

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
29 July 2003**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Herbert Levy, FAIA
Rudy D'Alessandro
Suzanne Pentz

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

Also

Robert P. Thomas, AIA, Campbell Thomas and Company
Linda Rosanio, Catelli Restaurant Corporation
Joseph R. Catelli, R.A., Architetra p.c.
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg and Ellers
Joanne Phillips, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews and Ingersoll
Adam Barzilay, Toll Brothers Incorporated
Kevin Smith, Toll Architecture
Fred Vincent, Walk Philadelphia
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
Randy Cotton, Preservation Alliance
Kathy Dowdell, Preservation Alliance
James Campbell, Campbell Thomas and Company
Chris Lessard, Lessard Architect Group, Incorporated
Matthew Koenig, J.K. Roller Architects
Bob Hotes, AIA
Aimee, Lala, Cultural Resource Consulting Group
Lori Salganicoff, Preservation Alliance/Fairmount Community Development Corporation
Paul J. Commito, Toll Brothers
B. Mitchell Kotler, Toll Brothers
Joanne Aitken, Dagit Saylor Architects
David W. O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Peter and Florence Bruy, 12 Queen Street
Fred Tropea, Ruggiero Development Group
Joseph Ippolitto, Ruggiero Development Group
Joe Ruggiero, Ruggiero Development Group
Jerry Roller, J.K. Roller Architects
Barry Kaplan, Barry Kaplan Architects
Joanne Phillips, Ballard Spahr Andrews and Ingersoll
Neil Sklaroff, Ballard Spahr Andrews and Ingersoll
Charles Loomis, Loomis McAfee Architects
Tom Prettyman, Ballard Spahr Andrews and Ingersoll
Michael A. Bruder
Joseph Serratore, AIA

Jonathan Broh, J. K. Roller Architects
 Cheon Won Suh, Wasabi House
 Hugh Zimmers, AIA
 Alan Delfiner
 Matt Semola
 Alan Scott, 1700 Green Street
 Charles Tonetti, National Park Service
 Jon Wagner, AIA
 Jason Beccaris, 508 South 3rd Street

Vincent Riviera, Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m.

Fairmount Waterworks

City of Philadelphia, Owner
 Robert Thomas, Architect/Applicant
 DATE: 1812 and 1822
 PROPOSAL: Conservatory addition and canopy in concept

This proposal has two parts. First, the application calls for a new canopy at the north entrance on the drive side of the Engine House. The proposed canopy sits on columns and has a low arch that matches the arched door surround. The plans do not show details, such as materials, length of canopy or method of attachment, if any.

Second, the proposal calls for a new conservatory addition on the drive side of the Engine House. This aluminum-framed structure will stand just over one story and have a hipped roof with a clerestory. The conservatory will connect to the historic building at the central door, but the plans do not detail the attachment. Several of the bays will have operable windows and double-leaf glazed doors will lead out of the conservatory on each side. Although most people view the Waterworks from across the river, the drive side is not a secondary elevation and the proposed structure obscures that façade.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the canopy, pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of the conservatory, pursuant to Standard 2, Standard 9 and two site guidelines [*Not recommended: locating any new construction on the building site in a location which contains important landscape features or open space, for example removing a lawn and walkway. Not recommended: introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color, and texture; which destroys historic relationships on the site; or damages or destroys important landscape features.*].

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. The applicants introduced themselves, including Robert Thomas, acting as historical consultant to the project; Linda Rosanio of the Star Restaurant Group; Joseph Catelli, architect for the restaurant, and Joanne Phillips, Esq., attorney for the project.

Mr. Tyler explained that this building, besides being a National Historic Landmark, is a major Philadelphia icon and second only to Niagara Falls as an American destination and subject for images dating from the 19th century. Charles Dickens much admired it. Vincent Rivera stressed that it was not only the building that has great significance but the surroundings as well.

Mr. Thomas made three points. First, he explained that the Commission had in the past approved additions to Valley Green Inn, Knowlton and Bartram's Garden to allow for the successful operation of businesses within those historic structures. He thought the extra space necessary for the economic success of this project. Second, the applicant has a vision for the restaurant to

include groups, for which the extra space is essential, and third, that the restaurant is flexible in terms of the actual design of the additional space.

Ms. Rosanio explained that Catelli's wishes to cater to all walks of life, including tourists, nearby residents, joggers, those wishing to hold weddings, and other group and corporate functions. The Star Restaurant Group is estimating an investment of about two million dollars to create the new restaurant. She explained that the restaurant must serve approximately 250 diners to keep the menu prices reasonable. The greenhouse space is economically necessary to accommodate the number of seats that they require. Although the Historical Commission had approved the glazing of the porch, the restaurant considered adding awnings on the riverside deck. However, these proved to be infeasible because of the engineering issues associated with the wind on the riverside.

Joseph Catelli, the architect for the project, explained how the main dining room, glazed porch and caretaker's house would hold diners. To create more kitchen space, some of the functions of the kitchen would be relocated to preparation bars in the main room of the Engine House. The proposed conservatory would hold groups of diners who may rent the space for functions. He said that other locations had been considered, such as the south garden, but were rejected for various reasons. He noted that the second floor and attic hold mechanical equipment. A new air-conditioning chiller for the added space would have to be located on the grounds. Mr. Catelli opined that the conservatory would indicate the same activity occurs in the Engine House.

