to the district. He reported that the developer has discussed the project at numerous meetings with the Zoning Board, Planning Commission, Historical Commission staff, and the Old City Civic Association. He noted that this design meets the parking and FAR requirements.

Mr. Thomas opined that the reconstructed building complements the rhythm and scale of the block. He advocated for a recommendation of approval.

Mr. Baron explained that Little Boys Way, a private street that is part of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District runs across the rear of this property. He noted that the Commission recently approved the restoration of the section of Little Boys Way on the neighboring property to the south. He said that the application does not propose an appropriate restoration of Little Boys Way. He asked for clarifications of the restoration plan. Mr. Feldman offered to revise the plan and seek a staff approval for a true restoration. Mr. Slater noted that he sought to improve drainage on the street. Mr. Feldman stated that his client's intent was to restore the street. He again offered to have the proposal revised to reflect a restoration.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance urged the Committee to recommend denial of the application. He recounted that several years he had referred to a design for the 200 block of N. 2nd Street as the worst proposal for new construction he had ever seen for Old City. He asserted that this design was even worse. It is the worst he has ever seen for Old City. He opined that it is out of character with Old City. It detracts from the important historic building to the south, which has just been restored. He stated that the proposed awnings are inappropriate. The storefronts are inappropriate. The balconies are out of character and totally inconsistent with the district. He noted the balconies at the National West to the north and claimed that they, like these, are out of place in the district. Mr. Gallery contended that the proposed metal panels have no precedent in Old City. He claimed that this design is not in compliance with the Standards. He stated that "it does not even come close to the essence of Old City." He suggested demolishing and rebuilding the entire front façade, which is not historic, rather than creating awkward combination of new and old. He concluded that it should be completely redesigned.

Mr. Feldman stated that the building is non-contributing. The developer contends that the proposal is compatible with Old City. The community has approved of it.

Mr. Thomas stated that, upon hearing Mr. Gallery's comments, he would suggest that the architect reconsider the store windows, which should not extend to the ground. Mr. Feldman replied that the design is working with the existing building. Mr. Levy commented on the floor heights and their relations to the sill heights. Mr. Thomas suggested that the applicant consider lowering the second-story sills to create a better façade and a more appropriate sill height. Mr. Slater conceded that the sill height is more than five feet at the second floor. Mr. Thomas remarked that the interior spaces would be very uncomfortable. Many occupants would not be able to look out the windows.

Mr. McCoubrey opined that the balconies should be inset, not protruding, to better harmonize with the surrounding historic buildings. He inquired about the balconies and canopies at the top floor, which are unusual and awkward. Mr. Slater responded that they were intended to protect the doors to the terrace and to break up the bulk of the terrace, which is very large. Mr. McCoubrey suggested much smaller canopies to protect the doors. Messrs. Levy and Thomas concurred.

Mr. Baron again suggested that the Little Boys Way portion of the application be revised substantially. Mr. Farnham suggested additional research to better understand the historic street where it crosses this property. Mr. Feldman withdrew the proposal for Little Boys Way, stating that he would revise and resubmit an application for the restoration of Little Boys Way.

Mr. Levy noted that the application for the building should be substantially revised as well. Mr. Feldman offered to redesign the building. Mr. Levy stated that the Committee should have an opportunity to review the revised design owing to the substantial nature of the required revisions. Mr. Feldman stated that he would like to convert the application to an in-concept application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the reconstruction of the building in concept, provided the storefront windows are redesigned to include a solid base like historic storefront windows in the area; the sills of the second-floor windows are lowered significantly to have better proportions; the top-floor balconies are eliminated; and the top-floor canopies are limited to the door areas only.

2019 WALLACE STREET

Owner: Michael and Heather Frattone

Applicant: Jeff Wyant, AIA

History: c.1866; individually designated: 07/06/1972; contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize demolition of rear wall, construct deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of the removal of a rear deck, the demolition of the rear façade including first and basement level, and the construction of a stucco rear façade with French doors and sunken parking pad. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the illegal work. The rear of this property faces North Street. Across North Street from 2019 Wallace is a loading dock. Some house fronts face North Street starting at 2031 North Street heading west. Most of the work would not be visible as it would be blocked by a rear gate and wall at the property line. The proposed deck would be placed at the first floor. The original was at the second floor. The deck would have a metal railing with narrow pickets.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Property owners Michael and Heather Frattone and architect Jeff Wyant, who was not involved in the illegal work but was hired to prepare the legalization application, represented the application.

