

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

**CITY HALL, ROOM 578
26 FEBRUARY 2008, 9:00 A.M.
DAVID AMBURN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

David Amburn, Chair
Suzanne Pentz
Daniel McCoubrey
Rudy D'Alessandro
Robert Thomas

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner I
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

ALSO PRESENT

Lorna Katz, Society Hill Civic Association
Paul Stone, Emerald Windows
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Bill Shields
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Dave Kauffman, National Image Solutions
George Thomas, Civic Vision
Sarita Trivedi, Nelson Architects
Bill Aumiller, AMPC
Matt McClure, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP
Robert D'Alonzo, D'Alonzo Associates
Craig Menta, Temple University Health System
Katherine Levins, Temple University Health System
David Blumenfeld, Grasso Holdings
M. Gonzalez
Frank Giunta
Carl Primavera, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzberg & Ellers
Michael Cooley, Provco Group
Allan Rubin, Spring Garden Civic Association
Sigmund Fleck, ARC
Jon Langmead
Robert Volpe
Louise Boverini
David O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Jean Barr, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Kevin Angstadt, Qb3
Jacklynn Arndt, Qb3

Stephen Mileto, Qb3
Kerry Polight
Richard W. Thom, Richard Thom Architects
Kiki Bolender, Schade & Bolender Architects
Camille Focarino
Joseph DiMaio
Andrew Ralzell
Mark Pinard, Pinard Architects
Janet Kalter
Joe Schiavo
Carol Heis
Kevin Kline
Dan Rottenberg
Steven Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Glenn Holsten
Jose Hernandez, J.K. Roller Architects
Robert Torres, ART
John Hunter
Jennifer Foster, Lawrence McEwen Architects
Laura Siena, West Mt. Airy Neighbors
Charles Capoldi, B Five Studio
Jonathan Doran, B Five Studio
Brett Webber, Brett Webber Architects
Josana Otto, Brett Webber Architects
Jason Brett Webber Architects
Craig Peterson
David France, Agoos/Lovera Architects
Bel Bauman, Agoos/Lovera Architects
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch
Brett Harman, Harman Deutsch
Joan Hunter, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
Dan Vigenco, DV Architects

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Amburn called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Ms. Pentz and Messrs. D'Alessandro, and McCoubrey joined him.

337 S. 6TH STREET

Owner: James Hone

Applicant: Todd Curry

History: c. 1809, John Warner, carpenter

individually designated; significant to Society Hill Historic District

Project: Replace windows with simulated-divided-sash

OVERVIEW: This application proposes installing new sash with applied metal muntins in the front façade of this significant, early nineteenth-century house.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Paul Stone of Emerald Windows represented the application.

Mr. Baron advised the applicant that the Preservation Alliance holds a facade easement on the building and must approval all proposals to alter the exterior.

Mr. Stone described the windows, claiming that they are more energy efficient than true-divided-light, double-glazed windows. He claimed that these windows are a good compromise between authentic appearance and energy efficiency. Mr. Stone asserted it would be difficult to differentiate between these windows and the originals when they are installed. He added that these windows have been tested in winds up to 100 mph.

Mr. D'Alessandro doubted the authenticity of the appearance of these windows. He also questioned whether the glass in the new sash would be as large as the glass in the historic windows. He stated that the Commission's task is to evaluate whether the replacement window replicates the historic window, not to evaluate its engineering specifications.

Mr. Baron presented a letter from the Society Hill Civic Association opposing the application. He also noted that the Commission has a long-standing practice of requiring true-divided-light replacement windows. He also noted that another company has provided estimates for true-divided, double-glazed windows for this building. Mr. Amburn noted that the Commission has approved simulated-divided-light windows, for example for a 1970s building. However, he stated that these decisions are made on a case-by-case basis. The Commission approved simulated-divided-light windows for the 1970s building because it is of lesser significance.

Mr. Baron spoke of the significance of this early building and noted that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that replacement windows should follow the original construction techniques and materials whenever possible.

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

346 S. SMEDLEY STREET

Owner: Andrew Augustine

Applicant: Todd Curry, Emerald Windows

History: c. 1850; stuccoed in the twentieth century

Project: Install windows with applied muntins

OVERVIEW: This application proposes installing simulated-divided-light sash replacements in the existing frames. The windows would be wood with composite muntins. Simulated-divided-lights windows are appropriate for this building because it has been significantly altered and because the original window pane pattern is uncertain.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the exterior muntins are wood, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Paul Stone of Emerald Windows and property owner Andrew Augustine represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the materials used for the exterior muntins. Mr. Stone replied that the muntins are made of a composite material that looks like wood, but that resists deterioration. It is not metal, as the staff suggested. Ms. Pentz asked if the building was stuccoed before designation. Mr. Stone stated that it was. Mr. Amburn asked if the applicant is proposing new sash only, not frames. Mr. Stone replied in the affirmative; he is proposing a sash replacement only. Mr. Baron noted that the brick mold and shutter hardware should not be removed. A sash replacement should not disturb the molding or hardware.

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

111 S. 15TH STREET

Owner: Chest-Pac Associates, LP

Applicant: Carl S. Primavera, Esq.

History: 1922, Ritter & Shay, architects

Project: Install signage

OVERVIEW: In February 2008, the Historical Commission denied a sign application for this building that proposed installing an illuminated sign on the ornate Samuel Yellin gate adorning the Chestnut Street entranceway of this significant Renaissance Revival building. The applicant has submitted a revised design for the sign. The sign has been relocated away from the Yellin gates and would be installed on the limestone wall of the building. The sign would hang from a mounting frame attached directly to the stone. The frame of the sign would be painted to match the limestone. The proposed sign would be back-lit with bronze channel letters. The electrical box and transformer would be located in the interior of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Sign manufacturer Dave Kauffman, architect William Aumiller, and attorney Carl Primavera represented the application.

Mr. Primavera noted that he and his clients have revised the signage design 20 times to appease the many regulatory agencies. He reported that he and his clients had accepted the feedback from the Commission and others that they should not install a sign on the Yellin gate. In response, they have relocated the sign to the wall to the west of the gate. He stated that they have revised the finish in response to comments and have reduced the size of the sign as much as possible. He distributed updated design drawings. Mr. Kauffman displayed two samples of the bronze finish that they are proposing. He stated that he prefers the medium oxidized finish, which would match the light sconces. The members agreed with his preference. Mr. Aumiller stated the sign would be relocated from the gate onto the wall to the right. He stated that it would have a flat finish, like wrought iron. Mr. Kauffman stated that the size of the sign was determined by UL requirements, which dictated the size of the smallest letter. Mr. Amburn asked the applicants to explain the sign's structure. Mr. Kaufman stated that the frame would be 2" x 2" square metal tubes and would be powder coated; the letters would mount to the frame, reducing the attachments to the facade. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the final sign design should minimize the number of penetrations into the limestone. Mr. McCoubrey noted conflicts between the pages of the plans and asked the applicants to clarify the overall size of the proposed sign. Mr. Kaufman stated the proposed sign is 3'-7" x 9'-11". Mr. McCoubrey then suggested that they not align the sign with prominent architectural features. Mr. Pentz asked if

the applicants would prepare installation drawing to guide the installer to minimize risk to the limestone. They stated that they would. Ms. Pentz suggested that the staff review the installation drawings. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the line drawing is accurately scaled. Mr. Aumiller stated that it is; the renderings are approximate.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance requested that the Committee to recommend denial of the application. He contended that the sign is inappropriate for the character of the building. He noted several prominent nearby restaurants that have very subtle signs. He stated that the proposed sign was not in character with the building. It should be smaller and more discrete. He suggested an approach similar to that of the Sharper Image sign, which has very architectural lettering. He distributed a photograph of that sign. Mr. Kauffman objected to the type of sign suggested by Mr. Gallery. He stated that it would not obtain UL approval. Mr. Gallery stated that he had seen no proof that a smaller sign would not receive UL approval. Mr. Kauffman stated that UL requires a minimum distance from neon to metal; a smaller sign would not meet that requirement. Mr. Primavera commenting that the restaurant company will be new to the Philadelphia area and therefore requires considerable signage. The restaurants noted by Mr. Gallery are well-known, local restaurants that can prosper with restrained signage.

Eric Blumenfeld, a representative of the owner, arrived and addressed the Committee. He explained that the restaurant space has been vacant since the building was renovated. He stated that this project was very exciting. He stated that the building owner and City must be accommodating in this lagging real estate market.

Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the signage could always be removed at a later time; it is reversible. He reported that he would vote for a recommendation of approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the 3'-7" x 9'-11", with the staff to review the installation plan, pursuant to Standard 9.

6918-6926 RIDGE AVENUE

Owner: Michael S. Kershaw

Applicant: Dominic Aspite for Wachovia Bank

History: Christopher Ozias House, c. 1805, demolished 2007

Project: Construct bank building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a branch bank building on a vacant lot at 6918-6926 Ridge Avenue in Roxborough. Until recently, the early nineteenth-century, rubblestone Christopher Ozias House stood on the lot. The house partially collapsed in late 2007. The Department of Licenses & Inspections cited the house as Imminently Dangerous. The current property owner demolished the house and cleared the lot without a building permit or the Historical Commission's approval. The owner claims that a building inspector authorized by the former Department Commissioner ordered him to demolish it. The property owner proposed the legalization of the demolition, but the Commission denied that request on 8 February 2008. At that time, the Commission discussed whether the property owner should be required to reconstruct the demolished house, especially in light of the claims that a failure to maintain the historic building may have precipitated its collapse. The lot remains designated and the Commission holds plenary jurisdiction over it. The owner has applied to the Commission for the rescission of the designation; that application will be heard by the Committee on Historic Designation on March 4 and the Commission on March 14.

