

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
30 November 2004**

Present

Vincent Rivera, Chair
Rudolph D'Alessandro
Herbert Levy, AIA
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz
Robert Thomas, AIA
Daniela Voith, AIA

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

Also

Edwin and Amy Rivera, 213 Catharine Street
Mark Wieland, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Eric Rahe, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Maleda Berhane, Aegis Property Group
Timothy Calligan, Aegis Property Group
Paul Irwin
Harold Irwin
Michael Hauptman, Rodeph Shalom
Allen Rubin, Spring Garden Civic Association
George Thomas
Martin Rosenblum
James Wiesenhutter
Jose Hernandez, JKE Architects
Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects
Matthew Wilcox, Regis Development
Rob Flaynik
John Hubert
Lonne Rice
Charles Loomis, Loomis McAfee Architects
Herb Scott
Steve Westbrook
Vic Perla, ACE American Insurance Company
Veronica Cox-Emanuel, ACE American Insurance Company
John F. Kaulbach, Kling
Francesca Oliveira, Kling
Julius Victoria, LeClere Associates
Michael Druet, ACE American Insurance Company
Mark Washington
David Keene, Capital Signs
Henry Lieberman, Applebee's
Carol Heiberger, 1600 Waverly Street
Richard Wolgin, 1600 Waverly Street

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
David Ertz, Cope Linder Architects
Thomas Witt, Esq., Wolf Block Schorr and Solis-Cohen, LLP
Joe Zuritsky, Parkway Corporation
Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects
Alicia Ali, Avalanche Companies
Robin Komita, Society Hill Civic Association
David G. Marshall, Rittenhouse Regency
James Garrison, Hillier Rittenhouse Regency
Bob Hillier, Hillier Rittenhouse Regency
Roger Smith, Hillier Rittenhouse Regency
Tom Sullivan, Hillier Rittenhouse Regency
Devin Aronstam, Rittenhouse Regency
Gerry Gutierrez, Group G
Scott Cronin, 109 Elfreth's Alley
Virgil Procaccino, 261-263 South 22nd Street
Art Elwood, 261-263 South 22nd Street
Craig Deutsch, 261-263 South 22nd Street
Jennifer Bonaccorsi, 250 South 18th Street
William L. Leonard, 250 South 18th Street
Blake Ingram, 317-19 South 20th Street
James Crowley, 2330 Pine Street
Ray Brogden, Soong Associates, 1015 Cherry Street
Julie Wong, Chinese American Buddhist Association, 1015 Cherry Street
Xian Can Shi, Chinese American Buddhist Association, 1015 Cherry Street

Rudy D'Alessandro, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. Mr. Thomas arrived soon thereafter.

500 Willow Grove Avenue, Chestnut Hill Academy

Chestnut Hill Academy, Owner

Eric Rahe, Architect/Applicant

DATE: Wissahickon Inn: 1882-84, Hewitt Brothers, architects, and William Mackie, builder; Commons Building: 1905, Frank Miles Day, architect; Gymnasium, Frank Miles Day; Kline Science Building: c. 1950, Hatfield, Martin & White, architects; Kingsley Gymnasium: addition 1956 and 1959, Hatfield, Martin & White, architects; Squash courts: Voith & Mactavish

PROPOSAL: Demolish building, construct two buildings and parking lot – in concept

This is an in-concept proposal with three phases. Phase One includes the demolition of the Commons building and the construction of the new commons building in its place. Phase Two calls for the complete demolition of the gymnasiums and the construction of a new gymnasium on the site. Phase Three is the demolition of the Kline Science building and the construction of a new Science building and the expansion of the existing parking lot on the opposite side of the former Wissahickon Inn.

The Commons Building houses the school's cafeteria. Much of the original building remains intact and many of the original features can still be seen from Willow Grove Avenue. The Kingsley Gymnasium was added to the Commons Building in the 1950s. The proposed building footprint of the proposed Commons and Woodward Gymnasium would wrap around the existing circular drive and a large wing would extend behind the rear of the Wissahickon Inn.

Other than dark renderings, the application does not include any details for the exterior of the new Woodward/Commons building and no details of the exterior of the new Science building. The application also lacks any justification for the demolition of the existing buildings.

Staff recommendation: Denial based on incompleteness.

Ms. Spina introduced this submission for a review in concept.

Francis P. Steel, Jr., the Head Master, introduced the proposal. He advised the Committee that the Academy has undertaken a 5 to 10 year strategic plan. It anticipates a growth in the student body from the recent and current 400/450 to in excess of 500. Not only does the Academy require more space, but the kinds of space it needs have changed also. The community has participated in this planning process.

Eric Rahe of Bower Lewis Thrower presented the proposal. He indicated on a site plan the existing open space and athletic fields and noted the importance of maintaining them. This goal resulted in the focusing on the currently developed sector for the proposed new buildings. As a part of its planning effort, the Academy now seeks a zoning permit for this future development. It recognizes that any zoning approval may expire, for much depends on the time required to raise funds. Even though details are not yet available, the Academy now wants the Historical Commission's perspective to consider in its zoning application further refinement of the master plan.

Mr. Rahe foresees several phases. They include a new commons building; the demolition of the existing gymnasium and commons; the demolition of the present science building, the construction of a new one. Frank Miles Day designed the current commons. He informed the Committee that the inadequate, small size of the old commons and gymnasium dictated their replacement. He and his colleagues studied an addition and/or reconfiguration of the existing facilities and found that this solution did not yield enough space.

Ms. Voith asked if the Academy could convert the gymnasium into a commons. Mr. Rahe replied that the firm has explored that as well as a multi-story option. The latter would result in a large building incompatible in scale with its context. They also explored encroaching on the open space; they rejected this owing to the goal of preserving the athletic fields for use by the Academy and community

Mr. Rahe turned to the design concepts for the new buildings. The architects strive for compatibility of the old and the new in massing, color, scale and roof shape without replication of the old. They foresee a commons and a science building of stone and a barn-like gymnasium.

Mr. Thomas thought that the clustering of buildings preserved the character of the campus and asked if the Academy would consider the creation of an open space conservation easement as mitigation of the demolition. Mr. Steel responded in the affirmative and observed that it made sense; however, the Academy Board must decide that.

Ms. Voith expressed a concern that the new will lack the excellence of the old; the lack of detail does not instill confidence in the new. She reiterated her preference for adaptive reuse. Mr. Rahe cited their efforts to preserve the old, which they cannot do and maintain the scale and massing of the complex.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested splitting the athletic facility and locating the commons elsewhere. Mr. Rahe replied that relocation would reduce the visibility of the commons to the detriment of its public uses and would compromise the goal of preserving interior open space. Mr. Steel added that split athletic facilities would create staffing problems and, consequently, reduced use.

Ms. Pentz noted the public interest or hardship requirements for demolition and requested comment from the applicant. Mr. Steel mentioned the community's use of the commons and fields which the proposed plan will allow to continue.

The Committee acknowledged the sensitivity of the proposal. It also reached a consensus that it needed more justification for the demolition.

The Committee recommended tabling this submission pending the receipt of more information.

RT

213 Catharine Street

Edwin Rivera, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1810

PROPOSAL: Cut garage door

The owners wish to install a garage at the rear of the property by carving out a space in the rear ell. The work has started without a permit or Historical Commission approval. The owner has inserted a steel I-beam below the second floor and plans to remove approximately four feet of the first floor to accommodate a car in the rear yard. The new rear wall of the first floor has two one-over-one wood windows. A large, stuccoed pillar supports the steel I-beam, which may remain exposed. The existing metal, picket gate will remain. On the east façade, a former window has been cut down to a single-leaf door.

The proposal also includes legalizing the installation of wood, one-over-one wood windows in several existing openings on the north and east elevations of the rear ell. Although the rear ell may not date to 1810, it is 19th century fabric and the windows should be six-over-six.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina explained the application and noted that design, not the garage *per se*, was at issue.