Mr. Wyant stated that the deck that was demolished was deteriorating. He stated that a structural engineer deemed it unsafe. He also noted the garage door had collapsed. He stated that the owners needed to act quickly to resolve the unsafe conditions. Mr. Frattone stated that the block of North Street at the rear of his house is blighted. He stated that there is a vacant loading dock across the street from the rear of his building.

Ms. Pentz asked if the excavation and reconstruction of the rear wall for the parking has been completed. Mr. Wyant stated that the excavation work has been completed. He noted that the owners obtained a zoning variance for the parking. Mr. Levy stated that he was confused about the work completed. He asked for a full accounting of the work completed and the approvals

and permits, if any granted for it. Mr. Wyant stated that the rear garden wall and garage door at the street have been demolished; the rear yard has excavated for basement parking; the rear wall of the building at the basement level has been demolished and rebuilt in a different location to allow for the parking; and the rear wall at the first floor has been demolished and rebuilt in stucco with new fenestration. He stated that the owners did not have the Commission's approval or building permits for any of the work, but they did have an interior-only building permit.

Mr. Thomas objected to Mr. Frattone's characterization of this block of North Street as blighted. He stated that many of the buildings facing this block have been nicely rehabilitated. He also objected to the proposed treatment of this street as a service alley. He suggested that a more appropriate garage door be installed. He said that the metal door is not appropriate for a street with many front facades. Mr. McCoubrey concurred with Mr. Thomas about the garage door. Mr. Baron suggested a wood garage door that would retract under the proposed deck as opposed to the metal roll-down gate. He provided the applicant with some door manufacturer information. Mr. Rivera agreed with the suggestion of a wood door.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a more appropriate wood garage door, not a metal roll-down gate, is installed, with the staff to review details.

1225 PINE STREET

Owner: Margot Berg and Robert Epstein

Applicant: Margot Berg

History: c. 1830, individually designated, 11/28/1961

Project: Install brick steps

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install front brick steps. The treads would be brick while the risers and sides would be parged in stucco. This application also proposes to install a marble threshold step. The original steps would have been marble. The extant steps are blue brick and are not original.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. No one attended to represent the application.

Mr. Baron stated that the applicant is concerned about the cost of restoring the steps in marble and therefore submitted this proposal for a less expensive alternative. The Committee stated that the proposal is not historically appropriate.

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

1636 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: George Bochetto, Esq.

Applicant: Carl Primavera, Esq.

History: c. 1860, individually designated, contributing to Rittenhouse Historic District

Project: construct stairhouse, entertainment room and deck on the mansard roof

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for constructing a penthouse and deck on top of the mansard roof of this corner house. The penthouse would contain the stair, entertainment room, and powder room. In September 2006, the Commission reviewed and denied an application for a larger mansard-on-mansard addition on this roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, the Roofs and New Addition Guidelines, and the Commission's previous denial.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Robert D'Alonzo and attorney Carl Primavera represented the application.

Mr. Primavera stated that he was not involved in the earlier application. He acknowledged the Commission's objections to the earlier proposal and stated that this submission responded to those concerns. He stated that this proposal is "de minimus." He asserted that this is the smallest addition possible. It would "unfair" of the Commission to deny all proposals to add onto this mansard. Mr. D'Alonzo asserted that the penthouse would not be highly visible. He also stated that it would be in character with the building. Mr. Primavera stated that the mansard-on-mansard has become a small pavilion. Mr. Thomas commented that this penthouse would be very visible from the street. Mr. Baron noted that the applicants' own sight line study shows that the entire penthouse would be visible from the street. Mr. Thomas suggested that the size of the penthouse be reduced to allow it to be set back significantly from the front façade of the building. He posited that it could be lengthened, but it must be narrowed and moved away from 17h Street. Mr. McCoubrey wondered if it was possible to set it back far enough. No addition may be appropriate. Mr. Thomas suggested that its function be limited to that of a stair house. He added that it must be set back significantly from the cornice. Mr. Rivera stated that a penthouse is not compatible with this historic building. He added that there is no reason to construct an additional living room on the roof. Mr. Levy suggested relating a smaller penthouse to the features of the main facades. He noted that the current penthouse proposal has no relation to the remainder of the building. Mr. Baron observed that the Committee was suggesting that a revised penthouse be minimalist, meaning minimum in size and minimalist in style. Mr. Primavera asked if that meant rooming the living space. Mr. Thomas stated that it did. He suggested limiting the stair house to the stair, bar, and powder room functions and removing any living space. Mr. McCoubrey stated that any new proposal should include accurate sight-line studies.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10, the Roofs and New Additions Guidelines, and the Commission's previous denial.