John Gallery, representing the Preservation Alliance, said that he supports the staff recommendation of denial. Describing the page on the Alliance's website discussing the proposal, he noted that the Alliance solicited comments from the public. He presented the Committee with a sampling of the comments and a list of organizations and individuals, such as the National Trust, the local chapter of the AIA, the National Park Service, the Athenaeum, and the Design Advocacy Group, who opposed the addition. He noted that the owner of the site, the Fairmount Park Commission, has not voted on the plan and that the Park Commission members have not seen the drawings submitted to the Architecture Committee for review.

Mr. Gallery reiterated Ms. Rosanio's statement that the conservatory addition is necessary because of economics; therefore, the applicant should make a formal financial hardship application. He said that in such a case it is the duty of the Commission to request the financial data and consider the possibility of hardship. He said that he has been requesting this financial data for months, but that it had not been forthcoming. Mr. Gallery opined that the City has a duty to ensure that it holds its own development to the same standards as private developers. Finally, he said that the proposed addition does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards* because it has a pseudo-historic look of a Victorian greenhouse, destroys the historic character of the site by obscuring the front façade, and alters the spatial character of the site.

Joanne Phillips, counsel for the project, said that the application is not claiming financial hardship, and she thought that a hardship showing was only for demolition applications, which this is not. She said it would be possible to put a coffee shop or a chain restaurant in the building without the greenhouse alteration, but that Catelli's is proposing a higher quality design with 250 seats to give more vitality to the site. She advised her client to come to the Historical Commission before the Park Commission voted on the proposal, and she was not aware of any request to Ms. Rosanio for financial information.

Staff agreed with Mr. Gallery's opinion that if the application is based on the economics of the site, then the applicant should submit a financial hardship application. Mr. Tyler read from Section 14-2007(7)(f) of the Ordinance, which states that financial hardship may be considered for alterations as well as demolitions.

John Carr of the Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust explained that the site of the Waterworks has several activities and occupants, and the restaurant is simply one part of the overall redevelopment plan. The Interpretive Center, which will host tourists and school groups, occupies a large portion of the site and will open in September 2003. Also, the decks will be open to the public.

Mr. Levy noted that the idea of having a restaurant in the Engine House has been discussed for years, yet nothing has happened. He opined that the addition would be acceptable based on the economic need. Mr. Riviera thought that some additional space could be designed. Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro thought the proposal inappropriate. Ms. Pentz recalled that the Committee and Commission discussed the glazing of the porch extensively and they approved it as an alternative to having an addition on the building. She thought that the glazed porch has had a negative impact on the design, and asked if the applicant would be willing to remove the glazing if the Commission considered additional space in another location. The applicants did not respond.

Mr. Gallery noted that the Fairmount Park's Request For Proposals (RFP) called for a restaurant with 200 seats and that the glazed porch already allows for 226 seats. He said that two other bidders responded to the RFP and were willing to work within the existing facility. Making the facility accommodate 250 seats is asking the Park Commission to change the terms of their agreement after the fact.

Ms. Phillips requested an opportunity to work with a small group of people to refine the proposal and come back to the Committee at a later date.

The Committee voted to recommend tabling the proposal for a period not to exceed 6 months.

R.A.B.

2420 Grays Ferry Avenue, Naval Home

Toll Naval Association, Owner

Paul Commito, Applicant

DATE: 1827-33, William Strickland, architect

PROPOSAL: Revised site plan, new construction in concept, new roof, dormers and skylights on Biddle Hall

This application has four major parts: a revised site plan, new construction in concept, the addition to Biddle Hall in concept and a design for the new roof, dormers and skylights on Biddle Hall.

Suzanne Pentz recused herself from the discussion and vote because of her involvement with the project as a consultant to the City.

The applicants introduced themselves, including Mitchell Kotler, Paul Commito and Adam Barzilay from Toll Brothers; Chris Lessard, architect for the site plan, townhouses and addition to Biddle Hall; Kevin Smith, of Campbell Thomas Architects, architect for the roof; Matthew Koenig of JK Roller Architects, who are designing the interiors; James Campbell, architect and historical consultant, and Carl Primavera, Esq., attorney for the project.

Site Plan

In 1999, the Commission approved in concept a site plan for the property, on the condition that further investigation and landscaping be done to minimize the parking area in front of Biddle Hall. A revised site plan comes for final approval. The application includes a plan that Toll Brothers put together in 2001, which City Council approved. The main differences from the current proposal and that of 2001 are: the large triangular building at the corner of 24th & Grays Ferry Avenue is now broken into smaller rows of houses; the parking garages at the rear of the site have been eliminated; the specific shapes of the buildings at the rear of the property have changed slightly, but the overall massing remains the same; a new parking lot is proposed off of the circle in front of the Surgeon's Quarters; and the driveways are widened to accommodate a second lane of traffic.

Although not on the plans, the owner wishes to demolish the solid brick wall on the Grays Ferry Avenue façade and install a low brick wall with brick piers and wrought-iron fencing. Also, the proposal includes widening the historic openings in the main wall and installing a gate house and gate set further in site.