Section 14-2007(8)(c) of the Philadelphia Code requires that:

The exterior of every historic building, structure and object and of every building, structure and object located within an historic district shall be kept in good repair as shall the interior portions of such buildings, structures and objects, neglect of which may cause or tend to cause the exterior to deteriorate, decay, become damaged or otherwise fall into a state of disrepair.

Furthermore, Section 14-2007(9)(d) stipulates that:

Any person who alters or demolishes a building, structure, site or object in violation of the provisions of Section 14-2007 or in violation of any conditions or requirements specified in a permit shall be required to restore the building, structure, site or object involved to its appearance prior to the violation. Such restoration shall be in addition to and not in lieu of any penalty or remedy available under the Code or any other applicable law.

Following the Commission's denial of the application to legalize the demolition, the bank, an equitable owner of the parcel, submitted this application to construct a branch bank building. The proposed building has no relationship to the recently-demolished historic building in location, massing, materials, or form.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial of the application, pursuant to Section 14-2007(9)(d), but approval of a bank building that replicates the location, massing, materials, and form of the primary mass of the historic building, with the staff to review details.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Michael Cooley, the developer, architect Sarita Trivedi, attorney Carl Primavera, expeditor Dom Aspite represented the application.

Mr. Primavera clarified that he is not representing the current property owner, Michael Kershaw, but is representing the equitable owner who is seeking to construct the bank branch for Wachovia. Mr. Primavera explained that Wachovia would like to consolidate two branches in Roxborough into a new building at this site. Mr. Primavera reported that the Ridge Park Civic Association and the Roxborough Development Corporation support the construction of the bank building. He noted letters supporting the project sent to the Zoning Board. He stated that whether Mr. Kershaw should have known of the designation or should have maintained the historic building is not his client's concern. His client was not involved, but would now like to develop the site. He concluded that it would be good for the neighborhood.

Ms. Trivedi stated that the proposed building is a "typical" Wachovia bank branch. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the "typical" nature of the building is precisely what makes it problematic; the building should be designed for this particular site. Ms. Pentz asked the Ms. Trivedi if she ever adaptive reuses the historic building for banks. She stated that she has converted buildings for banks. However, this site was presented to her as a vacant lot. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the proposed building is not compatible with the historic site.

Mr. Primavera pointed out that a suburban supermarket with a large parking lot stands directly across the street. He contended that his client has forsaken that model and is building according to the new model, with buildings close to the street to create a pedestrian-friendly environment. He stated that the proposed development is the type of development the community is seeking. Mr. Primavera asserted that his clients had had no involvement in the neglect or demolition of

the historic building. He suggested that the Commission fine Mr. Kershaw, the current owner, for the neglect and illegal demolition and use the penalty to fund a study of the preservation of the surrounding historic neighborhood. He also suggested that a plaque marking the historic site could be installed. Mr. Primavera stated that he would not defend or excuse the owner. He is looking for a solution for the good of the community and developer.

Mr. Amburn showed photographs of the historic building to Ms. Trivedi. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with the staff recommendation. Mr. Baron stated that the historic preservation ordinance requires the rebuilding of the illegally demolished structure. The provision in the ordinance is intended to deter the illegal demolition of historic buildings. Mr. Baron suggested that the main block of the lost building should be rebuilt in its historic location and any other requisite specialized bank functions be added to the rear. Ms. Pentz highlighted the section of the ordinance that states that the owner **shall** be required to rebuild.

Mr. Primavera explained that the bank is trying to consolidate two branches in the community into one. He suggested that the bank developer may decide to forsake this site if the approval process is too protracted, which would cause the community to suffer. He again stated that the community groups are supporting this project. He stated that they considered the historic building a dilapidated structure that was a blight on the neighborhood. Mr. Cooley stated that he is under tight time constraints with this project. Mr. D'Alessandro replied that the Commission does not predicate its decisions on the applicant's time constraints. It must comply with the historic preservation ordinance and standards. Mr. Amburn suggested that all photographs and site plans of the historic building should be gathered together and presented to the applicants.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the design is not appropriate for the location. He noted that the architect had described it as "typical." The design was not meant to be site specific; it is generic. He also noted that the siting of the building is important; the new building should be located appropriately for the site and the context. He stated that the staff recommendation was unrealistic. He stated that the bank will want to build a one-story building; the staff recommendation would require it to build a two-story building. He stated that verticality, not number of stories, is the important factor. He advocated for denial and suggested that the Commission insist on an appropriate building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application, pursuant to Section 14-2007(9)(d), but approval of a bank building that replicates the location, massing, materials, and form of the primary mass of the historic building, with the staff to review details.

100 E. LEHIGH AVENUE, EPISCOPAL HOSPITAL

Owner: Episcopal Hospital of Philadelphia, subsidiary of Temple University Health System

Applicant: Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll

History: Aspinwall, 1894; Harrison, 1905; both by Hewitt Bros., architects

Project: Complete demolition of the Aspinwall and Harrison Buildings

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the complete demolition of the Aspinwall and Harrison Buildings on the campus of Episcopal Hospital in Kensington. The application claims that there are no feasible adaptive reuses for the buildings. The application includes a financial hardship application, which will be forwarded to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

The hospital campus at N. Front Street and E. Lehigh Avenue is large, covering an entire city block. The Aspinwall and Harrison Buildings stand at the rear or south of the campus, behind large, mid twentieth-century hospital buildings. The Hewitt Bros. architectural firm designed both buildings. Aspinwall was constructed in 1894; Harrison in 1905. Aspinwall is a three-story, brick, Jacobean Revival building with terracotta ornamentation. Harrison is a one-story, brick building with terracotta ornamentation. Both were significantly altered in the past, have been vacant for years, and are in poor condition. The Department of Licenses & Inspections has declared both buildings Unsafe.

The designation of the hospital campus is poorly documented and, in fact, its current listing on the Register may result from a clerical error. There is no record of the Commission voting to designate the site. The only document supporting the designation is the inclusion of the Front Street address for the hospital on the pre-1985 list of designated properties. The revised historic preservation ordinance, which went into effect in 1985, defined a Historic Building as:

A building or complex of buildings and site which is designated pursuant to this section or **listed by the Commission under the prior historic buildings ordinance** approved December 7, 1955, as amended. (emphasis added)

Arguably, the complex was listed, i.e. it was on the list at the time of the adoption of the new ordinance, and may therefore be considered designated. However, there is no record of a vote by the Commission, record of a consideration by the advisory committee, official designation card, nomination, notice letter, or other document corroborating the designation. Without a record of the designation, it is impossible to know the relative values the Commission placed or would have placed on the individual buildings on the campus, which range from mid nineteenth- to mid twentieth-century buildings. The historic significances of the many buildings that stand or once stood on the campus differ greatly. The Commission's files do include a 1985 letter from the hospital to the Commission requesting "a list of the buildings on the grounds of Episcopal Hospital that are historically certified" and a response cataloging eight buildings including Aspinwall and Harrison that are "worthy of preservation." Interestingly, the letter does not answer the questions asked and state explicitly that the buildings are certified or designated; it merely states that they are "worthy of preservation."

The current applicant's preservation consultant states that the site was designated in 1957. This is incorrect; the misinformation derives from *Philadelphia Preserved*, a guide to Philadelphia's architectural history published in 1976, which erroneously states that the hospital was designated in 1957. The Commission's records for 1957 are complete and include lists of all sites designated and considered for designation; Episcopal Hospital does not appear on either list and was never mentioned in any Commission documents during that era.

A very important group of c. 1860 hospital buildings designed by prominent architect Samuel Sloan once stood at the northwest corner of the site. The group had great historic significance because it was the foremost model for hospital construction throughout the United States in the second half of the nineteenth century. Sloan was not only a prominent architect but also a prominent publisher. Publishing the first major architectural journal in the United States, he broadly advertised his hospital design, which became the national standard. Only one small remnant of the Sloan buildings survives, the chapel. All other Sloan buildings on the campus were demolished over several campaigns in the mid twentieth century. During the first documented involvement of the Commission with the hospital, the chair of the Architectural Committee apparently approved the last of the demolitions of the Sloan buildings in 1976. There is no record of any review or approval of this demolition by the Commission itself. The Commission also approved the demolition of Gill House, a turn-of-the-century residentially-

scaled building on the Episcopal campus not unlike the Aspinwall Building, as necessary in the public interest in 1987.

If the Commission explicitly designated Episcopal Hospital, it is very unlikely that it designated it because of the Aspinwall and Harrison Buildings. Although they were designed by a prominent Philadelphia architectural firm, the Hewitt Bros., they are some of the most unremarkable projects of that firm, which also designed the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, the Bourse Building, Drum Moir, the Wissahickon Inn, and St. Martin in the Field Church. They are relatively insignificant reworkings of residential designs for hospital use. They are subsidiary structures erected a half-century after the important Sloan buildings. In fact, the construction of these buildings and others on the campus marks the obsolescence of the Sloan buildings. They were erected to accommodate later medical programs that the Sloan buildings could not accommodate. The Aspinwall and Harrison Buildings primarily had historic value as markers of a particular point in the history of the Sloan buildings; that value was lost when the Sloan buildings were demolished and the buildings in question were shorn of their historic context.