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.

New Additions Guidelines: Recommended: Placing functions and services required for the new use in non-character defining interior spaces rather than constructing a new addition; Recommended: Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that the character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed; Recommended: Placing a new addition on a non-character-defining elevation and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic building; Recommended: Designing a rooftop addition when required for the new use that is set back from the wall plane and as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street.

1009 MOYAMENSING AVENUE

Owner: Chris Geslani

Applicant: Matthew Berks, architect

History: c. 1820, individually designated

Project: Demolish portions of rear ell and main roof, build two-story-addition and deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the rehabilitation of an early nineteenth-century house. The plans stipulate the demolition of the back half of the main roof and the rear dormer as well as substantial portions of the historic rear ell. The rear of the building is seen obliquely from 2nd Street. A new rear wall at the second and third floors of the ell and deck would be constructed.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Property owner Chris Geslani, lender Jonathan Fitt, contractor Robert Beeman, and architect Matthew Burks represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that the applicants are fully restoring the front façade, but that is not part of this application. He objected to the demolition of the dormer and rear roof. He noted the rear ell as unusual; it has a curved corner and the second-floor façade is set back and sits on wood framing.

Mr. Burks defended the demolition on the rear ell, claiming that it is structurally unsound. He stated the first-floor side brick wall of the rear ell would be retained, but the second-floor section, which sits on the wood framing of the first-floor roof, would be demolished. He explained that at the main roof, the existing framing and dormer would be retained but enclosed within a new flat roof. The chimney would remain. The dormer would be altered to create a passageway to the new addition. Mr. Thomas noted that the new second and third floors of the ell would cantilever out over the side yard.

Ms. Pentz questioned the visibility of the rear from the public right-of-way. Mr. Baron conceded that it is minimal.

Mr. Thomas objected to the cantilevering and the enclosing of the rear slope of the roof. Mr. Baron suggested that the front slope of the roof may need to be demolished if the rear section is demolished. Mr. Burks reiterated that they are not proposing to demolish the rear slope of the roof. He stated that they will retain the rear slope and rear dormer and use the dormer as a passage to the new addition. Mr. Baron suggested pushing the passage toward the party wall away from the dormer. Mr. Burks stated that the stair is located in this area, making a passage to the new addition impossible. Mr. Rivera stated that the drawings are very confusing. Mr. Thomas suggested that they redesign the addition to preserve more historic fabric.

Mr. Farnham reminded the applicants that they have the right to go before the full Commission and advocate for the approval of their project.

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

1300 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: Hartford Omega, LLC

Applicant: John Dundon, architect

History: c. 1830

Project: restoration, rooftop addition, rear gate

OVERVIEW: This project involves two former c. 1830 houses at the corner of 13th and Spruce Street. They have been internally combined into one structure and used for many years as a language school. The grand marble stair was removed at some time in the past prior to designation. Since designation, the building was fitted with aluminum windows and panning without a permit. The proposal calls for rehabilitating the structure to be used as condominium units with a ground-floor restaurant. The restoration aspect of the design calls for removing the aluminum windows and panning and installing correct wood windows. The blocked up opening in the center of the façade would be reopened and fitted with a restored door and new solid block marble stairs.

To accommodate the new restaurant, the applicant proposes to cut down a window on 13th Street and create a door with an internal ramp to reach the level of the first floor. On the rear, the plans call for a garage door to be installed on Cypress Street to cover the loading dock for the restaurant.