Staff recommendation: Approval, subject to the following details returning to the Committee and Commission for review: landscaping plan for the site, details of the treatments to the historic walls and fencing, and details of the rehabilitation and location of the gazebo, pursuant to Standard 2, Standard 9 and site guidelines.

Ms. Spina explained the similarities and differences between the previously approved site plans and the present application as outlined above.

Mr. Lessard explained that Richard Tyler, Bonnie Wilkinson at the State Bureau for Historic Preservation and Charlene Vaughn at the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation have reviewed the plans. He explained that in the site plan, Building #1 was pulled back to allow a clearer sight-line to the Surgeon's Quarters. The parking would still be sited behind a berm and a landscape plan would be developed and submitted. Mr. Tyler asked the architect about the collapsed portions of the wall along Bainbridge Street and the rear of the parcel. The applicant confirmed that these would be rebuilt to match the original.

John Gallery complimented both the Historical Commission staff and Toll Brothers for their work to preserve the structures since the fire and their future development. He said that he attended a civic meeting the night before and, without speaking for the neighbors, there seemed to be agreement that the site plan was consistent with the one seen before.

Chris Blaylock, a neighbor and architect, asked about street frontages of the buildings and if any connection existed between the site and Bainbridge Street. It was explained that there would be no physical vehicle or pedestrian access to Bainbridge Street because of the historic wall and that the site would be a gated community accessible through three gates. The parking, for the most part, would be internal or underground.

Kathy Dowdell, of the Preservation Alliance and the AIA, asked about the history of the proposal for parking in front of Biddle Hall. Mr. Tyler explained that it was always shown in the plans, but with a berm to minimize its visibility from Grays Ferry Avenue.

Mr. Riviera asked about the reuse of the historic buildings. The applicants explained that they would be condominiums after a period as rental units to allow for the use of the historic tax credits. Mr. Levy expressed concern that Building #12 sits too close to the side of the Governor's House. He said that since both rise the equivalent of three stories, the siting creates a canyon effect.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval, subject to the following details returning to the Committee and Commission for review: landscaping plan for the site, details of the treatments to the historic walls and fencing, and details of the rehabilitation and location of the gazebo, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.], Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment] and site guidelines [Recommended: designing new onsite parking, loading docks, or ramps when required by the new use so that they are as unobtrusive as possible and assure the preservation of the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape. Recommended: Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserves the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.]. The Committee asked that the architect restudy the siting of Building #12 and its proximity to the Governor's House.

The applicant agrees with the recommendation, except for the restudy of Building #12.

New Construction on Site

The conceptual designs for the new construction include front elevations only. Many of the properties will have visible rears with garages, but their design is still in development.

Whether townhouses, stacked townhouses or smaller condominiums, the overall design remains the same. All are four-story and have paneled doors, multi-light windows, and gabled roofs. Each house is articulated with different facing color, fenestration, or cornice and window hood ornamentation. For the 16' and 18' houses (yellow buildings on the site plan), the fourth floors have recesses to accommodate balconies.

Staff Recommendation: Approval with simplification of details, pursuant to Standard 3, Standard 9 and site guideline.

Ms. Spina noted that the new construction fits well on the site as far as massing and orientation, and staff commended the architect for having the garages on the rears and creating "alleys" between rows. However, the design of the buildings looks more like Northern Virginia than Philadelphia. The details should be simplified to have a less pseudo-historic look and reflect the contemporary nature of the design. Eliminating the shutters and simplifying the lintel details and window shapes would help streamline the design. Staff members noted that the recessed fourth floors for terraces and the coupled windows are good ways to emphasize the contemporary nature of the construction.

Mr. Lessard showed renderings of the new townhouses and noted that only the front facades had been designed at this point. He explained that in Alexandria, Virginia, the local historical commission requires new construction to have historical elements, reflecting the 19th century. They designed the townhouses in response to that directive. He noted that they intend to restudy the issue of the coloration of the brick. Ms. Spina opined that this development offers the opportunity to create strong contemporary architecture that would reflect the 21st century.

The Committee agreed that the new townhouses should be simplified with less historic detailing, such as the keystones, denticulated cornices and multi-light windows.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval in concept of a simplified version of the new construction, pursuant to Standard 3 [Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historic development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other properties, will not be undertaken.], Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and Site Guideline [Recommended: Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserves the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.]

The applicant objects to simplifying the design, but agrees to restudy the brick color.

Addition to Biddle Hall

In February 2000, the Committee reviewed a conceptual plan for the addition to Biddle Hall. The E-shaped addition attaches to the historic building at the two ends and in the center, creating two interior courtyards. In the conceptual design, the contemporary-styled addition was stucco with brick and a series of projecting bays and balconies. There was a glazed portion that visually separated the historic building from the new construction. The Committee recommended approval with a recess of three feet at the juncture of the addition; using scored stucco for the facing; not breaking the eave line with the bays; creating a symmetrical west façade; and extending the bays to all floors. The Commission never voted on the application.