Edwin and Amy Rivera, the owners, attended the meeting. They emphasized their belief that a more open area would be nicer aesthetically and would be less vulnerable to damage by vehicles. Mr. Rivera informed the Committee that the windows which were installed were a replication of the existing windows. Ms. Rivera acknowledged negligence in not acquiring a permit.

Mr. Thomas pointed out that houses front onto Fulton Street, which is included in the Thematic Historic Street Paving District. He asserted that unless the proposed garage alterations were enclosed with limited visibility, the Committee could not recommend approval.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.], Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and Standard 10 [New additions and 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.].

DH

218 Carpenter Street

Paul Irwin, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1858

PROPOSAL: Construct rear, two-story addition

The proposal calls for a two-story rear addition with a third-story deck on this corner property. The addition will have a stucco finish to match the existing side wall. The three windows and door that now exist on the rear wall will be moved to the new rear wall of the addition. At the third floor, the historic rear wall will be removed to create a wall of sliding-glass doors, flanked by sidelights, leading to the deck.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the addition and deck itself, but denial of the wall of doors at the third floor rear, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. The third floor should have a single-leaf door and perhaps a six-over-six window at this level.

Paul and Harold Irwin attended the meeting. Mr. Irwin noted that the 3rd story wall was designed prior to his knowledge of the historical status of the property. He offered to re-design the wall to reflect the staff's recommendation.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the addition and deck, but with a single-leaf door and six-over-six window at the 3rd floor rear, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and Standard 10 [New additions and 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.].

DH

615 North Broad Street, Rodeph Shalom

Congregation Rodeph Shalom, Owner

James Weisenhutter, Applicant

DATE: 1926-28, Simon and Simon, architects

PROPOSAL: Add stairtower, cut new entrances

This application includes cutting two side entrances, one on the north façade and one on the south façade, as well as a new stair tower at the rear of the building. The north entrance will be cut in the center bay and will have a double-leaf steel door with

perforated metal panels.

The south entrance, which faces a parking lot, will also be cut in the center bay. These doors will be double-leaf and fully glazed. This entrance will have a curved, prefabricated glazed and metal canopy, with glazed walls, that extends six feet. The entrance will also have a concrete ramp, with a plain metal pipe railing. A new gate in the metal picket fence will lead from the parking lot to the synagogue, with metal plates creating a circle, and contemporary lighting fixtures with globes and metal detailing.

The stair tower will be added to the east façade and will extend the full three stories. Faced with stucco on all façades, the addition will have a single-leaf flush door on the south façade leading to concrete stairs with a metal mesh railing. The south façade may also have a series of vertical windows.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the stair tower, handicap ramp, new gates in fence, lighting and cutting the doors on the north and south facades, but denial of the canopy, pursuant to Standard 9.

Michael Hauptman, the architect, Martin Rosenblum and James Weisenhutter attended the meeting. Mr. Rosenblum explained that the rear portion of the building houses the school, which has only one means of egress. He noted that the proposed south entrance on the parking lot façade would be located in the central bay. The small glazed structure which extends six feet would be removable with a rounded roof to shed water. Mr. Rosenblum stressed increased security issues and the current absence of accessibility by wheelchair to the rest of the building. He clarified that the door opening on the south side would be a square cut and not segmentally arched. Mr. Rosenblum said that the rear elevation, which is clad in brick, lacks rhythm in its design; therefore the application proposes a simple cream color stucco stair tower with possibly one window. Ms. Voith suggested that the stair receive some type of covering over it.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval as submitted, with the staff to review details. Mr. D'Alessandro recused himself.

DH

1520 Green Street

Courtyard Associates, Owners

Matthew Wilcox, Applicant

DATE: 1861-65 by Stephen Button, architect

PROPOSAL: Remove stained glass windows, replace windows, install HVAC equipment and skylights

This application includes several parts. First, staff has already approved the permit application to restore the stained glass windows on the front façade. The last remaining stained glass window sits in the middle bay on the east face. This window, designed by Nicolo D'Ascenzo, is the only window in the church that has religious themes. The owner wishes to remove the window and donate it to St. Joseph's University. The University is collecting stained glass windows for a future exhibition of stained glass in Philadelphia.

Second, except for the extant stained-glass windows, all of the other windows in the upper sanctuary are missing. The proposal calls for installing new, wood windows that are based on the muntin patterns of the lower floor. The proposal also includes new

windows in the bell tower and oculus. All of the other windows will match their original configuration.

Third, the application proposes twenty skylights in the roof of the building. The roof has a very shallow pitch and the skylights have short curbs so they probably will not be visible from the street.

Lastly, the proposal calls for eighteen new condenser units for air-conditioners on the roof of the rear portion of the church. These will not be visible from the street.

Staff recommendation: Denial of removing the D'Ascenzo window and approval of the other window replacement, skylights and HVAC, with staff to review details including shop drawings for the windows and front door, pursuant to Standard 6, Standard 9, and Roofs Guideline, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 6, 9 and Roofs Guideline.

Gary Reisner, owner and developer, George Thomas, historian, Jose Hernandez architect, and Matthew Wilcox, contractor, attended the meeting. Mr. Reisner disclosed to the Committee the discovery of remnants of an original window in the upper sanctuary and that he now plans to replicate the window in all of the openings. Mr. Thomas remarked that the window pattern is a very simple abstract design with painted glazing. Mr. Thomas noted that the project was given a structural review by engineer Nicholas Gianopulos. Once apprised of Mr. Gianopulos' involvement with the project, Ms. Pentz recused herself.

Conversation turned to the treatment of the remaining stained glass window. Mr. Reisner pointed out that the D'Ascenzo window has a strong religious content. Committee members asked if it could remain in place or be moved to other openings in the building. Mr. Reisner said that the window will provide the only light to three housing units and the colors of glass make it a very dark window. He plans to put photographs of the window in the lobby to document it for owners of the units. Committee members asked if the window itself could be placed in the lobby, but it is too large. Ms. Spina cited the proposal for a similar removal of stained glass at Our Lady of Loreto Church.

Mr. Reisner inquired if the Committee could approve of the re-location of the D'Ascenzo window to the stair tower opening. Both staff and Committee thought the re-location idea would resolve issues for all parties. Mr. Thomas commented that in the proposed new location the window would make the window more visible to the public.

Allan Rubin, speaking on behalf of the Spring Garden Civic Association, offered support of the project.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised proposal, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.], Standard 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.], Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.], Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.], and Roofs Guideline. [Recommended: Installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof such as air-conditioning when required for the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

Ms. Pentz recused.

DH

2131 Green Street

Martin Brigham and Harriet Rubenstein, Owners

Arlene Matzkin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1861

PROPOSAL: Construct garage with deck at rear

This proposal includes the construction of a one-story garage addition at the rear. The addition will have a stucco finish and a wood roll-up garage door. The roof of the addition will have a deck with a pergola with access through a new single-leaf, multi-light wood door cut down from a window at the second floor. The rear of this house faces Clay Street, which has only garages.

Staff recommendation: Approval with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Ms. Spina described the project. Arlene Matzkin, architect for the project, attended the meeting. Committee members agreed with the staff's recommendation.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.].

lms

2012 Spring Garden Street

Chesterfield Twenty, LLP, Owner

John Hubert, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875; brownstone detailing added, c. 1890; black glass front added c. 1930

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitate building, add stairtower and roof decks

This application includes façade rehabilitation and decks on both the roof and off the rear bay. The façade rehabilitation will include removing the smoked glass installed on the front façade in the 1930s. The details of the façade restoration, including new windows, will be worked out with staff.