The merits of the financial hardship application will be discussed in the staff's recommendation to the Committee on Financial Hardship. The staff will recommend to that committee that the applicant has demonstrated that the buildings cannot be used for any purpose for which they are or may be reasonably adapted.

The staff will also recommend directly to the Commission that it direct the staff to prepare a nomination for the Episcopal Hospital site proposing the rescission of the designation of the entire site and the new designation of the Sloan chapel, the only resource on the campus worthy of the Commission's oversight.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Architectural Committee recommend that the structural audit prepared by ADF Engineering on the conditions of the Aspinwall and Harrison Buildings and the cost estimates prepared by Entech Engineering to rehabilitate the buildings are realistic. The staff also recommends that, in lieu of an assessment of the historical significances of the buildings by the Committee on Historic Designation, the Architectural Committee recommend that the claims regarding the buildings' relative lack of significance as put forward in the affidavit of Kathleen Barron and the report by George Thomas are cogent.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz recused because she had evaluated the building for the Commission.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Matt McClure, hospital administrator Katherine Levins, preservation consultant George Thomas, and facilities manager John Sloan represented the application.

Mr. McClure acknowledged that the Committee on Financial Hardship would review this application on March 5. He stated that the hospital's choice is Hobbesian; it must demolish two buildings or expend \$7 million of its scant resources on the obsolete buildings that do not help it accomplish its mission to aid an impoverished community. He described Episcopal Hospital's current situation. It has been and is struggling to serve a needy population. It was rescued by Temple Health System, which itself is struggling to continue its charitable and educational mission during a period of rising costs and declining assistance. He stated that both buildings are obsolete and require significant investments to make them usable. He also stated that there is no market for these buildings.

Ms. Levins of Temple Health stated that she is responsible for governmental affairs and economic development at Temple. She explained that Temple became affiliated with Episcopal between 1998 and 2000. She provided statistics demonstrating that the population served by Episcopal is impoverished. Most patients are on government assistance. She stated that it serves 36,000 annually in the emergency room and 9,000 in the crisis center. She stated that it is the main behavioral health facility in the Temple system. She explained that other charitable organizations are supported on the campus. The Police Department's Special Victims Unit is housed in the Tower Building. She stated that Temple has experience with historic properties. For example, it recently rehabilitated the Neumann Medical Center as elderly housing. The renovation received awards with its design. She also noted the system's rehabilitation of the historic Budd campus. She stated that the system is maintaining a historic chapel on the Episcopal campus that was designed by Samuel Sloan. Episcopal also maintains the historic St. Luke's Church on the campus. Mr. McClure concluded that Episcopal already expends a significant amount of its scant capital funds on historic buildings on the campus.

Mr. Thomas spoke about the historical significance of the buildings on the campus. The buildings along the rear of the campus were constructed beginning about 1900 to accommodate facilities that the original Samuel Sloan buildings could not. By 1950, those buildings were obsolete and a new group of buildings was constructed in front of them. The Sloan buildings began to be demolished. Eventually, Apsinwall and Harrison became completely obsolete and were abandoned. Excepting the chapel, the Sloan buildings were all demolished. The remaining buildings are not significant. Mr. Thomas also noted that Apsinwall and Harrison have major design flaws that have led to their deterioration. The brick and steel framing are decaying. He also mentioned that the hospital is installing a new energy system for the campus and does not want to waste resources connecting these obsolete buildings to new system.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance objected to the advice provided by the staff to the Committee. He stated that the Committee should be advised to consider three issues, to evaluate the architectural significance of the two buildings, to evaluate the validity of the conditions assessments and rehabilitation plans and cost estimates, and to determine whether there are any feasible reuses for the buildings. He stated that the case that the buildings are not historically significant is strong. On the other hand, the buildings are able to be repaired. He stated that it is inappropriate for the staff to suggest to this Committee that it recommend that these buildings can be demolished because the staff assumes that the Committee on Financial Hardship will find that retaining them is a hardship.

Mr. McClure responded to Mr. Gallery, stating that the hospital has sought reuses for the buildings without success. He also noted that the conditions of the buildings are not necessarily relevant in a hardship review. The Commission could approve the demolition of a building in good condition if the non-profit was unable to maintain it.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated the reports from the engineering and architectural firms appear valid. He opined that the buildings could be repaired, but that those repairs would be very expensive.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Committee could not approve the demolition, but it could and would acknowledge that the cost estimates are realistic and the building lack architectural significance.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the structural audit and cost estimates to rehabilitate the buildings are realistic; and that the buildings lack noteworthy architectural significance.

1636 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: George Bochetto Esq.

Applicant: Carl Primavera, Esq.

History: c 1870; contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Add penthouse and deck on mansard

OVERVIEW: This project proposes constructing a penthouse with stair and bar as well as a deck on top of the mansard roof of this townhouse. The applicant has come before the Commission and Committee several times and received denials, but has revised the plans. The penthouse and deck will still have visibility from several streets. The staff thinks that a deck or penthouse is inappropriate for this very visible mansard.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Carl Primavera and architect Robert Galonzo represented the application.

Mr. Primavera referenced the minutes from the prior Architectural Committee meeting discussion of this project. At that meeting, the Committee recommended that the penthouse be reduced in size and its character be simplified to a narrow stair house. Certain Committee members suggested making the structure light and transparent and also moving it away from the facades. Mr. Primavera stated that the pilot house has been revised and simplified. Mr. Galonzo stated that he had minimized the square footage as well as the visibility from 17th Street. He described the addition as an observation room.

Mr. Baron stated that the Commission has typically required that decks be located on rear ells, not the main blocks houses.

Mr. Primavera stated that he perceived this as an incremental design process. He contended that the design has been moving in a positive direction. The revisions have been based on the feedback received from the Committee and Commission. For example, the penthouse has been set back considerably from the facades.

Mr. Baron reminded the applicant and the Committee that the earlier proposals were denied.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that it should be remembered that this application proposes an addition as well as a deck. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he was not adverse to a deck, but wanted the penthouse to be limited to an access point to the deck only. Mr. Amburn stated that the penthouse will still be visible from many angles because of the building's corner position and the location of the church across the street. Ms. Pentz asserted that, unless the penthouse is redesigned to be totally invisible from the street, the Committee should be consistent and deny the application. Mr. Amburn agreed that the size of the penthouse should be reduced.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the proposed work was inappropriate and reminded the Committee that the previous versions of this proposal have all been denied.

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

348 S. 16TH STREET

Owner: Frank Giunta

Applicant: Manuel Gonzalez

History: c. 1830, bay added c.1900; contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Legalize windows

OVERVIEW: The application proposes the legalization of the installation of eight windows. The windows are metal clad with interior snap-in grills and have subframes, which reduce the sizes of the openings. The applicant also removed paint from the façade in a way that damaged much of the outer surface of the brick. Several years ago, the current owner illegally covered the second-floor bay with vertical boards. A violation was issued, but the illegal condition was never corrected. The current application addresses the windows only. The correct windows for this building would be 6-over-6 at all floors except the second, which would be 1-over-1. All of these should be wood, true-divided-light windows without subframes. A window contractor informed the owner about the historically appropriate windows prior to the purchase.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Manuel Gonzalez and Frank Giunta represented the application.

Mr. Baron reported that a representative of the window supplier, Emerald Windows, informed the property owner of the historically appropriate windows for the building. After that discussion Mr. Giunta sent his contractor to purchase these inappropriate windows instead. Mr. Gonzalez, the contractor, stated that the windows that he removed were of poor quality and in poor condition.

Ms. Pentz advised the applicants that, when a property owner proposes work to a historic building, the Commission requires that that work promotes the restoration of the building, returning toward its original condition.

Mr. Giunta stated that the windows they removed had been installed more than 30 years ago. He assumed that his brother, who was in charge of the maintenance at that time, had undertaken it appropriately.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that the applicant's many inappropriate changes to the building have compromised the historic fabric. Mr. D'Alessandro stated he would not recommend legalization.

Mr. Baron reported that he had been in contact with Mr. Giunta when the bay had been illegally modified. He also reported that the inappropriate windows were installed not long Mr. Gonzalez had applied for and received an interior-only building permit. That permit specified that no work would be done to the windows or doors. Mr. Gonzalez claimed that he did not need a building permit for the windows because he was not changing the sizes of the window openings. Mr. Baron responded that he did need a permit because the building is designated as historic. Mr. Giunta stated he improved the building with the new windows. He asserted that the Emerald Windows representative told him the windows were appropriate. He also stated that he never received notification from the Commission that window replacement required the Commission's approval. Mr. Giunta stated that his son will restore the bay. Several Committee members advised him to obtain a building permit before undertaking any work.

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

563 N. 20TH STREET

Owner: Allied Realty LLC

Applicant: Brett Harman, architect

History: c. 1865, storefront c. 1940; contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District

Project: demolish building, construct townhouses

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the building and construct two townhouses with garages. The applicant's engineer stated in writing that the building has structural problems with joists that would be costly to repair. The engineer did not state that the problems are irreparable. Section 14-2007(7)(j) of the historic preservation ordinance allows the Commission approve the demolition of a building that contributes to a historic district in two instances only, when it is infeasible to adaptively reuse the building and when the demolition is necessary in the public interest. This application does not proffer a financial hardship or public interest claim. Therefore, the Commission could not approve this demolition, regardless of the merits of the case.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(j).

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Brett Harman and Paul Drzal and developer Sigmund Fleck represented the application.