The revised proposal returns for approval in concept. The new design retains the glazing at the juncture of the historic building, but nothing else of the previous design remains. The new concept calls for breaking the façade into different “buildings” visually by changing the color of the facing, window patterns and other ornamentation of the cornices and window hoods, and strong breaks in the roofline. Only a scored stucco base remains on the two “end” houses. Again, the overall look of the buildings resembles rowhouses found in Northern Virginia rather than Philadelphia.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The proposed addition has no relation to Biddle Hall. The new construction must be conceived as an addition and relate to the historic building. The addition should be made of light stone or scored stucco; have articulation to break the massing but in a uniform design; and have a contemporary nature to its design rather than a false historical presence.

Committee members praised the applicant for retaining the glazed connection and keeping the height of the cornice line between the new and old construction. While understanding the need for a smaller scale and differentiation of units, they thought that there should be a closer relationship between the historic building and new construction.

Mr. Tyler gave the examples of the Sainsbury Wing addition to the National Gallery in London and the Mitchell Giurgola addition to a bank building on North Broad Street as examples of the successful integration of new and old design. Ms. Spina suggested that the architects study the contemporary addition to the Ridgeway Library (now the High School for the Creative and Performing Arts) on South Broad Street.

Mr. Lessard explained that in reality as a person walked around the site, they would not perceive the new facades as an attachment to Biddle Hall because they would have no head on views of

the side. He also did not understand how the architecture should be related to Biddle Hall if the goal was to distinguish the old from the new construction.

Mr. Baron read from the portion of the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines for additions to historic buildings that says "the new work should always be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solid to voids and color." He noted that in areas, such as the courtyard side with the elaborate porches, one would read Biddle Hall and the addition as a related attached building and that care should be given to that relationship.

John Gallery said that if all the new construction on the site was related, perhaps Biddle Hall would be highlighted by the contrast. Robert Hotes, co-chair of the AIA's preservation committee, said that the new townhouses could look both separate from each other but read as a complete entity. He referred to the terraced rowhouses in Bath, England. Those houses are also finished in a light stone, which is more compatible with Biddle Hall.

Mr. Riviera said that the connection point of the addition could have an even greater setback to read the two parts separately. Committee members reiterated that the design of the new construction should acknowledge and relate to the historic building.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

Roof Replacement

The five-alarm fire earlier this year resulted in the destruction of the roof of Biddle Hall. All major elements of the roof will be reconstructed, including the dormers, monitor and central oculus, but the proposed roof and elements differ from the historic in several ways. First, the historic standing-seam metal roof had numerous flat seams where the metal sheets met. As the roof sloped towards the gutters, the standing seams tapered to flat seams. The monitor roof, dormer roofs and dormer cheeks had flat-seam roofs, again owing to the size of the metal sheets. The proposed roof will be made of larger sheets, so the flat seams will be eliminated. The new roof will also have flat seams at the gutters, but the gradual tapers from standing-seam to flat-seam will be eliminated. Finally the new sheathing on the dormer cheeks will have several flat seams, but not the number as found historically.

Second, the new skylight over the oculus will have an aluminum frame. The historic skylight is completely missing and may have had a steel frame originally.

Third, the dormers presently have coupled, six-light wood windows and wood detailing. The proposal calls for installing aluminum-clad, simulated-divided-light windows and using Fypon (a synthetic material) on the facing. The proposal also includes installing vents in the eaves of the dormers, altering the slope and eaves of the dormers slightly.

Fourth, like the dormers, the monitor would have Fypon on the facing, aluminum-clad windows and a slightly altered roof to accommodate new vents. Moreover, the historic fascia of the monitor had a half-round, which does not appear in the proposal.

Lastly, the proposal calls for rebuilding the cornice to include venting, but none of the historic moldings or profiles are included in the proposal. The design of the historic cornice does allow

the installation of the vents without sacrificing the details.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the new roofing material and pattern of seams, with staff to review details. Approval of the oculus skylight, on the condition that the aluminum have a painted finish rather than raw aluminum, with staff to review details. Denial of the aluminum windows and use of Fypon on the dormers and monitor, but approval of the vents. Windows should be wood, true-divided-light and the details should be made of wood. Denial of the cornice as proposed. All pursuant to Standard 6, with staff to review details.

Ms. Spina noted the differences between the original roof that burned in the recent fire and the proposed roof, including the differences in the seams of the metal, materials for the windows and moldings, the pitch in the roof related to new venting and most importantly the lack of similarity between the old and new cornice. She noted that the plans before the Committee detail a section of the south wing that was to be salvaged and restored, including an original dormer. Since the creation of the drawings, the property suffered another fire, which destroyed this last remaining section of historic fabric. The new proposal includes all new material for the roof, but some of the original trusses will remain in the south wing.

Mr. Tyler noted that the State Historic Preservation Officer also was not willing to approve the cornice in its current proposed configuration. The State, however, will accept aluminum clad windows and Fypon. Mr. Campbell argued for the use of Fypon details and aluminum-clad windows based on ease of maintenance. Committee members explained that the requirement to use wood, true-divided-light windows and wood detailing applies to all properties.

In response to Mr. Tyler's inquiry, Mr. Campbell and Mr. Kotler said that the original cast-iron columns on the verandas would be restored and reinstalled. Mr. Campbell explained that the new roof will be designed so that it cantilevers over the verandas, eliminating the need of the columns for structural support.