The new deck for the roof of the building would be set back fifteen feet from the front cornice and accessed by a new stair penthouse located at the westernmost edge of the house. The penthouse will be sheathed in mahogany siding.

On the rear, the proposal calls for decks off of the first, second and third floors. The three-story metal bay already has a deck on the roof that existed at the time of designation. The second and third story decks will be accessed by doors cut in the metal bays, but no details have been provided.

Staff recommendation: Approval of removing the glass panels on the front, pursuant to Restoration Standard 3 and Restoration Standard 4; Approval of the deck on the first floor rear and roof deck on the rear ell with penthouse, but denial of the decks on the second and third floors and roof deck on the main section of the building, pursuant to

Standards 9 and Roofs Guideline.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Architects Robert Flaynick and John Hubert explained that the house will be converted from eight apartments to four condominiums. They wanted each unit to have access to a deck. Mr. Flaynick performed more sight-line studies to show their visibility.

The deck at the first and second floors cannot be seen from 20th Street, but the one at the 3rd floor can, so the proposal no longer includes that deck. On the roof of the property, the proposal now calls for moving the front railing back twenty feet from the front cornice and seventeen feet from the front parapet of the mansard. The railing in this location would still be visible from Spring Garden Street at an angle. Committee members objected to the visibility of the front railing, especially with the large size of the proposed deck. They asked for the staff to review another mock-up to determine the location of the front railing so that it is at a point where it is not visible.

Mr. Flaynick explained that to access the deck at the 2nd floor, one of the windows will be converted to a single-leaf door with all of the details of the bay replicated. Mr. Thomas suggested that the door be moved to the opening closest to the party wall to limit visibility and maximize the traffic flow in the room. Messrs. Flaynick and Hubert agreed.

The Committee did not object to the removal of the black glass on the front since it would restore the façade.

Allan Rubin of the Spring Garden Civic Association supported the application.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the removal of the glass panels on the front, the decks on the first and second floors at the rear, and the decks on the roof, with staff to determine the location of the railing at the front with a mock-up, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as decks and terraces 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.].

lms

633 North 16th Street

Graduate Developers, Owners

Clayborn Cann, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Build residence on vacant lot – review and comment

This proposal calls for the construction of a new house on a vacant lot. The house will have a brick façade, one-over-one windows, multi-light doors on each floor with metal balconies running the full width, and a garage at the first floor with a roll-down paneled door.

The Historical Commission has 45 days for review and comment.

Ms. Spina described the proposed house. Lonnie Rice, architect for the project, noted that owner could not attend the meeting. The Department of Licenses and Inspections

had issued a foundation permit without referring the application to the Historical Commission so the foundation has been laid for the house.

Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Voith objected to the elevation drawing because it did not show neighboring houses and they could not tell if the proposed building matched them in height. Mr. Rice said that the house will have the same height and cornice line as the ones next door.

Ms. Voith noted that while infill construction is encouraged on a block, the particulars of this design are not consistent with the neighboring buildings. It does not match the scale or rhythm of the other houses on the block. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz agreed.

Allan Rubin of the Spring Garden Civic Association objected to the garage and noted that 16th Street is an extremely busy avenue. He stated that the Civic Association would support a variance from the zoning requirement for on-site parking in this location.

The Architectural Committee voted to table the proposal in order for the architect to redesign the house to be more in keeping with the neighboring houses.

lms

4100 Main Street

AAC of Manayunk Association, Owner

Jack Kanagic, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Legalize sign and lighting

Without a permit or Historical Commission approval, the owner installed a sign and lighting over the front door. The lighting includes a metal conduit that cuts across the second-floor window and two spot-lights to illuminate the sign. The sign covers the brick jack arch over the door.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the sign, but denial of the lighting conduit and lights. The conduit should be rerouted to run under the sign.

Ms. Spina described the proposal. No one representing the application attended the meeting. All of the Committee members not only objected to the conduit, but also that the sign obscures the decorative brick jack arch.

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property].

lms

Ms. Voith excused herself from the meeting.

1230 Pine Street

David Callan, Owner

Charles McLaughlin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830, storefront c. 1975

PROPOSAL: Demolish storefront and restore residential front, alter chimneys, demolish rear wall and roof, build 3-story addition

This proposal calls for the demolition of the visible and original rear façade, roof and dormer of this Federal/Greek Revival Style house. The rear would receive a new three story addition in its place. On the front façade, the applicant proposes the demolition of a recent storefront treatment and its replacement with a restored residential front. The details of that design have not yet been accurately worked out and this does not represent a restoration. Mr. Baron noted that the one story rear addition was demolished last week without a building permit.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Allen Metcalf, the architect, attended the meeting. Discussion first focused on the front façade. Mr. Baron reiterated that the first floor does not have any historic fabric, the staff's concern for an historically accurate façade restoration, and the question whether the steel beam inserted for support would impede the reinstallation of the restored residential façade. Mr. Thomas noted that the support structure may actually have been done in two phases so that it may be easily reversible and the beam could be removed entirely. Ms. Pentz agreed.

The Committee then turned to the rear façade. The Committee members took exception to the proposal not only because of its visibility from Waverly Street but also because it required the removal of much historic fabric at the second floor and roof, including an original dormer. Mr. Thomas observed that the entire rear façade was being removed for an addition that was only 6 feet deep. Mr. Metcalf noted that the owner was investing a lot of money into a small house and wanted to add square footage to make it more enticing to potential buyers. Mr. Baron suggested adding an addition at the first floor level since the historic fabric had already been compromised at that level. He said that the original brick wall at that level might be reused to rebuild the front wall. Mr. Thomas noted that since the first floor was being raised, the basement could be made into living space with the rear yard excavated. Mr. Metcalf asked if a deck could be added at the second floor and one of the windows cut into a door. The staff and Committee found this to be an acceptable compromise.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the rear addition as proposed, approval of the front façade restoration and approval of a one-story rear addition with basement excavation and a second-floor deck with a single-leaf, multi-light door, all with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and Standard 10 [New additions and 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].

lms

2124-2126 Wallace Street

Jonathan Wilson, Owner

Charles Loomis, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855, altered

PROPOSAL: Alter window openings, install cornice, repair brick, replace garage doors

This former carriage house had received alterations before designation including the removal of its cornice and the raising of the height of the top floor ceiling and a brick parapet on the front façade. This application calls for reinstalling a cornice in a new location at the top of the parapet and rebuilding the brick wall in that area. The applicants propose raising the height of the windows at the second floor and making them four over four rather than two over two. The carriage, garage and hayloft doors would be replaced.

The staff recommends that the applicant should install the cornice in its original location and install two over two windows.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the carriage, garage and hayloft doors with staff to review details. Denial of the cornice, brick wall and second floor window alterations pursuant to Standards 3, 6, 9, and 10.

Charles Loomis, architect for the project, and Jonathan Wilson, owner of the property, attended the meeting. Mr. Baron explained the proposal. Mr. Loomis said that the main purpose of enlarging the windows at the second floor is to gain more light in the living space.

Allan Rubin of the Spring Garden Civic Association opined that the building always looked awkward and that the larger windows would make it look better. The Civic Association supports the better use of the building. He also noted that some carriage houses had larger windows on the second floor.

Ms. Pentz emphasized that this particular building has windows of a set size and they should not be changed. Mr. Thomas noted that dramatically changing the windows' size does not meet the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*. In order to get more light into the space, he suggested skylights, which would be easy to install in the flat roof.

Committee members agreed that the cornice should be kept in the original location. Doing so also would negate the need to find historic brick to repair the front wall. Mr. Wilson asked if a cornice needed to be installed at all. Mr. Baron explained that the cornice serves two functions: many of the bricks that were used behind the cornice area were not the harder face brick so installing the cornice would help protect that softer brick, and the projection of the cornice helps keep water away from the face of the front wall, which, in turn, prevents water infiltration and deterioration.