The residential space in the building would be increased in size with a glazed addition on top of the roof of the visible rear ell.

Since the plans the Committee reviewed plans last month, the applicant has come back with a proposal deleting the side window and setting the rooftop addition back from the street about 15 feet to greatly reduce its visibility..

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Architect Jack Dundon represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the Committee reviewed an earlier version of this application last month. The Committee expressed two major concerns at that time. First, the Committee objected to the proposed window at 13th and Spruce Streets. This has been deleted. Second, he Committee objected to the large addition on the roof of the rear ell. The applicant brought the revised plans representing the Committee's suggestions to the last Commission meeting, but the Commission referred the project back to the Committee. Mr. Baron also explained that the applicant no longer proposes to roof the rear parking area. The Committee members agreed that the revised project is acceptable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

229-237 ARCH STREET

Owner: Berger Development L.P.

Applicant: Neil Sklaroff, Esq.

History: c. 1913; individually designated January 1977; contributing to Old City Historic District, December 2003.

Project: Demolish non-historic addition; construct ten-story addition (In concept)

OVERVIEW: The site at 229-237 Arch Street encompasses several historic and non-historic buildings. The entire project site extends from Arch Street, north along Bread Street, to Cherry Street. The site is adjacent to the Betsy Ross House. There are four- historic buildings within the site; a five-story industrial building facing Arch Street, a four story industrial building at the corner of Cherry Street and a three-story light industrial building on Cherry Street. A modern four-story addition connects the buildings on Cherry with the one on Arch Street. The application proposes to demolish the non-historic addition that dates from 1990. The applicant proposes to construct a ten-story addition in its place. The new construction would be contemporary in style. The massing of the building is analogous to other new construction projects in the area, including the new building directly across from Bread Street. The applicant proposes to build the addition out to the plane of the sidewalk along Bread Street. This would reinstate the street façade along Bread Street, which is currently fractured.

The applicant also proposes several changes to the historic building along Arch Street. The changes include reopening blocked up historic windows and opening new windows along the side of the building facing Bread Street. On the west façade, previously a party wall, the applicant proposes to cut new window openings. Restoration of the storefront ground level and some façade elements is also included in the application. The applicant has not submitted any details for any of these changes. The application does not include any changes to the buildings facing Cherry Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept of the tower addition and the rehabilitation of the historic building including the concept of reopening and cutting window openings at the east and west elevations, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Attorney Neil Sklaroff, developer Robert Downs, and architects Cecil Baker and Eric Leighton represented the application.

Mr. Danta distributed copies of a letter from the Preservation Alliance regarding the 65-foot height limit along with the response letter from the staff of the Historical Commission. Mr. Danta explained the staff's recommendation regarding the proposed openings on the east and west elevations. He stated that, conceptually, the proposed change appeared to comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards; however, additional details are necessary to fully assess the impact of the proposed new openings on historic fabric.

Mr. Baker presented an overview of the proposal. He displayed renderings showing the non-historic connector building, which he designed in the 1990s and now proposes to demolish. He stated that he plans to retain the garden next to the Betsy Ross House. The desire to maintain the garden and avoid building on the historic buildings has driven the current design and massing. He stated that the new tower would be appropriately scaled for Bread Street. It would repeat the rhythms of the volumes on Bread. It would be set back from Bread at the edges. He has not decided on materials, but they would be twenty-first century materials that reflect the historic materials in the area. He stated that the west, former party wall would be improved and

fenestrated. It would be made to look anonymous. The proposal complies with the FAR limits for the site but would exceed the height limit. The parking garage would be located under ground. He stated that the tower would be 120 feet tall, but shorter than the national West building, which is directly across the street and was approved by the Commission.

Mr. Thomas agreed with the staff recommendation. He stated that the Committee should review this proposal based on the Standards and the building's appropriateness to the district, not on zoning requirements. He observed that the porch on his old house was demolished years ago. If he proposed to rebuild the historic porch, it would not meet the zoning setback requirements, but it would be appropriate from a preservation perspective. He concluded that the zoning and historic preservation requirements are not always identical.