Committee members unanimously recommended approval of the new roofing material and pattern of seams, with staff to review details. Approval of the oculus skylight, on the condition that the aluminum have a painted finish rather than raw aluminum, with staff to review details. Denial of the aluminum-clad windows and use of Fypon on the dormers and monitor, but approval of the vents. Windows should be wood, true-divided-light and the details should be made of wood. Denial of the cornice as proposed. All pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated 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].

The applicant agrees with the recommendation, except for the materials of the window, dormer and monitor detailing.

R.A.B.

3260 South Street, University Museum

University of Pennsylvania, Owner

Joanne Aitken, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1897-99, Wilson Eyre, Cope & Stewardson, Frank Miles Day, architects

Addition – 1971, Mitchell Guirgola, architects

Addition – 2001, Atkin Olshin Lawson-Bell, architects

PROPOSAL: Replace lion head in fountain, new guardrails

The Committee and Commission previously approved the renovations to the main garden. However, two items need additional review. First, the marble lion head, attributed to Alexander Stirling Calder, cannot be reinstalled owing to its condition. The application calls for making a cast of the head for a replica; however, conservators are concerned that even a casting would damage the piece.

Second, the original skylight design called for pyramidal skylights at the end points of the lateral walkways. These skylights have been eliminated and the walkways will terminate at the building as they do now. To meet code requirements, guardrails must be installed at the sides of the walkways to prevent pedestrians from falling into the newly installed skylights along the museum walls. The proposed guardrails have simple steel posts and handrails with horizontal cables.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of replication of the lion head, on the condition that it is made from a mold of the original, pursuant to Standard 6.

Staff split on the railings. Three thought the proposed acceptable, owing to their non-historic nature. Two staff members thought simple, wrought-iron picket railings more appropriate.

Joanne Aitken, the architect, attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Ms. Aitken added that the lion head was in very poor condition and if a mold proved impossible, the project team would return to the Committee with an alternative proposal. Ms. Aitken noted that the railings are not required by the Building Code because the location is not an egress path. She added that the railings were designed to complement the glass pyramids that have been eliminated from the design. She stated that the University is willing to change the railing material to black metal to simulate wrought iron.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the replacement lion head, as proposed, and new simple black metal railings, with vertical pickets, and staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

JRB

12 Queen Street

Peter and Florence Bruy, Owners

Jose Hernandez, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830, permastone façade, c. 1955

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition in concept

The Commission voted to deny the demolition of 12 Queen Street last month. The developer has returned for a conceptual approval of removing a portion of the rear of the main section, the rear ell and additions of the building. Demolition of the main section would destroy the historic roofline, which is slightly visible from the east next to the proposed development and highly visible from the west. The proposal includes an addition on the rear of the remaining structure to

accommodate a garage. Other than a bare floorplate of the structure, the application does not include any information.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the demolition of the rear ell and additions only; however, the front section should remain and the historic roofline preserved, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. The staff would look favorably on a proposal for a rear addition, if it falls below the historic cornice-line.

Jerry Roller, Glenn Werner, Fred Tropea, and Joe Ippolito attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Mr. Roller stated that the lot line was drawn incorrectly on the site plan and the western property line of 12 Queen Street actually aligns with the building line. He explained that the first floor of the building is approximately 3 feet above grade and they had proposed cutting the building at the front end of the new internal garage space. He agreed that the side walls and roof profile of the existing original structure could be retained. The Committee and applicant discussed inserting a parking garage space at the rear of the building by demolishing only the rear wall and floors of the original structure. Ms. Spina asked about the original double chimney on the east wall. Mr. Roller responded that the chimney and roofline would be retained.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the demolition of the rear ell, piazza and rear wall of main portion of the house in concept. The Committee voted to recommend denial of the partial demolition of the side walls and roof of the main portion of the house, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment].

JRB

1901 Walnut Street

Rittenhouse Plaza, Incorporated, Owner

Joanne Phillips, Esq., Applicant

DATE: 1926, McLanahan & Bencker, architects

PROPOSAL: Alter storefront, install glass enclosure

The Committee saw this proposal previously, but the applicant withdrew the application before the Commission reviewed it. As before, the proposal calls for removing a wrought-iron gate and installing a glass wall and door at the street line, making the recess an interior vestibule. The tenant in the commercial space, Firsttrust Bank, says the glass is necessary for the security and comfort of its patrons. The condo association has approved the work, on the condition that the wrought-iron gate is given to them to store on site. The applicant also proposes to install a ceiling mounted fixture in the vestibule where an electrical box exists.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the addition of the light fixture, pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of the removal of the gate and installation of the glass, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

Joanne Phillips, Esq., and Barry Kaplan, the architect, attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Ms. Phillips explained the ongoing problems with the existing gate. Ms. Phillips and Mr. Kaplan discussed the design with the Committee. All agreed

that the existing gate was not historic fabric. Mr. Kaplan stated that they have attempted to make the proposed enclosure appear as transparent as possible. Ms. Spina noted that previously the staff and Committee recommended denial because the glazing would destroy the rhythm of solids and voids along the building face. Mr. D'Alessandro acknowledged that the glazing can be highly reflective and asked if the doors could remain in an open position during the day. Mr. Kaplan responded that if the glazing was acceptable at night, it should be acceptable during the day. The Committee discussed various alternatives and modifications but decided that there was no better alternative.