Mr. Baron presented a letter from Arthur Plaxton, a neighbor, urging the Committee to recommend denial of the demolition proposal. Alan Rubin, a representative of the Spring Garden Civic Association, interjected, stating that Mr. Plaxton is a difficult person and his opinion should be disregarded.

Mr. Harman, the architect, stated that the developer initially intended to rehabilitate the building, but changed his mind when the civic association objected to maintaining the corner store. He stated that the first floor is zoned commercial. Mr. Harman also explained that he retained a structural engineer to evaluate the building after they conducted interior demolitions. The applicants are concerned about the condition of the masonry bearing walls. Mr. Harman added that the building does not provide adequate spaces for contemporary living; he noted the lower ceilings on the top floor. With the deteriorating conditions, he advised his client that the best approach is to demolish the building and erect two townhouses. He added that this approach also makes economic sense for the developer.

Ms. Pentz replied that the structural deficiencies noted by the applicant's engineer are common to old buildings of this type and can be repaired. She asserted that these conditions alone are not sufficient to justify the demolition of the building. Mr. Baron reported that the Commission approved increasing the ceiling heights that Mr. Harman noted as an impediment; therefore claim should be discounted. Ms. Pentz noted that the Commission has approved rehabilitation plans for this building; she asked why those plans cannot be implemented. Mr. Amburn also asked why the approved project cannot be implemented, especially if the structural defects are not significant. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that, if the applicants are offering a hardship claim to support their request for a demolition approval, then they should submit an official hardship application to the Commission.

The owner asked the Committee to look at the broader picture. He said that the building is not viable. He also contended that it is out of character with the neighborhood. The structure does contribute to the neighborhood. Mr. Ruben of the civic association agreed. He proclaimed that it was a "slum store" in a former "slum neighborhood." He stated that it was a detriment to the neighborhood, like the used clothing store adjacent to it. He claimed that it never matched the surrounding buildings and was constructed with scrap materials. He concluded that it is "an embarrassment" to the neighborhood.

Ms. Pentz remarked that she heard two different arguments offered by the applicants and their supporters. First, the developer was claiming that the building could not be feasibly adaptively reused. Second, Mr. Rubin was claiming that the building does not warrant its contributing classification in the historic district. The first should be presented in a complete hardship application; the second argument in a request to amend the district nomination.

Rosemary Brandt, the owner of the neighboring building with the used clothing store, stated that, in general, she supported the application, but she is concerned about the demolition and the attachment of the new building to hers. She stated that she owns a portion of the building that the applicant seeks to demolish. Mr. Harman assured Ms. Brandt that he would take all necessary steps to protect her property.

Mr. Ruben recalled a review of an application for a property in the district, but not individually designated. The developer proposed several alterations. During the Architectural Committee's review, Committee member Herbert Levy asked "Why not tear the whole thing down?" Mr. Rubin suggested that Mr. Levy's comment should bear on today's review. He asked why, if that solution was appropriate in that circumstance, it is not appropriate in this circumstance. Several responded that Mr. Levy's suggestion was merely rhetorical. The Committee did not recommend demolition in that case and the Commission did not approve demolition. The developer rehabilitated the building.

Mr. Baron explained that a contributing building that is designated as part of a district is regarded by the Commission as equivalent to an individual designation. It is not valued less and the same rules are applied. The property Mr. Ruben alluded to was extremely dangerous and both façades were visibly bulging. Mr. Levy asked, after the replacement of both the front and the side wall, whether that other building is still considered historic. Mr. Baron stated that it is listed as contributing. Mr. Baron noted that Mr. Ruben's concern seems to derive from the commercial nature of the property under review. He said that the Commission had approved many conversions of commercial spaces into residential spaces in this neighborhood. The designation does not protect the use, only the exterior appearance. He said that it would be very difficult to make a case that the building was not contributing to the district because it is of the same time period and Italianate style as the rest of the neighborhood.

Mr. Ruben commented that the applicant should commission a different engineer to write a better letter regarding the condition. He said that the building does not have enough open space and that the zoning had lapsed.

Ms. Pentz suggested that the applicant provide an itemized list of the necessary repairs.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that this application fails to meet any of the standards required by the ordinance to justify a demolition. He contended that the Committee must recommend denial.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(j).

224 ST. MARKS SQUARE

Owner/Applicants: Luisa Boverini and Jeffrey Heit

History: 1877-80, G.W. & W.D. Hewitt, architects; individually designated

Project: Construct rear deck, cut door and legalize gate and parking area

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of the demolition of a deck and a wall as well as the construction of wood fence, trellis and parking gate. The application also proposes the construction of a large deck and the enlargement of a window into a door. The applicants have received a zoning approval for the parking area and fence with trellis. The community association supports the project. The property owner claims that a plans examiner at the Department of Licenses & Inspections told her that she did not any approvals other than the zoning approval for the parking area and fence with trellis.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the legalization of the fence, parking area, and door; denial of the enlarged deck, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. McCoubrey recused because his brother is the contractor for the project.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Luisa Boverini represented the application.

Ms. Boverini stated that the deck had a spiral stair; she would like to build a straight stair. She stated that the Commission approved a small deck and the cutting of a door to a window for the former property owners. The former owners had constructed the approved deck, but had not enlarged the window into a door. Mr. Amburn noted that the new door had been approved previously; therefore, the issues the deck are the enlargement and the stair. Ms. Boverini stated that the spiral steps were difficult to navigate. Mr. Amburn expressed concern about the expansion of the deck, which will extend into the yard. Ms. Boverini displayed photographs of the gate and driveway without the deck.

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

720 S. FRONT STREET

Owner/ Applicant: Jon Langmead

History: c. 1765; designated 8/30/1967

Project: Construct rear third-floor addition with roof deck.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear third-floor addition with roof deck on this significant eighteenth-century dwelling. The property currently has an access door at the rear of the half gambrel leading onto a deck on the roof of the two-story rear ell; the proposed addition would occupy this space. The addition would be clad in cement board. The cladding would extend up to create parapet walls for a roof deck. The deck would be accessed through an interior spiral stair housed within the new addition. The rear of the property is not visible from any public-right-of-way. However, the proposed roof deck would extend beyond the peak of the

half gambrel and would be visible from Front Street. This protruding parapet would alter the massing and spatial relationship of the front façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as submitted, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10; the staff would recommend approval of a third-story rear addition that does not extend above the ridge of the half gambrel.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. John Langmead represented the application.

Mr. Langmead stated his architect approached the project in a sensitive manner and tried to minimize the impact of the deck on the historic building. He stated it would be an extension of the third floor-addition and that the visibility of the deck would primarily be from Front Street across from the dog park. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Amburn expressed concerns about visibility of the addition from the street.

Ms. Pentz opined that a careful structural evaluation should be conducted, owing to the proposed location of the new addition. She stated that an addition built on two prior additions might need structural reinforcement.

Mr. Amburn stated that the railing should remain below the ridge of the gambrel, and that if any of the addition extends above the roofline, it should be as transparent as possible. Mr. Langmead stated he preferred a solid wall, resembling a parapet, but that he would be open to other suggestions.

Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the height of the ceiling in the addition could be dropped from ten feet to eight feet in order to make the railing disappear from the line of sight. Mr. Langmead mentioned that he would work with his architect on that point. The Committee members encouraged the applicant to consider their suggestions and agreed with the staff's recommendation and suggestion.

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

2036 DELANCEY PLACE

Owner: Lily Development

Applicant: Reed Axelrod

History: Built c. 1880, contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District

Project: Alter front steps, reface garage, exterior restoration.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes two alternatives for alterations to the front steps of this Second Empire house. Alternative One proposes to demolish the existing brownstone steps and reconstruct them with cast stone treads, parged side walls, and an iron handrail reminiscent of the basement window grills. Alternative Two proposes to demolish the existing brownstone steps and reconstruct them in the same style with the addition of a new handrail in cast iron. The reconstructed steps would not be brownstone, but a combination of cast stone and stucco. Both steps would roughly be the same dimensions as the existing. However, the steps in Alternative One encroach farther onto the sidewalk than the existing ones. Both options propose the elimination of a planter around the bay window and the repavement of this area with brick to match the existing herringbone pattern.

The application also includes a proposal to reface a non-historic garage on 21st Street. The new garage façade would have an expose channel lintel above a set of three individually operated garage doors. The proposed doors are a traditional carriage house door type. They would be painted, not stained. The new façade would be accented with two light fixtures and a cast iron balustrade.

The applicant also proposes extensive restoration work to the exterior of the house. The staff has already approved some of this work and will continue to work with the applicant for the rest. All proposed restoration work would require review of details and samples in the field.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of both alternative proposals for the front steps, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6 and 9; approval of new façade for garage pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, and approval of the restoration of the house, with the staff to review the details.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Robert Volpe and Reed Axelrod represented the application.

Mr. Axelrod took exception to the description of the steps as brownstone. He stated that the steps were covered by stucco repairs and that the description of brownstone was misleading. He described the project, and stated that the reasons for the proposal stemmed from the poor structural condition of the steps.