Joseph Schiavo, a resident of Old City, inquired if roof space would be occupied. Mr. Baker replied that it would not. Mr. Schiavo requested that the Committee recommend denial because the project exceeds the 65-foot height limit in the area. He opined that a Commission approval would disadvantage the community before the Zoning Board. He stated that Historical Commission approvals hold considerable weight with bodies such as the Zoning Board. He asked if the Committee would consider including a caveat in its recommendation that acknowledges the height restriction.

Mr. Rivera asked if the developer had met with the community yet. Mr. Baker stated that they had had a preliminary discussion. Mr. Downs stated they are scheduled to appear before the civic association on 11 December 2007.

Mr. Gallery stated that he would not comment on the design. He stated that he would only question why the Commission and its staff believe that they can ignore the 65-foot height limit, which is established by a City law passed by the City Council.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that Philadelphia's regulatory system that allocates zoning, historic preservation, and other realms of jurisdiction to separate agencies is not unique. The system only works when each agency applies its own laws and rules. He also noted that, if the Historical Commission is going to begin to apply the zoning code to its applications, then it must apply all of zoning, not only segments like the height limit code. If it applied all of the zoning code, then it would need to determine not only whether the building satisfied the height limit, but also whether it qualified for a variance from the height limit. He advised that the Zoning Board should limit its purview to the zoning code and the Historical Commission should limit its purview to the historic preservation ordinance, as the system prescribes. Mr. Gallery countered that the Commission should enforce the height limit because no interpretation is necessary; either a building satisfies it or it does not. Mr. Reuter stated that whether the Commission makes decisions in compliance with the height limit is a matter of policy, not law. He advised the Committee to make its determinations using the criteria provided in the historic preservation ordinance, the Standards and other measures of appropriateness from a historic preservation perspective. Mr. Sklaroff agreed and noted that the Commission and its staff do not have the expertise to apply the entire zoning code. Mr. Schiavo opined that there are many good things about this project, but it exceeds the height limit and therefore should be rejected. Mr. Thomas also noted that the Committee does not approve projects, but only makes non-binding recommendations. He stated that he did not consider it prudent to base a recommendation on a criterion outside the Commission's purview. Mr. Levy stated that he did not deem it appropriate to comment on the height limit in the recommendation. The other Committee members agreed. Mr. Reuter reminded everyone that this is an in concept application. This topic can be discussed again during the review for final approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the tower addition and the rehabilitation of the historic building including the concept of reopening and cutting window openings at the east and west elevations, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

521 S. JUNPIER STREET

Owner: Francis Kilson

Applicant: Francis Kilson

History: c. 1835, designated December 1984

Project: Legalize stucco of rear and side facades, construct rear parking area.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to repair stucco on the side and rear facades of this corner rowhouse. The designation photograph shows only the water table parged with stucco, the rest of the house was exposed brick. The stucco was applied years ago. The Commission files do not contain any information on its approval, thus it is assumed to be illegal. The applicant is currently restoring the front façade, which was also parged. The engineer for the project recommends retaining the stucco on the side and rear elevations rather than removing it owing to the weakened condition of the walls. The application proposes the installation of new windows, new single-lite rear door and rear light fixture. The applicant also proposes to construct a parking area in the rear yard. The drawings submitted show fencing on only two sides of the yard. The side along Rodman Street would not be enclosed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval of the stucco repairs, windows, rear door and light fixture, pursuant to Standard 9, denial of the parking area pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application. Property owner Francis Kilson and attorney Kafi Lindsay represented the application.

Mr. Danta explained that the staff did not object on the creation of parking on the rear yard, but that they did object to an open rear yard, given that the yard would have been fenced historically. Mr. Danta asked Mr. Kilson if he would object to creating the parking area with a solid gate. Mr. Rivera agreed with the staff's recommendation and opined that a beaded board gate and fence would be appropriate in this location. Mr. Rivera specified that the gate should block the public visibility of the parking area. Mr. Kilson did not object to a gate and stated he would have the drawings revised based on the Committee's guidance.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the stucco repairs, windows, rear door and light fixture, and approval of a revised parking area with a solid wood beaded board fence and gate along Rodman Street.

1837-55 N. BROAD STREET

Owner: Temple University

Applicant: Tom McCreesh

History: c. 1899, designed by Thomas Preston Lonsdale; designated February 1984.