The Committee voted to recommend approval provided the glass is non-reflective and a catalog cut of the light fixture is submitted to staff for review.

JRB

1714 Locust Street

David Michie, Owner

Timothy Hemsath, Applicant

DATE: c. 1830, ground floor altered mid 20th century

PROPOSAL: New windows, façade rehabilitation

This proposal calls for installing new divided light windows in place of the single sheet of glass in the modern storefront of this row-house. The applicant also will restore the brick façade in locations where it has through wall air-conditioners. The plans also call for cutting a new window and closing a door in the rear façade.

Staff recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Charles Loomis, the architect, attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Baron presented the proposal. The Committee discussed the elimination of the doorway and widening of a window at the rear. Mr. Rivera asked about the use of the first-floor space. Mr. Loomis responded that the room at the rear will be used as a workshop and the owner desires additional light. The Committee discussed the character of the alley at rear. Mr. Loomis stated that although the door opening may be original, the door itself is not. He added that the enlarged window opening will have a simple steel lintel and indicated on the floor plan the location of another ground floor door at the side for egress. The Committee suggested salvaging some bricks from the rear for possible reuse as infill for the openings at front.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the project as proposed, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

JRB

1709 Pine Street

Carl Maybry, Owner

Joseph Serratore, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Roof deck

This proposal calls for a roof top deck over the main section of the house; the structure has no rear ell. Because of its mid-block position, the deck will have little if any visibility.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standard and Standard 10, subject to the deck being pulled back to a point where the railing has no visibility from Pine Street. Staff recommends installing a mock up for review on site.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and noted that although the deck itself sits below the ridgeline, the required railing protrudes above it. He asked that a mock-up be built so that staff can verify that the railing would not be visible. Joseph Serratore, the architect for the project, agreed.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, on the condition that the railing is not visible, with staff to review details and a mock up, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

lms

1011-13 Chestnut Street

Philadelphia Management, Owner

Jonathan Broh, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1890, Phillip Roos, architect for addition

PROPOSAL: New storefront in annex

The application involves rehabilitating the storefront of the annex based on old photos. Clear glass will substitute for the missing original prism glass of the transoms. The design of the storefront bulkheads cannot be seen in the old photographs, but follows the design of the transom bars.

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

Mr. Baron presented the to Committee several historic photographs of the annex to the Victory Building which illustrate the various storefronts that once occupied the first floor. Staff worked with Jonathan Broh, the architect, who designed a storefront that utilized the existing metal transom bars and restored the granite columns. Mr. Broh asked if the storefronts could be made of wood instead of metal. The Committee believed that since the existing historic transom bars are metal, the new elements should match in material.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the storefront design with metal frames, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated 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.].

lms

1238 Pine Street

Fitima Soudi, Owner

Cheon Won Suh, Applicant

DATE: 1831

PROPOSAL: Legalize exhaust fan

This application calls for legalizing the installation of a fan to vent kitchen exhaust from a first floor restaurant on this corner building. There have been several former restaurant tenants in the space and one of them installed a fan in a transom window area without approval. Mr. Suh who has very recently rented the space had the exterior fan replaced in preparation for his use of the space presumably also for a restaurant.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 9.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal. Cheon Won Suh, the tenant, and Sherry Young, his interpreter, attended the meeting. Mr. Suh said that the owner of the property is the former restaurant owner, who had installed the previous fan. Mr. Suh noted that he was not sure how much cooking he would be doing on the premises because most of his menu would include sushi. Committee members recommended that he contact the Health Department and the Department of Licenses and Inspections to see what ventilation would be required. Committee members asked if the vent could be run through the building to the roof. Mr. Suh answered that it may be possible because the space on the second floor is currently empty.

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

lms

902 Spruce Street

Brian Management, Owner, Principal, Matthew Semola

Hugh Zimmers, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1831, Thomas U. Walter, architect

PROPOSAL: Shed dormer on rear ell

This proposal calls for the excavation of the basement level for a stair and windows and a large dormer addition on the roof of the ell. The roof addition has been reduced in size from that seen at the last meeting and now preserves more of the historic roof structure. The plans also show the excavation of the basement with two sliding-glass doors. The Committee recommended approval of the basement alterations at the previous month's meeting.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standard 9.

Mr. Baron described the revised proposal for a shed dormer on the west side of the building's rear ell. The owners, Alan Delfiner and Matt Semola, attended the meeting with their architect, Hugh Zimmers. The plans show cement clapboards and a rubber roof. Committee members stated that the siding should be wood, as well as the new one-over-one windows.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the shed dormer with wood

windows and clapboarding. As before, the Committee voted to recommend approval of the basement alterations, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment].

lms

1700 Green Street

Allen Scott, Owner

David Hauser, Applicant

DATE: 1987, John Bushnell, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace front doors

This proposal calls for legalizing a set of recently installed double-leaf solid-panel wood front doors. The doors were installed without a permit on a non-contributing rowhouse constructed as part of a larger development in the Spring Garden Historic District in 1987. The solid doors replaced the original double-leaf glazed doors. Original double-leaf glazed doors still hang on the other rowhouses in this development.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5.