Mr. Volpe questioned the reasons for a recommendation of denial from the staff. He stated that similar steps had been rebuilt on the same block with precast pieces. Mr. Baron stated that the staff has the authority to approve repairs to steps, but that their application proposed complete demolition and reconstruction, which the staff does not have the authority to approve. Mr. Axelrod expressed his disagreement with Mr. Baron's comment. Mr. Danta stated that most of the buildings along this block are Italianate and that originally they did not have railings, but simple marble steps. He further explained that the staff has approved the addition of simple metal picket railings to those steps through the years. He further stated that the staff agrees the steps are in disrepair, but that according to the Rehabilitation Standards, by which every project is reviewed, the repair methodology is not appropriate. Mr. Baron commented that brownstone is commercially available and the staff has the contact information of three brownstone quarries. He mentioned three projects that have used natural brownstone to make his point, such as the Union League, a façade restoration at 19th and Spruce, and a garden wall restoration at 21st and Spruce. Mr. Axelrod stated that the garden wall restoration was done in precast not brownstone. Messrs. Baron and Danta commented that it was their understanding that the material used was natural brownstone.

Mr. Baron further stated that there are different repair options consistent with the Standards; one to rebuild the stairs using natural brownstone, or to restore the existing stairs without demolition using a cementations brownstone repair. Mr. Axelrod disagreed with the suggestions and argued what neither approach was logical.

Mr. Danta asked the Committee to comment on two points related to the application; one, if the steps could be repaired maintaining the historic fabric; and two, assuming the demolition was necessary, then what material would be acceptable, natural brownstone or cast-stone.

Ms. Pentz stated she was aware that natural brownstone could be quarried, but that she would not be opposed to cast-stone in this project. Mr. Axelrod stated there are financial

considerations involved in the use of natural brownstone. Ms. Pentz suggested that Alternative Two on page AX-1A is an acceptable replacement. Mr. Axelrod commented that he prefers Alternative One on page AX-1, because he finds the design of the historic steps imposing and bunker-like. Mr. Axelrod further stated there was a \$60,000 difference between the two designs and asked if the Committee takes financial issues into consideration. Mr. D'Alessandro replied that they base their decisions solely on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Mr. Baron stated that allowing cast-stone instead of natural brownstone, even when the standards suggest replacement in-kind, already would provide a substantial reduction in cost.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend Alternative Two on page AX-1A with the replication of the steps in cast stone. The committee was divided on the material for the sides of the steps. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Amburn recommended approval of the proposal as submitted, and Messrs. McCoubrey and D'Alessandro recommended that the sides be covered in cast stone panels, not stucco.

7048 GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Owner: Hedgebank Properties LP

Applicant: John Capoferri

History: 1836, T.U. Walter, architect; c. 1850, Italianate addition; designated 2006

Project: Install simulated-divided-light aluminum-clad windows in house and barn.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the replacement of windows and doors in two historic buildings on this site, a villa and a barn. The Historical Commission approved a redevelopment plan for the site that included the construction of fourteen new townhouses at the rear of the parcel and the restoration of the villa and barn into residential condominium units. The staff is currently working on the restoration details of the villa, such as new stucco and porch restoration. The applicant proposes to install replacement windows that would not be historic replicas of the originals. At the villa, the application proposes to install Kolbe & Kolbe wood replacement units with simulated-divided-lights. The muntin in the Kolbe simulated-divided-light sash is metal, not wood. This manufacturer only provides wood muntins in their true-divided-light line. At the barn, the applicant proposes metal-clad simulated-divided-light window replacements. The windows at the barn are a combination of historic and non-historic openings.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer John Capoferri and architect Jennifer Foster represented the application

Ms. Foster described the proposal to the Committee members. She clarified that they were proposing entire frame and sash replacements throughout and that the replacements would be wood at the villa. She stated that they had decided to propose simulated-divide-light sash owing to sound transfer qualities, security, and cost. Mr. Capoferri stated that, owing to the villa's proximity to Germantown Avenue, he was concerned about sound transfer through single-pane true-divide-light windows. He asserted that sash replacements would not be an option owing to the deteriorated conditions of the frames.

Mr. Baron opined that there were places at this development where clad windows would be appropriate, but that he felt this was a very significant house by a famous architect and that it should be treated as a full restoration. He also stated that the staff was concerned with the

proposed metal extruded muntin, and that some of the windows were not true replications, such as the double arched windows at the landing of the stairs. Ms. Foster answered that they would match all windows, and that unusual existing configurations replicated with custom ordered windows.

Ms. Pentz stated that the Committee should recommend the correct historic form and that true-divided-light windows should be used in the villa, and that they could be either single-paned or double-paned. She further stated that simulated-divide-light would be acceptable at the barn. Mr. Capoferri asserted that true-divided-light replacements would have a tremendous economic impact on the project.

Laura Sienna of West Mt Airy Neighbors Association supported the project. She stated that the community was very eager to see this project completed and that developer had already made many concessions to address community concerns. She opined that a compromise on the windows, owing to the deteriorated housing market, should not be completely eliminated. She opined that the Committee should possibly consider true-divide-light windows for the front facade along Germantown Avenue only. She also questioned if the circular windows were designed by T.U. Walter as suggested by Mr. Baron. Mr. Danta replied that those windows were not designed by Walter; they date to the Italianate period of the villa. Mr. Capoferri asked the Committee to consider the cost savings of the simulated-divided-light sash.

The Committee members agreed that the level of significance of this villa required that the windows be wood true-divided-light with the correct muntin patterns. They also agreed that simulated-divided-light windows would be acceptable at the barn.

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

258 S. VAN PELT

Owner: John & Gina Moore

Applicant: Charles Capaldi

History: c. 1890 as carriage house; converted to residential in early 20th-century
contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Construct rooftop addition, install green-roof, construct two-story side yard addition, and cut window openings.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a green roof over the main roof of this former carriage house; no details as to the installation were provided. The green roof would be accessed through a penthouse addition. This addition would not be highly visible from the public-right-of-way. The property has a side yard where the applicant proposes to construct a two-story addition. The addition would be located at the rear of the yard, away from Van Pelt Street. It would however be minimally visible from 22nd Street across a parking lot. The proposed addition would be of a respectful massing compatible with the surrounding carriage houses, and it would be clad in brick. Lastly, at the rear façade of the property the applicant proposes to cut three new window openings. These openings would mimic two historic openings with six-light casements.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Charles Capaldi and owner John Moore represented the application.

Mr. Capaldi stated that they were not proposing new openings on the rear of the building and that those windows were all existing. Mr. Danta reviewed the drawings with Mr. Capaldi and concluded that the staff has misinterpreted the rear windows to be proposed new openings. Mr. Danta complimented the applicant for the installation of a green roof and opined that the combination of historic preservation and green architecture makes for a rich project.

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

339 S. 2ND STREET

Owner: Bruce and Eloina Le Buhn

Applicant: Josh Otto, AIA

History: c. 1965, contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 1999

Project: Replace front door, replace front gate.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the original front door to the property. The original door design found in this property and throughout most of the row is a ribbed wood door with a side light. The proposed replacement would be a painted flush door installed within the existing frame. The subject property has a non-original gate that encloses an originally-open front vestibule. The applicant proposes to replace the existing gate with a more architecturally compatible gate. The replacement gate would be constructed of steel and painted black. The applicant has submitted examples of replacement doors and other gates installed throughout this row. However, the staff would like to note that all of those examples were existing conditions at the time of designation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the gate, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of the replacement door, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Josh Otto, architect, represented the application. Mr. Danta distributed a letter from the Society Hill Civic Association signed by Steven Wexler supporting the staff recommendation.

Mr. Otto stated that he would like to replace the existing door, which is in disrepair, and noted the different types of doors that are found throughout the row. He asserted that the door is set within a vestibule away from the sidewalk and behind a gate, which makes it minimally visible.

Ms. Pentz asked the reason for not attempting to repair the historic door. Mr. Otto stated that it was for aesthetic reasons. Mr. Baron opined that the historic door was unusual and that its aesthetic was very specific to that style and period of architecture. Mr. Amburn agreed the door was special and indicative of its time. Mr. Danta stated that the contemporary buildings of Society Hill are as important as the eighteenth and nineteenth-century buildings and that their design elements should be preserved.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the gate, pursuant to Standard 9; and denial of the replacement door, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

1308 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: North Central Positronics

Applicant: Brett Webber, AIA, LEED AP

History: c. 1840; altered c.1900; individually designated, 1968

Project: Replace front door and security gates.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install shutters on the front façade of the building. The louver type and pattern needs revisions, but the staff can assist the applicant with the details. The rest of the application proposes alterations to the rear of the building. The side of the rear ell currently has wood windows. The applicant proposes to install clad, simulated-light replacement sashes for those openings and entire frame replacement of deteriorated casings. These replacements would either be wood or clad to replicate the profiles of the original wood planks. Some modifications to existing masonry openings are proposed, such as the creation of a doorway; the enlargement of two separate windows into a large single window and the enlargement of a double hung window into a casement. These changes would be minimally visible from the public-right-of-way.

The application proposes major work to the rear façade of the rear ell. This elevation currently has a second-floor bay and a non-historic ground floor. The applicant proposes to construct a bay that would extend three floors. The proposed bay would be recessed from the corner of the ell and it would retain the gable of the ell exposed. However, it would require the demolition of the second-floor bay and the removal of the third-floor masonry exterior wall. The proposed bay would be clad in an aluminum system with accents of zinc interlocking panels; casement fenestration is proposed. The application also proposes the installation of two stainless steel chimneys and a rooftop condenser enclosure. This enclosure would be minimally visible from the public-right-of-way. Finally, the applicant proposes to install a roll down gate in place of an existing one along Cypress Street. The housing would be concealed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of clad window replacements along the side elevation of the rear ell, approval of the chimneys and condenser enclosure, approval of shutters with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of bay addition and roll down gate, pursuant to Standards 4 and 9

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Brett Webber and Jason Lutz represented the application.