Project: Alter facades for ADA accessibility.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to the exterior of the Baptist Temple. On the front façade, the applicant proposes to remove handrails, an illuminated sign, and a cross. These elements would be reinstalled after the rehabilitation work on the rest of the building is completed. On the east elevation, the applicant proposes to demolish a stair and install a VRC lift and also cut a window opening to accommodate a roll down door. On the west elevation the applicant proposes to remove historic steps and cut down a door for ADA accessibility and install metal louvers in two basement windows. Along the rear of the building the applicant proposes to remove handrails and infill a door with new stone veneer to match the surrounding limestone.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the VRC lift, roll down gate, restoration of the front façade and installation of the louvers on the west elevation, provided these area set behind unglazed window grills that match the muntin configuration of the original windows, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of cutting down the steps and lowering the door on the west elevation, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro recused owing to their firms' involvements in the project.

Mr. Danta presented the application. Architects Sonja Bijelic and Kenneth Jacobs represented the application.

Mr. Jacobs stated that they had inherited the project from another architect who wanted to cut out large pieces of masonry. He stated that they are trying to disturb the historic building as little as possible. He explained that creating access for disabled people is difficult because the interior floor level is 42 inches above the sidewalk. He stated that they decided that it would not be acceptable to install ramps on the exterior. Therefore, they are proposing to remove the steps, create a larger doorway, and accommodate the level change inside. He noted that, when this building was designed, the door now proposed for alteration was intended to be a window. Ms. Bijelic showed the plans and explained that they had hoped to disturb as little masonry as possible. Mr. Levy asked if they could move the ADA entrance to the other, less visible side of the building. Mr. Jacobs stated that they could, but the proposed location is on the main walkway of campus; the other side faces a service alley. The University does not want disabled people entering through a back alley. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the alley is gated as well.

Mr. Jacobs clarified that the cross would not be reinstalled on the façade of the building as the drawings wrongly state. He also noted that the railings would be replaced in kind. He stated that the ornamented railings would remain and that the proposal refers to the non-historic handrails in the middle of the steps, not the historic rails. Mr. Jacobs stated that all illuminated signage would be removed and salvaged.

Mr. McCoubrey opined that the proposed transom over the cut-down door on the side seemed to break the symmetry and massing of the façade. It is visible from Broad Street. He suggested a solid wood panel where the large glazed transom is proposed, to maintain the solidity of the corner. Mr. Jacobs stated that the University had approved this proposal and that any revisions

would need the review and approval of the University. Mr. McCoubrey restated his comments and suggested that a solid panel be installed rather than a glazed transom. Ms. Bijelic approved of the idea and offered to implement it. Mr. Levy deemed the glass acceptable, but Mr. Danta contended that the wood would satisfy the Standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the VRC lift, roll down gate, restoration of the front façade and installation of the louvers on the west elevation, provided these area set behind unglazed window grills that match the muntin configuration of the original windows and approval of cutting down the steps and lowering the door on the west elevation, provided a solid undivided panel is installed rather than the proposed glazed transom, with the staff to review details.

116 S. 20TH STREET

Owner: Jose Garces

Applicant: Julio Sanchez

History: Built c. 1860, designated as contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District on February 1995.

Project: Alter storefront and façade.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the façade and storefront at 116 S. 20th to match the alterations recently approved by the Commission for 114 S. 20th Street. The restaurant is expanding into the building at 116 S. 20th Street and the owner would like to have both facades match. The applicant proposes to install café windows and clad the existing wood storefront surround with copper to match the next door property. However, no details were provided and the drawings submitted do not portray the storefront accurately. The storefront at 114 S. 20th was originally copper, not wood. The storefront at 116 S. 20th Street was originally and still is wood, not copper. The storefront would have a simple picket railing. A menu box and metal sign are proposed for the front door. The sign would be attached to the inside jambs of the door surround. The front doors would also be replaced with glazed double leaf wood doors. The basement windows are currently infilled; the applicant proposes to install windows like those at 114 S. 20th Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of all exterior alterations, except the copper cladding, pursuant to the Commission's approval for the same changes at 114 S. 20th Street; denial of the copper cladding on the storefront surround, pursuant to Standards 4, 5, and 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Robert Scully and Julio Sanchez represented the application.