For the carriage house doors, Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the bottom rail should be wider than the lock rail.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the carriage, garage and hayloft doors with staff to review details and denial of the cornice, brick wall and second floor window alterations pursuant to Standard 3 [Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.], Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.], Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and

Standard 10 [New additions and 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.].

lms

613 North 18th Street

Steven Westbrook, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Demolish and rebuild front façade and rear ells, add decks

This proposal seen last month as a substantial demolition returns as a revised proposal to legalize the demolition of the rear ell. It calls for rebuilding the front façade using the existing brick and building a new cornice, doorway and windows to match the originals. The details provided for the windows, however, are incorrect. Unfortunately, it does not call for saving the first and second floor of the façade or the doorway as had been recommended by the Committee. It also gives no details of the doors, door surround or windows to be replaced. The revised plans now show the rear bays to be reinstalled to their original size and covered in cedar.

Staff recommendation: Approval only if the applicant specifies which portions of the façade can be retained and provides revised details of the proposed new features such as windows and doors for staff review pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the application. Herb Scott, the architect for the project, and Steve Westbrook, the owner, attended the meeting and presented a new drawing. Mr. Scott explained that after meeting with Mr. Baron he revised the drawings to reflect the changes requested by the Committee last month.

On the front façade, the area that needs to be rebuilt is primarily the portion between the two windows at the second and third floors. The cornice will be repaired and the door surround will be repaired. After looking at photographs of the façade, Ms. Pentz questioned the assessment that only the portion between the windows needs to be rebuilt. She noted that at least one lintel is broken and the brick above the 3rd floor windows has fallen in. Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro discussed possible reasons for the collapse for the front wall. The tension on the wall may be attributed to several causes, primarily water infiltration. Mr. Scott asserted that the roof is intact.

Mr. Thomas questioned the size of the windows on the rear ell. He noted that the windows should be larger, both to match the historical configuration and to take advantage of the southern exposure.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the submission, with larger windows in the side façade of the rear ell, the areas of façade reconstruction noted on the drawings and staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.].

lms

436 Walnut Street

ACE-INA Insurance, Owner

Michael Del Rossi Jr., Applicant

DATE: 1915, addition 1972

PROPOSAL: Replace windows

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which calls for replacing the windows in both the new and older portions of this office building. In the old section of the building, a former

owner replaced the historic wood sash in aluminum and capped the window frames with aluminum prior to designation. The applicants have researched the original design with an historic photograph, surviving sidelights in the upper floor and the historic frames under the capping to help create a new aluminum window.

Staff recommendation: Approval with staff to review details pursuant to Standard 6.

Victor Perla, Veronica Cox-Emanuel, and Michael Del Rossi attended the meeting. Mr. Del Rossi noted that the large arched windows have existing wood sidelights in the old portion of the building. He said that in his proposal the frame panning size decreases and the meeting rails are slightly wider. Mr. Baron presented historic photographs showing six-over-one windows. He said that because the proposed windows in the new addition have accurate dimensions, the windows could be approved at staff level.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired if the sash would be positioned in the same location. Mr. Del Rossi responded that the panes of glass would be in relatively in the same position.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with staff to review details pursuant to 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.]

DH

436 Walnut Street

ACE-INA Insurance, Owner

Robert Thompson, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1915, addition 1972

PROPOSAL: Demolish penthouse, install HVAC equipment and screening

Mr. Baron presented the proposal, which calls for the demolition of a utilitarian penthouse and the installation of two large cooling towers. The units will be hidden with brick red colored screens.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Victor Perla, Veronica Cox-Emanuel, Fred Kaulbach, Francesca Oliveira, and Mark Washington attended the meeting. Mr. Perla informed the Committee that the proposed screening would be red in a corrugated pattern. The two L-shaped screens would obscure the old and newly installed mechanical equipment. He noted that screening would be put in front of the existing dunnage, but behind the parapet wall. In response to Mr. McCoubrey's query about tying into the existing chases, Mr. Washington said that some new steel would be required; however, a six-foot high unoccupied floor exists, which will receive the ductwork. Mr. Kaulbach presented samples of the proposed screening in two colors: brick and a gray. He noted that the preferred screening would be a simple corrugated panel in a warm gray color to complement the existing 1972 enclosure. Committee members concurred that the applicant should construct a mock-up for a determination of the more appropriate color.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval subject to staff review of a mock-up for a determination of the appropriate color.

DH

5500 Wissahickon Avenue, Alden Park: The Kenilworth

Eastview Realty Associates, Owner

Sonny Victoria, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1925, Edwin Rorke, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace roof with asphalt shingles

This proposal calls for the installation of new red asphalt shingles to replace existing red asphalt shingles. Plans show the original roof as curved Spanish Tile. The applicants had originally proposed a metal roof system that better replicated the look of tile. Because the metal would cost on average \$ 200,000 more than the asphalt in a 1.7 million dollar project, the applicant now wishes to use the less expensive product. The asphalt makes a very poor match with Spanish tile because of the shape and the fact that real Spanish tile lines up in rows whereas the asphalt is staggered.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 6. The metal should last longer and the applicant includes estimates where the metal is cheaper from one company than the asphalt costs from another.

Mr. Baron introduced this application.

Sonny Victoria, the architect and applicant, informed the Committee that the Kenilworth program also included pointing and window painting. Any cost savings will permit yet other work on the building.

Ms. Pentz asked if the applicant had secured an estimate for terra cotta tile, i.e., the original roofing material. Mr. Victoria responded in the negative.

Mr. MrCoubrey inquired about the duration of warranties. Mr. Victoria answered that metal simulated terra cotta and asphalt both carried 20-year warranties. Ms. Penta observed that metal should last longer.

Mt. Victoria presented the several colors available in asphalt. The Committee found them all very similar. Moreover, Committee members noted that terra cotta tiles had a vertical orientation in contrast to the horizontality of asphalt.

John Gallery added that the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia holds an easement on the property and that he had no awareness of the asphalt proposal. He expressed a preference for terra cotta.

Mr. Levy would like to see an estimate for terra cotta with a life-cycle cost analysis.

Mr. Victoria outlined again the scope of the Kenilworth project, including window and masonry roof. In a total budget of \$5.5 to \$5.6 million, the owner cannot afford any extra roofing costs.

The Committee voted to recommended a denial of the asphalt and the submission of a terra cotta estimate with a life-cycle cost assessment for consideration by the Committee at a future date. It also expressed a willingness to consider the metal simulated tile.

RT

215 South 15th Street

Felchen 15, LP, Owner

David Keene, Applicant

DATE: 5th District Police Station, built 1870/1898 Charles Supplee, architect

Bookbinders Restaurant,

PROPOSAL: Add illuminated signage and awnings

This application for signage returns to the Committee with some changes. The application now calls for shed type awnings in canvas like fabric on the west and north facades. The main flat wall sign will be replaced with a smaller sign flanked by two sets of neon letters on armatures. The central flat wall sign has a plastic sign face. The large corner sign returns with modification only to its plastic sign faces. The applicant looked into reattaching the sign with a less fabric hiding the quoins of the building corner; however, it was found that this would force the applicant to make a new zoning application and the existing sign size would no longer be “grandfathered”.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the awnings and flat-wall signs if these are constructed with a metal rather than plastic face pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron introduced this submission.

Mr. Keene reviewed the proposal and reviewed the zoning question on the blade sign.

Mr. Levy urged that the attachments for the new flat wall sign occur in the mortar joints.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for a slight reduction in the width of the center wall sign so as to expose the quoins. He also inquired into the extent of damage to the brick behind the present Bookbinders sign.

In response to a question, Mr. Keene said that his firm will fabricate the apple in the center wall sign in metal, not vinyl.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the signage and awnings with staff to review details and to work with the applicant to mitigate any damage under the existing wall sign, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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.]