Mr. Webber clarified that the bay was a two-story extended bay, not a three-story bay as described. He stated that the existing glazed addition below grade is not historic and dates to renovations done in the 1970s.

Ms. Pentz asked if there were any plans to eliminate the air conditioner openings in the front façade. Mr. Webber stated that the owner plans to convert the building to single-family use and that those openings would be closed up at that time.

Mr. Baron stated that the Committee recently reviewed a similar project at nearby 1300 Spruce Street and another one in Spring Garden at 1832 Green Street. He noted that there are three designated buildings on Waverly Street, one of which faces towards this property. Mr. Webber corrected Mr. Baron and stated that there were no front facades directly facing the rear of this property, but rather a parking lot. He further stated that the buildings Mr. Baron is referring to are farther down the block. He referred the Committee members to the site plan and the

photographs for further clarification. Mr. Baron stated that the owner of 1300 Spruce Street was required to install a wood carriage gate rather than a metal roll down gate. The owner at 1832 Green Street restored a similar covered historic bay, exposed the paneling, and constructed a simplified bay on top of it. Mr. Baron showed the Committee members the drawings for that work. He opined that the historic fabric should be restored with a simplified bay addition placed on top.

Mr. Webber answered that a solid rear wall stood directly across from this property, noting most of the proposed changes would be nominally visible, except for the proposed bay addition. He stated that architecturally their philosophy rejected creating artifice and instead they wished to honor the historic integrity through compatible massing and scaling.

Mr. Danta commented that the staff discussed attaching a bay at the third floor and maintaining the wood bay at the second floor, but were not sure if it was physically possible, owing to the structural constraints of nineteenth-century wood construction. Mr. Danta asked the Committee to consider whether the demolition of the historic fabric is significant enough to deny the application, or if the new proposal is an acceptable change for this rear façade facing a service alley. Mr. Baron stated that Waverly Street should be considered a street, not an alley, because houses face it.

Mr. Amburn stated the second-floor bay was not significant enough and that the proposed changes were acceptable for a rear façade. He observed that the alterations were sensitively designed and of a simple yet compatible massing. Ms. Pentz echoed Mr. Amburn's opinion.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval all the work except the rear bay and roll-up gate, provided the shutter configurations are corrected, with the staff to review the details. The Committee split on the bay and gate. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Amburn recommended approval; Mr. D'Alessandro and Mr. McCoubrey recommended denial, pursuant to Standards 4 and 9.

1613 LOMBARD STREET

Owner: Morris Rotenstein

Applicant: Morris Rotenstein

History: c. 1850; contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Legalize vinyl windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of vinyl windows in the front façade of this row house. The historic windows were wood six-over-six double-hung windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

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

Ms. Cote presented a letter from the owner stating that the vinyl windows were installed prior to his purchase of the property. The letter stated that the current owner should not be held responsible for work done by the previous owner. The Committee members noted that the property owner is responsible for the property regardless of who undertook the illegal work. If the Commission adopted a policy absolving property owners of work undertaken by others, the

preservation ordinance would be irrelevant; a change of ownership would essentially legalize any illegal work.

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

2116 LOCUST STREET

Owner: Kerry and Sonali Polight

Applicant: Kevin Angstadt

History: c. 1875; contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Construct third-floor addition and roof decks

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a third-floor addition, which will be set back 9'-6" from the façade of this 1870s carriage house. The Architectural Committee has reviewed two similar proposals from these applicants for this building. This application eliminates the alterations proposed for the front façade in the earlier applications and focuses solely on the third-floor addition. During the previous reviews, the Committee was concerned with the visibility of the addition and suggested that it be set back from the front façade. Roof decks are proposed at the front and rear of the addition. The addition would be clad in pre-painted copper and would be visible from the public right-of-way.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Kevin Angstadt and Stephen Mileto and property owner Kerry Polight represented the application.

Mr. Angstadt introduced photographs of the property in its current state. It has an office on the first floor and single-family residence on the second floor. As stated, the front deck would be set back 9'-6" from the front facade. The space on the second floor is extremely small with a few windows and a skylight. He hopes to reconfigure the second floor. A new stair will be constructed along the party wall to the third-floor addition. Based on sight-line studies, he designed an inconspicuous addition with a copper bay and cornices. He stated he reduced the ceiling height to diminish the visibility; it now has an 8'-6" ceiling height in the master bedroom. All the materials would be a pre-patinaed copper and mahogany. It would be a modest 450 square-foot addition. The building was constructed in 1875; the limestone storefront was added in 1920.

Camille Focarino, the neighbor in the twin carriage house, spoke about her concerns. The two buildings have a single roofline and single drainage system, which she has maintained solely for the last eight years. They carriage houses also have a single crawl space. She has no evidence that the party wall would sustain the additional weight of the addition. There is no documentation for the roof drainage. She objected to the front deck and claimed that there are no front decks in the neighborhood. She asserted that the deck and addition would be very visible from the street. She contended that the applicants have not maintained the property well. She asked the Committee to deny the application. Mr. Angstadt stated a structural engineer would ensure that the party wall could support the addition. Ms. Focarino stated that there had been no communication. Mr. Amburn suggested to Ms. Focarino that most of her concerns would be better expressed to the Department of Licenses & Inspections.

Mr. Angstadt stated that the plans have been greatly improved since the last review. The cladding material is more appropriate. The height of the addition has been reduced. The deck and addition have been set back from the front façade. Mr. Amburn stated that the Commission routinely rejects highly visible decks. Ms. Pentz asserted that the deck would be highly visible.

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

309-315 ARCH STREET

Owner: 313 Arch Partners LLP

Applicant: Richard W. Thom

History: c. 1895; individually designated 4/12/1979; significant to the Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Install internally-illuminated signage

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of two signs; one would be wall-mounted in the existing cast iron band of the architrave and the other would be a projecting sign placed on the upper column between the entrance doors. Both signs would be internally-illuminated. The Commission has routinely denied internally-illuminated signs.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Richard Thom represented the application.

Mr. Amburn suggested that the proposed signs may be visually appropriate even if the Commission routinely rejects internally illuminated signage. He asked if there is another feasible way to illuminate the signs. Mr. Thom argued the Commission rejects plastic box signs, which are monstrosities. This is a well designed, technologically sophisticated sign. It was carefully conceived and will not stand out at night. He suggested that it produces less illumination than the Starbucks sign nearby. Mr. Baron stated that the illumination itself is not the issue. He suggested halo lighting and white enameled lettering. He noted a sign for Tower Records with a metal grill with many tiny holes; the light shined through the holes. Mr. Baron stated that the materials were problematic. Mr. Amburn asked if Mr. Thom would accept cut-out letters were the light behind them. Mr. Thom responded that his client may simply hang the sign behind the window, outside the Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission does have jurisdiction inside the window, but the material choice would become less significant in that case. Mr. Farnham disagreed; he stated that the Commission would have jurisdiction over anything adhered directly to the inside of the glass, but no jurisdiction over anything within the interior, behind the glass. Mr. Thom asked if the sign would be acceptable if he replaced the plastic with a milky glass. Mr. Amburn and Ms. Pentz responded affirmatively.

Joseph Schiavo of the Old City Civic Association stated that there are complexities when working with a European client, but contended that this building has unique issues. For example, most pedestrians walk on the north side of the street, not across the street from the building. Also, the storefront is unusually tall and the signage looks "puny." He suggested redesigning the signage to better accommodate the storefront and pedestrians.

Ms. Pentz questioned about the attachments of the signs to the cast iron. Mr. Thom replied that attachment holes would be drilled and the signs bolted to the storefront.

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

1802 PINE STREET

Owner: Kevin Kline

Applicant: Marc Pinard

History: c. 1850; contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Construct roof deck on main block

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck on the main block of the building. The deck would be accessed by way of a stair connecting from a fourth-floor window cut down to a door. It would measure 20 feet by 21 feet and would be set back 20 feet from the front façade. The deck would be wood with 36 inch high black metal rails with vertical pickets. The Commission has a main block roof deck policy that avoids the construction of roof decks on the main block of the building, especially if a rear ell exists.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Mark Pinnard and property owner Kevin Kline represented the application.

Mr. Pinnard described the air rights his client owns above his condominium. He also claimed that the deck would be minimally visible from Addison Street. Mr. Amburn stated the Commission consistently denies decks on the main blocks of row houses with rear ells. Mr. Pinnard replied that there is not enough room on his section of the rear ell for a deck.

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

1634 PINE STREET, 1637 WAVERLY STREET

Owner: William O'Hara

Applicant: Timothy Kerner

History: non-contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Demolish existing garage, construct three-story house

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish an existing garage standing at the rear of 1634 Pine Street, facing Waverly Street and construct a three-story house. The garage is classified as non-contributing to the historic district. The new structure would have a brick façade with cast stone window sills and cornice. A garage is proposed for the first floor. The new garage door would be wood and recessed behind an arched covered entryway.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Tim Kerner represented the application.

Mr. Kerner stated that he intends to build on the footprint of the existing garage. He would build a garage with a single-family residence above. He described the proposal as an in-law

residence. He stated there is already a curb cut at the property and here 12 garages on the block of on Waverly Street. The pedestrian door would be set back to create a recessed entryway. The exterior materials will be cast stone and a dark terra brick. The overhead door will have the appearance of a wood carriage door, but with horizontal seams.