Mr. Scully explained that they seek to expand a restaurant that now occupies 114 S. 20th Street. Mr. Danta asked the applicants if they would be willing to paint the storefront surround a copper color as opposed to the copper cladding. Mr. Scully stated his client would probably consider this option, but was unsure if paint would accurately replicate the copper storefront next door. Mr. McCoubrey concurred with the paint suggestion and believed it would achieve the applicant's intent without covering historic fabric. Mr. Rivera agreed and stated that he objected to cladding a historic wood storefront with copper. Mr. Scully stated that the storefront wood is rotting and needs replacement. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested repair rather than replacement.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the café windows; sign, menu box, and railing, with the staff to review

details, but denial of the copper cladding on the storefront surround, pursuant to Standards 4, 5, and 6.

1714 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: Paul A. Monaghan

Applicant: Paul A. Monaghan

History: c. 1855; Contributing to the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, 8 February 1995

Project: Replace rear swing gate with metal roll-up gate.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a metal roll-up gate at the rear of the property that fronts the 1700-block of Delancey Place. This block of Delancey is not a service alley. The buildings at 1704 to 1732 Delancey Place face this street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Committee. No one represented the application.

Ms. Sell explained that a metal roll-up gate is not compatible with the character of the streetscape or district in design and materials. She suggested that a sliding wood picketed gate would be more appropriate for this location in the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District.

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

2002 AND 2004 SHUNK STREET

Owner: John M. Gallante Jr. (2002) and Jason Capone (2004)

Applicant: John M. Gallante Jr. and Jason Capone

History: 1914; Contributing to the Girard Estate Historic District, 11 November 1999

Project: Install metal gate

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of a metal gate at the paved side yards separating the houses at 2002 and 2004 Shunk Street. The owners would like to install it for added safety and security. Historically, this opening would not have been gated. The gate would be set back behind the porches and gutters of the houses. The original design of the gate was highly ornate with decorative leaf and vine panels. Since the Architectural Committee meeting, the applicants have submitted a much simpler, revised design.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. Property owners John Gallante Jr. and Jason Capano represented the application.

Ms. Sell explained that the staff suggests a simpler straight picket design. Mr. Gallante described his corner property being the first of three in a row. He is concerned about security concerns and noted pedestrians often assume that his side yard is a public alleyway. The applicants stated that they chose the gate from a catalog that labeled it a "Victorian-style" design. He opined the design is compatible with the historic character of his building. Mr. Rivera acknowledged the applicant's security concerns, but suggested a simpler design that would not

detract from the house's important architectural character. He suggested a less ornamented design. Mr. McCoubrey stated ornate gate would compete with the architecture of the historic house. Mr. Gallante responded that he did not desire a plain gate. Mr. Rivera suggested removing the decorative grills. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested a simpler design with twisted bars as a decorative detail. Mr. Gallante asked if keeping the finials would be an option. The Committee responded that keeping the finial caps would be acceptable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial because of the historically inappropriate style of the gate, but approval of a simplified design, pursuant to Standard 9.

2127 PINE STREET

Owner: Charles P. Goodwin & Nicole D. Galli

Applicant: Charles P. Goodwin & Nicole D. Galli

History: Built circa 1870; Designated 8 February 1995; Contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District.

Project: Legalize painting of masonry.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the painting of masonry lintels, sills, and watertable. In October 2007, the owners painted them purple without the Commission's review or approval. They had been painted previously, but were not painted historically.

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

Masonry Preservation Guideline: Not recommended: Applying paint or other coatings such as stucco to masonry that has been historically unpainted or uncoated; Not recommended: Changing the type of paint or coating or its color; Not recommended: Using new paint colors that are inappropriate to the historic building and district; Recommended: Cleaning masonry surfaces with the gentlest possible method, such as low pressure water and detergents.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Committee. Property owners Charles Goodwin and Nicole Gall represented the application.

Mr. Goodwin stated he based his decision to paint the masonry without a Commission review after reading guidelines posted on the Historical Commission website, which state:

The Historical Commission has jurisdiction over the entire building envelope and it reviews all work that requires a permit or that may change the exterior appearance of a property. This includes, for example, roofing masonry cleaning, pointing and painting, window and sash replacement, and window boxes. As a matter of policy, the Commission does not regulate the painting of exterior trim. The staff approves permit applications for interior work that does not affect the exterior appearance of a building upon submission.