RT

1700-1706 Rittenhouse Square Street

Parkway Corporation, Owner

Thomas Witt, Esq., Applicant

DATE: new building on vacant ground and on site of rowhouse approved for demolition

PROPOSAL: Erect 33-story residential building

This proposal involves the construction of a 33-story residential tower on a vacant lot and the site of a row-house that the Commission has formerly approved for demolition.

Staff recommendation: Approval; however, the staff finds the building to be excessively large in scale for this location south of Locust Street and the north wall facing

Rittenhouse Square Street to be blank. That wall could benefit from more glass, even if it would expose the side of the elevator and the utility room.

Mr. Baron introduced this proposal and noted the previous approval of the demolition of 1706 Rittenhouse Square Street.

Mr. Ertz described the project in greater detail. Cope Linder designed the new building to respond to the scale of the Medical Arts Building across South 17th Street and the residential tower to the north. Through the treatment of details and materials, especially at the base of the new structure, they also seek compatibility with the scale of the dwellings on Rittenhouse Square Street and Manning Street.

Mr. McCoubrey expressed concern about the blankness of the north elevation. Mr. Zuritsky informed the Committee that he shares this concern and continues to consult with the occupants of the building across Rittenhouse Square Street on the solutions to this question.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, also spoke about the north wall. In addition, he asked if this is a construction, 45 day review and comment submission. Mr. Tyler responded in the affirmative, for most of this parcel was vacant land at the time of the designation of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend the approval of the submission.

RT

2010-2012 Chancellor Street

Acorn Property Development I, LLC, Owner

Arlene Matzkin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Revise approved façade design

An application very similar to this one was seen by the Committee and Commission several months ago. At that time the project was approved with the doors to be revised at the front in conjunction with staff, the third floor addition to be approved at the rear subject to a setback, and the retention of existing openings on the second floor on St. James Street. The Commission agreed to allow the applicant to stucco the rear wall of 2010 Chancellor Street. The applicant who agreed to these conditions before now returns to the Committee without revising the front doors, with no setback on the third floor and without the retention of the second floor openings. They now seek to rebuild the rear wall in brick rather than to cover it with stucco. The staff does not object to rebuilding the wall in matching brick, but thinks that the applicant should meet the other requirements already stipulated by the Commission in its review.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron described the application.

Ms. Matzkin advised the Committee of her client's dissatisfaction with the compromise reached several months ago for this property. The client now wants to rebuild the St. James Street wall in brick, not stucco the existing wall; to change the fenestration; to use leaded glass in some openings, and not have a setback.

Mr. Baron observed that the revised submission would yield a building that does not resemble a carriage house. Mr. Levy thought that the carriage house appearance must remain.

The Committee recommended approval of the rebuilding in brick of the St. James Street wall but with the third floor addition set back four inches (4") and with greater verticality in the second floor windows, with staff to review details. The Committee recommended denial of the use of leaded glass. It made these recommendations pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and 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.]

RT

1646 Waverly Street aka 415 South 17th Street

Andrew Eisenstein, Owner

Alicia Whitt Ali, Applicant

DATE: c. 1840, remodeled c. 1970

PROPOSAL: Install garage doors to existing opening

This proposal seeks to install a garage door in front of an open parking bay.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standard 9.

Alicia Ali and Marvin Fagg of the Avalanche company attended the hearing .

Mr. Baron explained that this location had contained an open parking bay in the past as shown in an early 1960s photograph. The applicant wishes to install a roll down garage with a carriage door-like design.

Several neighbors, Carol Heiberger and Richard Wolgin, attended the meeting and spoke against the proposed work. Ms. Heiberger explained that the parking bay had been closed before the designation of the property with a stucco wall and doors. She said that the owner removed this fabric, made a curb cut and started to park cars there. Although Licenses and Inspections posted a stop work order, the owner has continued to work. She said that the nature of this block is residential and that a garage would damage the character of the streetscape. John Gallery spoke in support of the neighbors' position.

Committee members had questions about the size, structure and plan of the garage. The applicants explained that they were unaware of this information and that they would prefer to withdraw the application for now and come back with additional information.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended denial because of an incomplete application.

RB

226 South 4th Street

J. Rice and M. Forman, Owners

Martin Jay Tackett, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1804; significantly altered c. 1900 and in 1966

PROPOSAL: Construct rear addition, deck and garden wall, rehabilitate façade, add rear dormer and HVAC equipment

This application proposes the construction of a rear addition, rear dormer, patio, and garden wall as well as some rehabilitation of the façade. The impressive rowhouse was built about 1804, substantially altered about 1900 when it was converted to commercial use, and then rehabilitated, but not restored in 1966. It is listed as contributing to the Society Hill Historic District.

The lot lines will be adjusted, adding a large plot of land to the property at the rear of 228 S. 4th Street, the neighboring parcel to the south. A two-story stucco addition is proposed for the newly-acquired land. The unusual addition would include wood doors, wood shutters, and a large wood screen, but no conventional windows. No explanation for the addition's odd configuration has been provided.

A patio enclosed by a garden wall would be added at the rear. New French doors would be added to an existing opening at the patio.

A wide dormer would be added to the rear slope of the main block roof. It would have a stucco finish and a metal roof. The roof of the building is not original and the roofline does not approximate the historic roofline. The non-historic roof was added as part of the 1966 rehabilitation.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided the addition design is justified and improved, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the project to the Committee. He noted that the proposed addition is unusual in design; he asked the architect to elucidate on his proposal. Architect Jay Tackett explained that there had been a structure at proposed location for the addition, but that was demolished at some point. The proposed addition reflects that long lost structure. The first floor of the addition would provide space for a large kitchen. The second floor, which is open to the sky, would be a private deck. He also noted that the Brandywine Conservancy holds a façade easement on the building.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the architect visually separate the historic stucco rear ell from the stucco addition with a small reveal. Mr. Tackett agreed to add the reveal.

Robin Comita of the Society Hill Civic Association spoke in support of the project, but asked questions about the repair of the doorway cornice.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal with a vertical reveal on the west-facing wall separating the old and new construction, with staff to review details, pursuant to 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.]. Ms. Pentz abstained.

RB

257-259 N. 2nd Street

257-259 Development, LLC, owner

Carl Primavera, applicant

History: vacant lot at the time of the designation of the Old City Historic District

Project: Erect 6-story residential building on vacant lot – review and comment

This application proposes the construction of a large residential building on a vacant lot at 257-259 N. 2nd Street, south of Vine Street. The Commission's jurisdiction is limited to 45 days of review and comment. Construction began in October 2004 without any Commission review. The Department of Licenses & Inspections had issued a building permit without referral to the Commission. After numerous complaints from neighbors about the construction, the Commission staff inquired at the Department about permitting for the project. When the Department realized that it had issued a permit without referral to the Commission, it suspended the permit and forwarded the application to the Commission.

The 6-story building would stand on piers, with an open first story dedicated to parking and five upper stories occupied by residences. The deep building would stretch from N. 2nd Street east to the service road that runs along the I-95 corridor. It would be faced with metal and glass on the street elevations and Dryvit on the sides. It would include small balconies.

Staff Comment: The proposed building is not compatible with the surrounding historic buildings on 2nd and Vine Streets. Several features including the ground-level parking and balconies; the materials, especially the Dryvit; and the size, scale, proportion, and massing are all incompatible with the surrounding, smaller, brick buildings, including one that dates to the eighteenth century. Direction for a compatible design is offered by 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.*].