Neighbors Carol Heiberger, Dan Rottenberger, and Wendy Goldstein addressed the Committee. Ms. Heiberger was concerned about replacing a garage with a garage. She asked why an "out-of-towner" could demolish a historic property. She claimed that there is no reason to remove the garage. She felt the demolition would have a negative impact on the neighborhood. She asserted that the new design is not consistent with the block. She voiced her dismay over the lack of notification. She stated that the lot is zoned for one residence, not two. She hoped that the zoning would be denied before the demolition occurred. She worried that the demolition would result in destabilization and that her utilities would be impacted. Mr. Rottenberger described the many books that mention this block. He stated that the houses were originally the homes of black domestic servants. Ms. Goldstein questioned the lack of notification. She objected to the impact of the new construction on the block.

Mr. Baron stated the new building will have a gabled roof. The design will respect the character of the block and its history. The garage is non-contributing to the historic district. The Commission therefore considers it to have no historic value. The new building was designed to be compatible with the district.

Mr. McCoubrey observed that the rhythm of the windows should be maintained across all floors. Mr. Kerner stated that his client may decide to install multi-paned windows. Mr. Amburn stated that minor changes to the project may be able to be reviewed by the staff.

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

335 GASKILL STREET

Owner: Glenn Holsten

Applicant: Kiki Bolender

History: c. 1810; designated 01/22/1963; significant to Society Hill Historic District, 03/10/1999

Project: Install simulated-divided-light windows, door, reconstruct watertable and demolish and rebuild garden wall

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install two-over-two simulated-divided-light sash throughout. The window details provided show an applied muntin with rounded moulding detail as opposed to a putty slope, and a sub frame, which reduces the opening. The historic windows did not have a subframe and would have been six-over-six true-divided-light windows with putty slope muntins. A new eight-panel door was originally proposed; however, after a site visit with the staff, the applicant is now proposing a five-horizontal-panel door to match the original on a neighboring house. This application also proposes to replace the alley door in kind with a tongue and groove wood door. The revised application proposes the reconstruction of the former water table and replacement of the concrete basement lintel with a marble lintel. The other buildings in this row prove that this rowhouse would have had a cellar bulkhead. Lastly, a new garden brick wall with a slate cap and new brick pavers are proposed for the rear.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the windows; approval of the alley door, five panel door, rebuilding of the watertable using salvaged bricks, garden wall and brick pavers, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Glen Holsten and architect Kiki Bolender represented the application.

Mr. Baron met with the architect in the field. The building has been altered many times over the years. He noted a substantial crack and possibly a coal chute cut into the ground floor and covered with stucco, leaving only a four-inch strip of original brick between the door and the basement window. Owing to a tree in front of the house, reconstructing the cellar bulk head is not feasible; it would leave less than 1'-6" for the sidewalk. Mr. Baron stated that the brick work at the watertable is in very poor condition. He said that the architect had agreed to use salvaged brick, perhaps from the back yard fence, and from the existing watertable. It may be possible to rotate some of the existing bricks to expose the undamaged face. He felt that the new marble lintel would be important to mark the location of the cellar bulkhead. The width could be determined, perhaps by looking at the infill lines on the wall of the basement. Photographs of the watertable area were presented. The Committee agreed to rebuilding of the base using salvaged bricks and infilling the coal chute. The Committee thought the former bulkhead opening should be marked with the wide marble lentil and a slight reveal in the brickwork, while allowing for the retention of the existing basement window.

The Committee agreed to recommend approval of the horizontal-panel front door and the reconstructed alleyway door. It approved of the rebuilding of the garden wall in brick or with a stuccoed finish. It also recommended approval of the brick pavers at the patio.

Mr. Baron explained that the house has heavy plank frames, which indicates that it had small pane windows. He said that 6-over-6 windows would also be more appropriate for the building, even with the metal classical revival cornice, which was added later. Mr. Baron stated that the staff thought that an individually designated building of this period that is significant in the district should have true-divided-light windows. The specific applied muntin window that is proposed has a subframe that will close down the opening. The muntins shown in the drawings are curved rather than flat with a putty slope.

Ms. Bolender asked if insulated true-divided-light windows would be approved. Mr. Baron replied that the staff would review and may approve wood true-divided-light windows. Ms. Bolender showed two window samples, one a true-divided-light Weathershield window and the other a simulated-divided-light Marvin window, which she is proposing. Mr. Baron explained that the staff had not approved that particular model of Weathershield window for many years in spite of its true-divided lights because it is historically inaccurate. He showed a sample of a more historically appropriate a true-divided-light window by Window Technologies. The Committee closely inspected the Marvin window sample presented by the architect. It determined that the design was quite successful. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the muntin profile was better on the true-divided light example. Ms. Bolender said that the putty line groove could be manufactured into the Marvin window.

Mr. Danta stated that the staff and Commission are in the process of studying products that are of good quality with simulated-divided lights that may be acceptable in historic buildings. He said that the question is not one of aesthetics, but also of energy efficiency, cost, durability, and other factors. Mr. Danta acknowledged that a true-divided-light window is often expensive, but that a high-quality simulated-divided-light window can cost as much or more.

Ms. Bolender commented that energy conservation as well as historic preservation is important for our future. Mr. Amburn said that simulated-divided-light windows had been approved for some less significant buildings but not for significant buildings. Ms. Bolender asked why, and suggested that the Commission should be consistent. Mr. Baron noted that it is possible to tell the difference between an applied and real muntin when seen from the street. It is partly a matter of reflectivity. He thought they would be acceptable on the rear and side of the building. He added that wood is a better insulator than the metal used in the simulated spacer bars. Ms. Bolender stated that the window she is proposing has a very good thermal break. Ms. Bolender contended that it is not possible to see the difference between applied and real muntins when the windows are well made. She stated that she is applying for approval of the simulated-divided-light windows for the front as well as the rest of the building. She said that she is committed to the seeking an approval of these windows. Ms. Bolender stated that she did not want this to be passed off to the Commission; she wanted the Committee's opinion on the window. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that it was as much about the carpentry technique as the true vs. simulated. Ms. Bolender replied that all windows, true and simulated, are factory made with machines. Ms. Pentz stated that it is important to perpetuate the construction techniques. She noted that Secretary of the Interior's Standard 5 suggests that "distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques that characterize a property will be preserved."

Steve Wexler of Society Hill Civic Association stated there has only been one instance where the association has supported simulated-divided-light windows. They were proposed for a 1970s house. He asked if there were any documents showing 6-over-6 windows in this building. He thought that, lacking documentation, perhaps the 2-over-2 windows might be appropriate. Mr. Baron produced an insurance survey for the building which indicated a small glass size, likely for 6-over-6 windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the windows, but approval of the rebuilding of the watertable with a marble lintel and reveal, a five-horizontal-panel front door, the alley door, the garden wall and the brick pavers for the patio, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

2019 CHANCELLOR STREET

Owner: Alon Barzilay

Applicant: Jonathan Broh

History: c. 1870; contributing to Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Construct roof deck with stair house and powder room

OVERVIEW: The applicant submitted an application in April 2007 that proposed the construction of a roof deck and stair house addition. The application proposed a wood deck and balustrade rail set back 17 feet from the façade. The stucco stair house containing a stair, powder room, and storage closet would be set back 24 feet from the façade. The Architectural Committee recommended approval. The application was withdrawn prior to the Historical Commission meeting.

The applicant now proposes a revised application for approval. The application proposes to construct a roof deck with stair house and powder room. The wood deck and balustrade rail would be set back from the façade 15 feet 6 inches. The stucco stair house containing a stair, powder room, and storage closet would be set back about 24 feet from the façade.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Jose Hernandez and Julie Fort represented the application.

Mr. Hernandez asserted the previous withdrawal was related to the rendering of the existing slope of the roof. He stated that they have addressed the slope of the roof and submitted new plans with true slope and sight lines. Mr. Amburn asked if the rear of the deck rests on the rear parapet. Mr. Hernandez stated it does. Ms. Pentz asked if there was a rear view of the deck. Ms. Sell directed the Committee's attention to the aerial images that show that the property is landlocked at the rear.

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

1933-35 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: George Karivalis

Applicant: Kijin Jay Choi

History: c. 1875; contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Install storefront

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to cut new openings and install storefront windows and doors on the south and west facades of this property, which stands at the corner of 20th and Spruce Streets. The west elevation would have one-light metal casements with transoms and a metal double door. There are no drawings provided for the south elevation. However, a rendering shows that an existing doorway would be closed and three fixed windows would be installed at the south. The applicant proposes to stucco the entire exterior and install awnings over all new openings.

A photograph from 1930 shows only the base of the property, but a simple corner entrance with storefront window on the south façade can be perceived. A photograph from 1950 shows a storefront on the first story. The south façade had commercial windows, row of transoms, and center entrance. The west façade has been greatly infilled, but former window and door opening locations can be delineated. A heavy cornice above the first story mounted the entire width of both facades.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Standard 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Kijin Jay Choi, the commercial tenant, represented the application.

Mr. Choi indicated that he wants to improve the exterior appearance of the building. He stated that several doors and windows have been infilled. He described that he would like to open these and install awnings.

Mr. Amburn suggested the need for a more detailed drawing and elevations. He also suggested the applicant reopen the old window and door openings rather than create new, larger openings. He opined that the staff could approve some investigative removal of the false pent roof and paint.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated the plans needed to show the relationship of the old and new openings and the awning to the building. A site plan and existing and proposed elevations would be helpful. He suggested the applicant obtain an architect to help with the design.