Mr. Goodwin stated that he considered the masonry lintels, sills, watertable, and door surround as "trim" and believed that the Commission would not regulate their painting. Mr. Levy and Ms. Pentz stated lintels, sills, watertable, and door surround are not considered to be trim, but rather structural supports integral to the construction of the building. Ms. Galli stated they had obtained all legal permits necessary for work on the interior and windows on the façade. She stated they followed the guidelines as stated on the web site. She emphasized that the painting was done in

good faith. Mr. Goodwin stated that a contractor told him it would be too expensive to remove previously applied coats of paint and that his own attempts to power wash at a high pressure did not remove the paint, but rather chipped the masonry. Ms. Sell explained that the process of masonry cleaning and paint removal also requires the Commission's review. They should have sought the Commission's approval before trying to power wash the paint from the building. Mr. McCoubrey informed the applicant of the advisory role of the Committee and its obligation to follow the Secretary of Interior Standards. He suggested that they should present their case to the full Commission.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9 and the Masonry Preservation Guidelines. Masonry Preservation Guideline: Not recommended: Applying paint or other coatings such as stucco to masonry that has been historically unpainted or uncoated; Not recommended: Changing the type of paint or coating or its color; Not recommended: Using new paint colors that are inappropriate to the historic building and district; Recommended: Cleaning masonry surfaces with the gentlest possible method, such as low pressure water and detergents.

215-217 VINE STREET

Owner: Gary and Kim Vernick

Applicant: Elaine DelDuca

History: c. 1820; individually designated 12/31/1984 Contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Construct single family dwelling

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a four-story single-family dwelling at the corner of North American and Vine Streets. The BRT address at the time of designation and currently is 215–217 Vine Street. The section at 215 Vine Street, where the construction is proposed, is currently used as a parking lot. The section at 217, is occupied by a three-and-a-half-story building constructed about 1820.

The design of the new building would be contemporary and would include wide bay windows at the second, third, and fourth stories on the south and east facades, a recessed balcony at the fourth story on the east façade, and a garage with curb cut on the east side.

While the overall massing of the new construction fits within the district, the materials, features, proportions, and rhythm are incompatible with the character of the district. The building will be constructed with red brick, however, the two large bays that dominate the two main facades will be clad with a vertically-hung one-by-six-foot cedar board. In addition, there is not a tradition of bay windows in Old City. The rhythm of proportions, fenestration, and openings in the structure are incongruent with surrounding buildings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owner Gary Vernick and architect Edward Fink represented the application.

Ms. Sell explained that the property is not a vacant lot, but is an open part of the property that includes the historic building to the west.

Mr. Levy voiced his concern about the overhanging bay and suggested that the Streets Department would not approve the projection. He stated he was in favor of a contemporary building, but does not believe the bays are compatible with the surrounding historic district. Mr. Rivera stated the bays are too massive for the scale of the building and there is no architectural element that carries the composition. He explained that historically bays were designed to allow for more light. This design includes bays for more space. He noted that one bay projects through the roofline. Mr. Rivera noted the lack of step to the front entrance. He reiterated that there are too many features in the design. Mr. Rivera concluded it was too complicated of a design with many architectural contradictions. Mr. McCoubrey questioned the size of the bay on the Vine Street facade.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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.

Masonry Preservation Guideline: Not recommended: Applying paint or other coatings such as stucco to masonry that has been historically unpainted or uncoated; Not recommended: Changing the type of paint or coating or its color; Not recommended: Using new paint colors that are inappropriate to the historic building and district; Recommended: Cleaning masonry surfaces with the gentlest possible method, such as low pressure water and detergents.

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.

New Additions Guidelines: Recommended: Placing functions and services required for the new use in non-character defining interior spaces rather than constructing a new addition; Recommended: Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that the character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed; Recommended: Placing a new addition on a non-character-defining elevation and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the historic building; Recommended: Designing a rooftop addition when required for the new use that is set back from the wall plane and as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street.