Committee members commented that the structure makes no attempt to fit its context. They particularly noted the open first floor with parking and the building's shape and materials. Mr. Tackett asserted that the context includes I-95, the Ben Franklin Bridge, gas stations, and parking lots. Committee members noted the nearby historic brick buildings. Committee members suggested a solid brick wall at the first floor to shield the parking and harmonize with the surrounding buildings. Although a photograph of an advertising rendering was shown, no information was provided to accurately judge the proposed building in its context. Committee members suggested that a streetscape drawing would improve the application.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance contended that this was the worst building that had ever been proposed for Old City. He said that it should be held up as a poster child for greater Commission authority over new construction in historic districts.

The Committee commented that the building, especially its first floor, should be redesigned to better fit its context.

RB

219-229 S. 18th Street, Rittenhouse Regency

Rittenhouse Regency Affiliates, owner

Lubert-Adler Management, Inc., applicant

History: Built 1925, Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects

Major alterations 1957, Cronheim & Weger, architects

Project: Construct 5-story addition, alter façade – in concept

This in-concept application proposes extensive alterations and additions to the former Penn Athletic Club building on Rittenhouse Square at the northeast corner of 18th and Locust Streets. The building was designed by the important Zantzinger, Borie & Medary firm. It was converted from the Penn Athletic Club to an Army Corps of Engineers office building in 1957. During the unsympathetic conversion, several important decorative features were removed and many new features including windows introduced. The application proposes:

1. Restoration of the storefronts
2. Restoration of the main entrances
3. Restoration of the arched window openings at floors 2 to 5
4. Addition of window openings in the corner bays at floors 3 to 9
5. Alterations to windows in the center bays at floors 7 to 15
6. Two-story additions at both corner sections on 18th Street
7. Four-story rooftop addition at center bays on 18th Street
8. Alterations to window configurations and openings throughout the building

Essentially, this application proposes to reconstruct this building in a manner predicated on the original, yet unrealized, paper-only design. It does not propose to restore it to any point in its bricks-and-mortar history. Included in the application package is a rendering of the elegant, unrealized 1924 design by Zantzinger, Borie & Medary for a 12-story building with subtle detailing including balconies, pergolas, and inset columns of arched windows. The structure erected by 1927 was rather clumsy when compared to the refined 1924 design. It was five stories taller and devoid of much of the gracious detailing of the earlier design. The building was debased by the 1957 alterations and later modifications. This application proposes not the return to the 1927 as-built building or even the 1924 as-designed building, but instead to create a new, larger building based on the 1924 design.

Staff Recommendation:

1. approval in concept of the restoration of all 1927 as-built historic fabric including the storefronts, main entrances, and arched window openings at floors 2 to 5;
2. approval in concept of the two-story corner additions and the four-story rooftop addition, provided they are sufficiently differentiated from the historic building, but denial of the proposed pseudo-historic additions;
3. approval in concept of new windows in the upper corner facades, provided they are sufficiently differentiated from those of the historic building, but denial of the proposed new facades with pseudo-historic detailing;
4. approval in concept of inconspicuous pergolas;
5. denial of all other alterations including the addition of window openings in the corner bays at floors 3 to 9 and the alterations to windows in the center bays at floors 7 to 15; pursuant to Restoration Standard 10 and Rehabilitation Standards 3 and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer David Marshall introduced architect Bob Hillier, Devon Aronstam, an investor representative, Alan Domb, the director of sales, preservation consultant Jim Garrison, design architect Roger Smith, and construction manager Tom Sullivan.

The Committee addressed the two-story corner additions first. Some members believed that they were not sufficiently differentiated from the historic building. In response to the comments about differentiating the new construction, Mr. Marshall said that they could clad the additions in terra-cotta. This would distinguish the new areas and obviate the need to find a matching brick.

Discussion then turned to the proposed alterations to historic windows, especially at the center of the west façade. In terms of the larger windows and balconies, Mr. Marshall explained that the windows are quite small and the view onto the Square is the main selling point for the building. He said they would not widen the window openings, but instead extend them downward, making them taller.

In regard to the proposed addition of new window openings to complete rows of windows added as part of the 1957 alterations, Mr. Garrison asserted that the completion of a partially implemented fenestration scheme would be more appropriate than undoing the alterations. He stated that any attempt to revert back to the historic window arrangement in the corner bays at floors 3 to 9 would fail because of the impossibility of matching the brick.

Tom Sullivan said that all new HVAC equipment would be mounted on the roof at points hidden from public view.

John Gallery complimented the development team on its ambitious project, but asserted that the rooftop addition should be set much further back from 18th Street and that the details of the addition should be more clearly differentiated from the old. He thought that the filigree nature of the balcony railings clashed with the heavy original balconies. He also asked for clarity regarding the bounds of any conceptual approval.

Mr. Rivera noted that the building is U-shaped in plan with the base of the U facing 18th Street. Therefore, the rooftop addition cannot be set back too far. Mr. Sullivan reminded everyone that the building was constructed as an athletic club and explained that the rooftop addition cannot be efficiently set back because of large unsupported areas above a swimming pool and squash courts.

Mr. Baron said that he thought that this building, unlike others, could accept a four-story rooftop addition because of its level of previous alteration as well as its stepped Art Deco facade. He said that a monolithic Renaissance Revival building with a flat roof would not graciously accept a large rooftop addition.

Alan Domb said that the developer is trying to create relatively affordable units in comparison with other buildings on Rittenhouse Square. They were targeting a market that would purchase \$300,000 to \$900,000 units. He said that the views would be a very important part of the marketing of the rehabilitated building.

Mr. Tyler said that the additions should have somewhat more differentiation. He asked for a bit of tension between the new and the old sections. Mr. Tyler suggested that the Architectural Committee hold a special meeting to further review this complex project.

Owing to the complexity of the project, Mr. Farnham stood before the applicants' large-format renderings and elevations and asked the Committee members to provide specific recommendations for each aspect of the proposal.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval in concept of the following:

1. *the restoration of all 1927 as-built historic fabric including the storefronts, main entrances, and arched window openings at floors 2 to 5;*
2. *the two-story corner additions and the four-story rooftop addition, provided the two-story additions are clad in a material distinct from the historic brick and provided the façade details are restudied to avoid replicating historic details, especially the recessed arches at the windows;*
3. *the new facing and openings in the upper corner facades, provided the façade details are restudied to avoid replicating historic details, especially the recessed arches at the windows;*
4. *inconspicuous pergolas;*
5. *the addition of window openings in the corner bays at floors 3 to 9;*
6. *the alterations to the windows in the center bays at floors 7 to 15, provided the details, especially the balconies, are restudied.*

RB

109 Elfreth's Alley

A. Caren and S. Cronin, owners

Gerry Gutierrez, applicant/architect

History: 1811 for Ephraim Haines, cabinet maker, Significant in Old City Historic District

Project: Erect 3-story addition – in concept

This in-concept application proposes the demolition of non-historic one-story side and rear additions and the construction of a three-story addition with a rooftop link to the historic building. The building, which stands at the northwest corner of Front Street and Elfreth's Alley, is listed as Significant in Old City Historic District. The rear yard is large and extends to the north along Front Street, which was relocated with the construction of Interstate 95.

The Commission approved the small rear addition in 1977 and the small side addition in 1988.

The proposed addition would stand to the east of the historic rear ell along Front Street. It would be faced with brick and stucco and fenestrated with large windows. It would be highly visible from Front Street and Elfreth's Alley. A third-story connector would run along the roof of the rear ell, linking the addition with the third-story of the main block of the historic rowhouse. The connector would significantly alter the historic ell roof and the massing of the building generally.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The staff would recommend approval of an addition that is sited to the north away from the historic building and that does not significantly alter the historic building or obstruct the views of it.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Gerry Gutierrez and owner Scott Cronin represented the project.