Mr. Choi was disappointed and lamented that waiting for approvals is costing too much money and time. The applicant remarked he may keep the existing poor condition and open his business.

The Committee and suggested that the applicant submit a site plan and elevations with dimensions of existing conditions and proposed work.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Standard 6 and 9

105-107 COTTON STREET

Owner: Maximum Properties

Applicant: A. Robert Torres

History: Within the Main Street Manayunk National Historic District; vacant lot

Project: In Concept – Construct four-story building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story commercial building with a roof deck on the lots. The building would be constructed of brick, however the majority of the façade would be comprised of large glass windows with transoms. The Station Street elevation would be clad with stucco, metal siding, and tiles. The first story would have two bands of glass doors.

While the design of the new building is contemporary, the scale, materials, and texture of the building are not compatible with contributing buildings in the historic district. The contributing buildings in this area are mainly two and three-story row houses with stone and brick facades with cornices and have a tradition of smaller framed window openings. The overall massing is out of character in the district. The proposed rhythm of proportions, fenestration, and openings in the structure are incongruent with surrounding buildings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Manayunk Ordinance Section PM-704.2.7

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Barry Reinhart and architect Robert Torres represented the application.

The architect explained although the proposed new construction is not in scale with the adjacent buildings, it is in scale with a four-story building facing Main Street. He showed examples of other four-story buildings in area. Mr. McCoubrey stated the examples are within different settings and the façade treatment was not respectful of the surroundings. Mr. McCoubrey did praise one example of a four-story building on Main Street with a façade design that visually recessed the fourth story.

Ms. Pentz agreed with the staff's recommendation. She suggested the applicant should use less glass, incorporate more solid sections, and the pattern and scale should be more compatible with the neighborhood.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance agreed with the staff's recommendation. He stated the height can be variable, but the design must fit in with the streetscape. He suggested a compatible tall building can work on this site.

The architect said he was afraid to make the building too tall. He stated that he addressed the perception of height horizontally.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Manayunk Ordinance Section PM-704.2.7.

106-110 GRAPE STREET

Owner: Maximum Properties

Applicant: A. Robert Torres

History: Within the Main Street Manayunk National Historic District; 106-110 Grape Street are contributing, 108 Grape Street is listed an intrusion.

Project: In Concept – Demolish two buildings and construct four-story building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish two buildings within the Manayunk Historic District.

The structure at 106-108 Grape Street is an early twentieth-century one-story brick garage with gabled parapet listed as an intrusion in the district. 110 Grape Street is a three-story row house, constructed in the 1830s, and listed as contributing within the district. The house retains its cornice and storefront moldings at the first story, chimney, and original window frames and sills.

This application proposes to construct a 47-foot, four-story commercial building with a roof deck on the lots. The building would be constructed of brick, however the majority of the façade would be comprised of large glass windows with transoms and metal clad columns. The first story would have one glass single door and two glass double doors.

While the design of the new building is contemporary, the scale, materials, and texture of the building are not compatible with contributing buildings in the historic district. The contributing buildings in this area are mainly three-story row houses with brick facades and have a tradition of smaller framed window openings. The overall massing is out of character in the district. The proposed rhythm of proportions, fenestration, and openings in the structure are incongruent with surrounding buildings. (See photos).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Manayunk Ordinance Section PM-704.2.7.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Robert Torres represented the application.

Mr. Baron clarified the Manayunk Ordinance regarding demolition. Mr. Torres stated that they have considered retaining the façades of the house and garage; however, there is not enough space in the rears. Mr. Baron encouraged the applicant to adaptively reuse the existing buildings. He stated there is flexibility with these buildings because they have large existing openings at the ground level. The owner commented that the structural issues in the existing buildings that are not repairable.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance recalled the property at 3 Rector Street. In that case, the developer demolished the entire interior of the building and constructed a new building inside the exterior shell. However, he indicated that this building is inconsistent with the district and does not meet the Standards.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated they cannot propose a new design for the applicant. The applicant should redesign the project and resubmit the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Manayunk Ordinance Section PM-704.2.7.

38-44 N. FRONT STREET

Owner: 38 N. Front Street Associates

Applicant: Rustin Ohler

History: c. 1830; individually designated 1/6/1977; significant in Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Construct roof decks and stair house

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct three wood roof decks and a stair house. The decks will be interconnected by a series of walkways.

Deck 1 would be located on the rear of 42-44 N. Front Street. It would be set back six feet from the rear façade and seven feet from the Cuthbert Street façade. Deck 2 would be located on the rear of 40 N. Front Street. It would be set back five feet from the rear façade. Deck 3 would be located on the main block and pitch of 42-44 N. Front Street. It would be set back 24 feet from the front façade and seven feet from the Cuthbert Street façade. The connecting ramp from Deck 1 to Deck 3 would extend 87 feet and be set back seven feet from the Cuthbert Street façade. The stair house would be set back 24 feet from the Cuthbert Street façade and 31 feet from the rear façade. No information regarding materials or the support structure has been submitted for review.

Site line studies have been submitted for Cuthbert and Front Streets, but staff contends Decks 1 and 3 and the connection walkway will be visible from public areas.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the stair house and Deck 2, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9. Denial of Decks 1 and 3 and the connection walkway, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Rustin Ohler and attorney Bret Harman represented the application.

Mr. Harman asked Ms. Sell to clarify the recommendation of denial for Deck 3. Ms. Sell stated that Deck 3 is proposed for the main block of the building and is not in accordance with the Commission's policy on roof decks. Mr. Baron reminded the Committee that an application for a roof deck on the main block of the neighboring property at 36 N. Front Street was denied by the Architectural Committee in November 2007. However, a redesign isolating the deck to the rear ell was approved by Commission in December 2007. Mr. Harman argued that the decks are not visible from public rights-of-way. Ms. Sell advised that a mock-up installation would be helpful to clarify visibility issues.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance commented that there is a high level of visibility to these roofs, which is the reason there are no roof decks in this row. He noted that the stair house would be highly visible and a mock-up should be required. He informed the Committee that the Preservation Alliance holds an easement on Cuthbert Street. He described the street as having a high degree of integrity containing some of the earliest of Philadelphia's building, dating from 1712. He stated that this type of project is undesirable and that he has great concern over the impact this project would have on the streetscape.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of Decks 1 and 3 and the connecting walkway, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9. Approval of Deck 2 and the stair house, provided a mock-up proves that they are not conspicuous from the public right-of-way.

321 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: The American Interfaith Institute

Applicant: Benjamin Bauman

History: 1905, Clark Bank, T.P. Chandler, architect ; individually designated 6/30/1970, significant in Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Replace and expand vestibule, ADA ramp, and trash enclosure

OVERVIEW: This application proposes expanding an enclosed entranceway with ramp at the Liberty Museum. The existing entrance stands on the east or Orianna Street façade of the building. The Historical Commission approved the addition of the extant curved glass and aluminum entranceway and ramp in 1980.

In August 2004, the Historical Commission approved a design for the expansion of the vestibule and ramp. The vestibule would terminate before the eighth pilaster and architectural bulge at the north end and the ramp would terminate halfway over the third pilaster at the south end. However, the work was never performed.

This application now proposes a plan to expand the vestibule and ADA access ramp that is very similar to the plan approved in 2004. However, this design proposes to lower the existing brick wall along the ramp, construct a glass enclosure with standing seam metal roof, and install an open mesh metal handrail.

This application also proposes a wood trash enclosure that would cover the base of the eighth pilaster.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Dave Frank and Ben Bauman represented the application.

Ms. Sell introduced a letter from the National Park Service (NPS) stating it is still considering the proposal. Mr. Frank stated he was in communication with NPS and in compliance with their recommendations. He added that their project goal is to simplify the look of the vestibule and ramp to be compatible with the existing structure. Ms. Pentz inquired if the proposed work would cross onto federal property. Mr. Bauman responded that half of the project is within the Independence National Historic Park and they have met with NPS twice to develop an appropriate design. Mr. Baron suggested that the Commission may not render a decision

without NPS approval. Ms. Sell stated there are minor differences between the approved plans from 2004 and the proposed plans. She added that the wood trash enclosure would extend over the eighth pilaster, further than what was previously approved. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the proposed lighting fixture could be recessed so it is not visible. Mr. Bauman said that is possible and he would look into the issue.

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

1506 LOMBARD STREET

Owner: Craig Peterson

Applicant: Danil C. Vicencio

History: c. 1960, contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Demolish garage and construct rear addition with roof decks

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a detached non-historic garage facing Naudain Street and construct a first-story rear addition with a roof deck. This application also proposes a rear deck on the third story with a spiral stair leading to a deck on the third-story roof. The decks will be wood with wood picket balustrades.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided a rear gate at Naudain Street is installed, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Craig Peterson, the owner, and Danilo Vicencio, the architect, represented the application.

Mr. Peterson noted that the garage was illegally constructed. He agreed to install a rear gate as the demolition of the garage would create an open space for trespassers. Ms. Pentz inquired whether the roof deck would be erected over new construction. Mr. Vicencio confirmed that the deck would be incorporated into a new addition at the rear. Ms. Pentz stated that it appeared as though the addition would be built with its own roof and drainage system. Mr. McCoubrey added that the new third story would be higher than the rear gable of the existing roof. Mr. Vicencio stated that the railing would be higher. Ms. Pentz inquired if the new roof would be flat. The applicant stated the roof would have a slight slope.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a rear gate at Naudain Street is installed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard 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.

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.