Mr. Baron presented the project to legalize the replacement of the original glazed front doors with paneled wood doors. He explained that the row house had been constructed in 1987. Elaborating, he stated that the application prompted a larger question about how the Historical Commission will treat proposals to alter recently constructed buildings within districts. Mr. Rivera asked the owner, Allen Scott, to clarify the 1st-story plan of the building. He asked especially about whether the door in question leads to a common vestibule or to the interior of a single unit. Mr. Scott, the owner, answered that the door leads directly to his living room. He further explained that he changed from a glazed to a paneled door for privacy and security. Several Committee members agreed that a solid door was appropriate for a rowhouse entrance; a glazed door, they asserted, would be appropriate for an apartment building entrance. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he concurred with the staff and thought that the original glazed door should be preserved.

Mr. Scott agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

The Architectural Committee voted 3 to 1 to recommend approval of the legalization.

JF

2238-40 Mt Vernon Street

Jack Gallo and Gage Johnston, Owners

Michael Bruder, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: 4th floor addition on rear ell with balconies, new garden wall

This application proposes the addition of a 4th story with French doors and balcony on a portion of the rear ell of 2238 Green Street, the addition of a balcony with French doors at the 2nd story of the same rear ell, and a garden wall at the rears of 2238 and 2240. The parcels at 2238 and

2240 have been consolidated into one property. Owing to its location at the southeast corner of 23rd and Mt. Vernon Streets, the rear of this property is highly visible. The existing rear ell at 2238 is not historic. The addition on the rear ell would be small, about 12 by 12 feet, and faced with a stucco-like material. The balconies would be simple metal structures. The 8-foot wall would be constructed of CMU and finished with stucco and a stone cap. Details of the gate are not provided and its position is not consistent between drawings.

At its March 2003 meeting, the Architectural Committee reviewed a similar proposal that consisted of the components included in the current proposal as well as a roof deck with penthouse. The Committee recommended approval of the components included in the current proposal, but denial of the roof deck with penthouse. The application was withdrawn before the Commission meeting.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided the height of the wall is reduced from 8 feet to 6 feet, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the project to the Committee. He noted that the staff considered all aspects of the project appropriate except the height of the garden wall. An eight-foot wall at the sidewalk, he stated, would obstruct views and detract from the pedestrian experience. Mike Bruder, the contractor, then commented on the proposal. He stated that the eight-foot wall was needed for privacy and security. He added that other eight-foot walls exist in the immediate neighborhood. Elaborating, he stated that the height was needed at the sidewalk along 23rd Street because the ground slopes upward to the east. The eight-foot wall would stand only four or six feet above ground at the eastern edge of the property, he claimed. About the gate or gates in the wall, he stated that the owners had not yet decided where they would be positioned. Committee members discussed the project and decided that the addition and balconies were acceptable as proposed, but that the proposed wall was too tall. They decided that a six-foot wall with steps in the south wall to maintain a height of six feet was more appropriate than the eight-foot wall. They decided that the most suitable location for a step, if needed, would be at a gate positioned at the center point of the south wall.

Mr. Bruder, the contractor, disagreed with the Committee's decision about the height of the wall, but could not speak for the owner.

The Architectural Committee recommends approval, provided the height of the wall is reduced from 8 feet to 6 feet, with a step in the south wall if needed, preferably at the gate, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

JF

1627 Wallace Street

Ralph Pungitore, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Legalize stucco on side and rear

This application proposes legalizing the stucco recently applied to the side and rear of the rear ell of the rowhouse at 1627 Wallace Street. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation for unpermitted stucco and window replacement on 21 July 2003. This application does

not address any window replacement. The rear ell is highly visible from 17th and North Streets across a large vacant lot.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6.

Mr. Tyler presented the project. No one attended to represent the application. Committee members reviewed the application and photographs. They noted that all stuccoing requires a building permit regardless of historical status because stucco can be used to hide structural defects. They then decided that they needed more information.

The Architectural Committee recommends that an inspector from the Department of Licenses & Inspections examine the property and determine if the stuccoing of the rear ell facades is necessary or if the repointing of the brick would be sufficient. If the stucco is necessary, the Committee recommends legalization; if not, it recommends denial, pursuant to 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 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; and Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.].

JF

625 North 16th Street

Jonathan Oler, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Retaining wall

This application proposes adding a CMU retaining wall to separate the rear yards of 625 and 627 N. 16th Street. The yards, which slope to the south, will be leveled, creating a 2-foot drop at the property line. The owners of both properties approve of the construction of the wall. The wall would be faced with stucco (champagne color, sand finish) and capped. It would be visible from Wallace Street, which runs along the south side of the yard at 625; the wall would run along the north side of the yard. Although not proposed, the retaining wall may require a fence along the top to meet the building code.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the wall, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application and noted that the wall would be visible from Wallace Street. The Committee reviewed the plans. Mr. Rivera expressed concern about the structural stability of the wall, owing to its height. Ms. Pentz concurred. The Committee agreed that the wall could be approved based on its architectural merits; however, it suggested that the applicant consult with an engineer for the structural details of the wall.

Jonathan Oler, the owner, agreed with the Committee's recommendations.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion,

and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]. The Committee suggested that the applicant consult with an engineer for the structural details.