Committee members had concerns about the visibility of the addition to people visiting Elfreth's Alley and asked if the addition could be moved to the north on this very long lot away from the Alley. Mr. Gutierrez said that relocating the addition to the north would be insensitive to the neighbor to the west, whose view of the bridge would be blocked. He added that a relocated addition would encroach on Mr. Cronin's parking pad, which is located on Front Street. He noted that earlier iterations of the design located the addition

closer to Elfreth's Alley; he had moved the addition back away from the Alley and the rear ell after discussions with staff and the Elfreth's Alley Association.

Committee members were troubled by the alteration of the rear ell roof as well as the three-story addition at the back of the ell. Both alterations would obscure the characteristic A-shape of the ell. Members questioned whether this important building could accommodate the program driving the design, the addition of a large amount of space, without significantly harming its character. They acknowledged the great importance of this building and this block. They observed that a two-story addition would leave the rear ell roof intact and its A-shape exposed.

Ms. Pentz posited that it might be better to move the addition forward, encasing the side of rear ell in order to expose the rear and avoid raising the roof of the ell. The architect pointed out that this would be counter to the requests of the Elfreth's Alley Association, which asked that the addition be set back away from the Alley.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of this application, pursuant to 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.]. The Committee suggested that the architect restudy the design with the intent of reducing the size and impact of the addition.

RB

250 S. 18th Street

Mark Rogers, owner

Jennifer Bonaccorsi, J.K. Roller Architects, applicant/architect

History: Built 1923, McIlvaine & Roberts, architects

Project: Replace awning with bronze canopy, replace wood doors with bronze, add bollards

This application for the large residential building at the southwest corner of S. 18th Street and Rittenhouse Square proposes the replacement of a canvas barrel-arched awning with a bronze canopy, the replacement of glazed wood double-leaf doors with a single-leaf bronze door and infill, and the addition of bollards with chains.

Remnants of struts on the building testify that a canopy once hung above the doorway. A Commission photograph taken from a great distance shows a canopy or awning hanging from the struts. According to a representative of the condominium council, this canopy was not original, but was added in the 1970s. An ornate stone pediment hangs above the doorway. The relationship of the proposed canopy to the pediment is unclear. One drawing depicts it intersecting the building at the pediment; another depicts it mounted above the pediment.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the canopy as proposed; approval of a canopy mounted above the entrance pediment, with staff to review details; denial of the door and infill; denial of the bollards and chains, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. William Leonard of the building's condominium council and Jennifer Bonaccorsi of J.K. Roller Architects

represented the proposal.

Committee members noted the contradiction in the plans. One drawing depicts the canopy intersecting the building at the pediment; another depicts it mounted above the pediment. Ms. Bonaccorsi assured the Committee that the canopy would be mounted above the pediment. Mr. McCoubrey asserted that the canopy design needs to be better detailed. As currently designed, it impacts the ornate door surround awkwardly. He suggested that the canopy narrow at the building, following the lines of the door surround. He also asserted that the canopy reflect the pediment. Mr. Rivera agreed. He stated that the overall form of the canopy was acceptable, but that it should be redesigned to better fit the door opening.

Discussion turned to the door replacement. Mr. Leonard cited security concerns with the double-leaf doors. Committee members inquired about the doorman. Mr. Leonard stated that a doorman is on duty 24 hours a day; he added that the doormen do not feel safe at night in that neighborhood with only the glazed double-leaf doors protecting them. The Committee members agreed that the proposed bronze single-leaf door with panels was not appropriate. Mr. McCoubrey contended that the new door should be in keeping with the original doors. The Committee stated that, if a single-leaf door was required for security reasons, it should be a door with sidelights, not panels, that retained as much of the original appearance as possible.

The Committee then discussed the bollards with the applicants. Mr. Leonard explained that reckless bicycle riders often careen by the doorway threatening the residents. The bollards, he claimed, would protect residents from the riders. The Committee members contended that the bollards with chains cluttered and blocked the sidewalk. They suggested moving them much closer to the building, near the projecting step, and deleting the unnecessary chains.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the following, with staff to review details:

- 1. approval of the canopy, provided that it is mounted above the pediment and provided that it is detailed to fit cleanly within the historic doorway;*
- 2. approval of a single-leaf door with sidelights based on the historic doorway, but denial of the proposed door with infill panels;*
- 3. and approval of the bollards, provided that they are located closer to the building and provided that the chains are deleted from the plan;*

pursuant to 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.]; and 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.].

JF

261-263 S. 22nd Street

200 Christian Street Partners, owners

Craig Deutsch, applicant/architect

History: 261 S. 22nd Street, c. 1875

263 S. 22nd Street, 1957

Project: Demolish and rebuild facades, erect additions with decks

This application proposes design details for two townhouses at 261 and 263 S. 22nd Street. The application is part of a larger project that the Commission and its Committee have reviewed several times. The overall project entails the partial demolition of a large L-shaped building and the construction of three residential buildings with garages and decks in its place. At the north, the property extends from 22nd Street to Van Pelt Street and includes the 261 S. 22nd and 262 S. Van Pelt facades. At the south, the property extends east about 120 feet from the 263 S. 22nd façade. The site is listed as three buildings in the Rittenhouse-Filter Historic District inventory; all three are classified as Contributing.

At its 12 November 2004 meeting, the Commission approved several segments of the overall project. At that time, it voted to approve the proposal for the building at 262 S. Van Pelt Street, with staff to review details, provided the penthouse is reduced in size to the minimum necessary to accommodate an elevator and stair only and provided that the profile of the new building does not exceed that of the building at 264 S. Van Pelt Street; to approve garages in all three new townhouses; and to approve the demolition and third-story addition at the 22nd Street townhouses, but to deny the details of the two townhouses. This application proposes details for the townhouses at 261 and 263 S. 22nd Street. The details specified in the current plans are identical to those reviewed and denied by the Commission at its 12 November 2004 meeting.

Staff Recommendation: The current plans should not be reviewed by the Architectural Committee, but should be recommended for denial without review because they are identical to plans already reviewed and denied by the Historical Commission at its 12 November 2004 meeting. The Committee is not authorized to reopen or overturn Commission decisions.

Developers Virgil Procaccino and Arthur Ellwood and their architect Craig Deutsch represented the application at the Architectural Committee meeting. Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. He reported on the numerous reviews of the project already conducted by both the Committee and the Commission and explained that the current plans had been denied by the Commission at its 12 November 2004 meeting. He noted that the Committee could simply reject the proposal because of that denial, but he suggested that it work to forge a compromise to break the deadlock. Committee members asserted that they could not design the facades for Mr. Deutsch. Mr. Farnham agreed, but begged their indulgence in this particular case. Mr. Rivera concurred that the Committee should push this project forward despite the flawed application. Mr. Farnham presented a bulleted list of suggested improvements to the facades that complied with earlier Committee and Commission decisions.

Mr. Rivera and Mr. McCoubrey worked through the list with the applicants with a large set of the elevation drawings for the 261 and 263 S. 22nd Street buildings spread out before them. The Committee members asserted that the recessed entrances must be deleted and the doors brought forward to the sidewalk. The applicants agreed to make the changes. At 261, the applicants agreed to substitute a simplified single-light transom over the door and two simplified single-light transoms over the garage door for the proposed designs. At 261, they also agreed to replace the proposed front door with a 2-light over 2-panel wood door replicating the historic door. At 263, they likewise agreed to modify the entrance and garage door transoms with simplified transoms configured with panes like those in the upper windows. They also agreed to delete the awkward limestone belt courses. Above the first floor, the limestone belt will be replaced with

brick soldier courses. Above the second floor, the limestone belt will be deleted altogether.

Discussion then moved to the most contentious issue, the penthouses. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission had specifically asked that the penthouses be reduced in size to house a stair and elevator only. The applicants insisted that the proposed penthouses were essential to the success of their project. Committee members countered that the space within the penthouses was not planned efficiently and that they could be reduced in size without sacrificing any functionality. After considerable discussion about the program and design of the penthouses, the applicants agreed to reduce the width of each penthouse by three feet and, at Mr. McCoubrey's suggestion, to add glazing to moderate their squat, bulky appearances. Mr. Procaccino asked the Committee to recommend approval of solid 42'-tall wood railings on the decks. The Committee agreed that they would be acceptable if not visible. Mr. Deutsch promised to revise the plans to comply with the Committee's recommendation.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the following, with staff to review details:

- 1. the deletion of the recessed entrances and the relocation of the doors to the sidewalk line*
- 2. the reduction of the width of each penthouse by three feet*
- 3. the addition of glazing to the penthouses*
- 4. a 2-light over 2-panel historic wood door at 261 S. 22nd Street*
- 5. a simplified single-light transom over the entrance door at 261 S. 22nd Street*
- 6. two simplified single-light transoms over the garage door at 261 S. 22nd Street*
- 7. a simplified three-light transom over the entrance door at 263 S. 22nd Street*
- 8. two simplified three-light transoms over the garage door at 263 S. 22nd Street*
- 9. the replacement of the lower limestone band with brick courses at 263 S. 22nd Street*
- 10. the deletion of the upper limestone band at 263 S. 22nd Street*
- 11. solid 42'-tall wood railings on the decks, provided that they are not visible*

JF

317-319 S. 20th Street

Blake Christoph, owner

Blake Ingram, applicant

History: Rowhouse and carriage house joined and carriage door infilled, c. 1925

Project: Cut garage doorway from window, add door

This application proposes work to the Delancey Street facade of the large building at 317-319 S. 20th Street. It proposes the removal of a large segmentally-arched window, the enlarging of the opening for a garage entrance, and the installation of a garage door. A carriage house door once stood where the new door is proposed. The original carriage door opening was infilled and window installed about 1925, when the carriage house was joined to the rowhouse to the west.

The proposed garage door with plywood infill would not replicate the carriage house door that once stood at this location. The design of the door should be improved to replicate the historic carriage house door.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the reopening of the doorway and the installation of an historically appropriate, carriage house door that appears to be segmentally-arched,

but denial of the proposed door and infill, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. He outlined the genesis of the current building and noted that this portion of the building had historically been a carriage house. Owner Julia Brian and contractor Blake Ingram represented the project. The Committee concurred with the staff's recommendation. The owner agreed to work with the staff on the design of a more appropriate door.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to approve the reopening of the doorway and the installation of an historically appropriate, carriage house door that appears to be segmentally-arched, but denial of the proposed door and infill, with staff to review details, pursuant to 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.].

JF

2330 Pine Street

Michael and Jennifer Friel, owners

James Crowell, applicant

History: Built nineteenth century; significantly altered by Charles E. Broudy, c. 1960

Project: Replace windows and doors

This application proposes the replacement of doors and windows and the construction of an entrance canopy at the residential building at 2330 Pine Street. Despite the numerous alterations executed about 1960, this building is listed as Contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. The application proposes new double-hung and fixed windows as well as new French doors in existing and new openings. Panels would be added below the windows to fill the oversized openings. Balconettes would be added at several windows and doors. A canopy would be added above the main entrance.

Some may not deem this building as significant as nearby, older buildings; nonetheless, this building should not be altered in ways that would further detract from the surrounding, historically significant buildings. The proposed windows and doors, all of which include small panes, are not appropriate for this c. 1960 building. They are historic window and door configurations appropriate to some eighteenth and nineteenth-century buildings as well as twentieth-century Colonial Revival buildings. Single-pane casements or other windows common to 1960s architecture should be substituted. Also, the double-hung windows on the drawings are rendered upside-down, with the outer sash at the bottom. Like the windows, the balconettes at the double-hung windows are entirely inappropriate. The balconettes should be limited to the openings with French doors and should be compatible with the 1970s building. Finally, more details should be provided to facilitate a full review of the entry canopy; it should not mimic historic canopies.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 3.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Lighting designer James Crowell represented the project. Mr. Farnham noted that the application raises a

significant preservation question: Should reviews for proposals for this building be directed at protecting the modern building itself? Or, should they be directed at protecting the surrounding district from the impact of further changes to this building? He stated that the building is listed as Contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. He reported that the staff's recommendation was written from the perspective of protecting the surrounding district from unsympathetic changes to this building, but not at protecting the building itself. Mr. Rivera objected emphatically to the staff's implied deprecation of this building. He posited that it might have been designed by world-famous Philadelphia architect Norman Rice. He asserted that it is a "gem" and a "classic" and should not be altered unsympathetically. His fellow Committee members agreed that it should be preserved in its own right. Mr. Crowell stated that its modern appearance was the work of architect Charles F. Broudy. The Committee asserted that the windows and doors should be replaced with appropriate windows such as single-light casements or awnings. Members stated that the proposed windows, doors, and balconettes are entirely inappropriate for the building. They also bristled at the proposed removal of the terracotta decoration below the windows and the infilling of a strip window. The applicant asked if a window might be added to light the stairway above the entrance. The Committee replied that it would be receptive to a new window that utilized the modern vocabulary, but not the inappropriately scaled, positioned, and configured window proposed. The Committee members contended that this building should be restored and treasured as one of the few of its type in the city.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial.

JF

Mr. McCoubrey excused himself from the meeting.

1015 Cherry Street

Chinese American Buddhist Association, owner

Sabrina Soong, applicant/architect

History: Built c. 1830

Project: Demolish and install storefront, construct 1-story rear addition

This application proposes alterations at the first-floor front façade and the construction of a small rear addition for the Fo Chow Temple of the Chinese American Buddhist Association. The building is a Greek Revival rowhouse erected in the 1830s. In the mid twentieth century, the first-floor front windows were replaced with a large storefront window. The remainder of the façade including the arched entranceway, watertable, and steps are unaltered. The application proposes demolishing the entirety of the first-floor front façade including the Greek Revival doorway, marble steps, and marble watertable and replacing it with a projecting entranceway consisting of a recessed central doorway, fixed windows, steps with decorative railings, and a yellow tile roof. At the rear, a small addition would be constructed beneath a second-story bay.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the front façade alterations, pursuant to Standard 2. Approval of the rear addition, pursuant to Standard 9. The staff would recommend approval of front façade alterations limited to area of the non-historic storefront window.

Ray Brogdon of Sabrina Soong Associates, Xian Can Shi of the Chinese American Buddhist Association, and interpreter Julie Wong represented the project. Mr. Tyler informed the applicants of the lack of a quorum. They agreed to continue without a

quorum. Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Levy stated that the demolition of the historic first-floor façade and construction of the Asian-style entranceway was appropriate because of its Chinatown context. Mr. Rivera disagreed, stating such a recommendation would set a perilous precedent. Mr. Levy opined that the historic building had no relevance to its current owners and argued for the proposal because it would fit into the neighborhood. Mr. Farnham warned that basing a recommendation on a cultural separation between the original inhabitants and current occupants of a structure would set a dangerous precedent. What would happen, for example, if the residents of Girard Estate asserted that their buildings, the moralistic suburban architecture of pre-World War I Progressives, had no relevance to their current culture?

Mr. Tyler and Mr. Rivera sought a compromise. They suggested saving the historic portions of the first-floor front façade, but safely encasing them in the new construction, which could be removed in the future. They suggested, for example, that the architect redesign the façade to use the door opening as a window without removing the arch, jamb, and other historical features. They also suggested reusing or encasing the marble watertable and steps. The applicants agreed that this was an acceptable approach.

The Committee discussed the rear addition and agreed that it was acceptable.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the rear addition as proposed and approval of the front façade addition provided it is redesigned to preserve in place as much historic fabric as possible, with staff to review details.

JF

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Hughes
Randal Baron
Jonathan Farnham
Laura M. Spina
Richard Tyler