DMH

224 Market Street

Scott and David Stein, Owners

Thomas Citro, Applicant

DATE: c. 1920

PROPOSAL: New storefront

This application proposes the renovation of the four-bay storefront at 224 Market Street. The proposal stipulates single-leaf glazed doors in the outer bays and bi-fold windows in the inner bays. Double transoms would be installed in all bays. No details such as materials are provided for the doors and windows. At its February 2003 meeting, the Architectural Committee reviewed and recommended denial of an even less appropriate proposal by the same applicant. The application was withdrawn before the Commission meeting. Although this proposal is an improvement over the previous one, no attempt has been made to restore the existing historic fabric and recreate the missing elements. Much of the historic storefront exists and the missing elements such as the double-leaf doors and transoms are thoroughly documented by Commission photographs.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2, 3, 5, 6, and Restoration Standard 7.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. He stated the proposed work cannot be considered restoration. He added that some of the historic fabric is extant and that, with help of the Commission's historic photographs, a restoration could be undertaken. Thomas Citro, David and Scott Stein, the owners, Adam Zangrilli, the designer, attended the meeting. Mr. Citro presented photographs of other buildings on the block as evidence of the appropriateness of his proposal. The staff noted that Old City is not yet a district and that many buildings in the area have not been under the Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Citro then pointed out that the existing doors at the subject property are beyond repair and need to be replaced and that the applicant proposes to clean the masonry and remove the old signage.

Ms. Pentz inquired about the double transom proposed for the storefront. Mr. Zangrilli, the designer, stated that the east doorway currently has a double transom and that this double transom would be extended across the entire storefront. Mr. Farnham noted that current door, transom, and boarded sidelight in the eastern doorway are non-historic. Committee members insisted that the new design should not be based on non-historic infill. If based on the non-historic door, the storefront proportions would be entirely inappropriate. Mr. Farnham added that the historic transom and pilasters for that doorway are extant. Committee members agreed that they should be reused as the basis for the renovation. Mr. Zangrilli stated that he chose a standard size door for economic reasons and that its height dictated the double transom. Ms. Pentz contended that the applicant should base the renovation of the storefront on the historic storefront.

Committee members further discussed the proposal with the applicants and concluded that the submitted drawings are inadequate. They claimed that they are incomplete, difficult to read, and do not depict the entirety of the work to be undertaken. Also, full information on existing conditions has not been provided. They noted, for example, that it remains unclear whether or not the original storefront cornice exists under the plywood box above the storefront. If it is extant, they stated, it should be restored. Mr. Levy asked Mr. Zangrilli why the stone step at the east

entrance seen in recent photographs does not appear on his drawing. Mr. Zangrilli replied that they intended to remove the step for accessibility. Mr. Levy then stated that its removal might be acceptable, but that the removal as well as all other work must be documented on the drawings. Committee members again asserted that the drawings were inadequate. Mr. Levy stated that a plan should have been included. Without a plan, he claimed, it is impossible to understand the proposed storefront. He stated that he was unable to determine if the proposed doors were recessed or not. Mr. Rivera agreed that the plans were not adequate. Mr. Farnham informed the Committee that he and Mr. Tyler along with Edward Jackson of the Department of Licenses & Inspections had met with Mr. Citro and the Steins in early July to discuss the project. At that meeting, Mr. Tyler had informed Mr. Citro that the submitted drawings were incomplete and that the proposed design did not satisfy the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*.

Mr. Citro then requested that the Committee grant him a temporary approval, with updated plans to be submitted in the future, so that the project could move forward. He noted that the restaurant has been ready to open since early July, but he cannot obtain a Certificate of Occupancy without two means of egress. Mr. Baron informed the applicants that there is no provision for temporary permits within the Commission's ordinance or *Rules and Regulations*.

Committee members concluded the applicants did not provide adequate information on existing conditions or adequate drawings documenting the proposed work. They also concluded that the submission fails to propose a plan compatible with the historic storefront. They therefore decided that the proposal was inadequate and inappropriate on several grounds. They suggested to the applicants that they explore the existing conditions and work with staff to devise a more suitable proposal.

The applicants did not agree with the Committee's recommendation.

The Architectural Committee recommends denial, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 3 [Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.]; Standard 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.]; and Restoration Standard 7 [Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.].

DMH

241 Chestnut Street

Carolyn Caton, Owner

Jon Wagner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1857, Stephen Button, architect

PROPOSAL: Canopy

This application proposes the addition of a three-piece canopy to the storefront at 241 Chestnut

Street. At its July 2003 meeting, the Commission approved new windows, a frameless door system, concrete steps, and bullet-glass sidewalk panels for the easternmost three bays of this four-bay storefront. At that time, it referred a revised canopy design presented at the Commission meeting back to the Committee. This application proposes that revised design. The canopy would consist of three aluminum and colored acrylic components, one over each bay. The canopy would be held aloft with cables tying into the storefront cornice. The connections of the cables and canopy to the cast iron storefront are not detailed. In plan, the canopy would be a streamlined, biomorphic form, not a rectangle.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and Restoration Standard 7. The staff would recommend approval of a contemporary canopy over the frameless door or traditional awnings over all bays, provided that the mounting connections did not damage the significant cast iron storefront.

Mr. Farnham presented the project. Jon Wagner, the architect, attended the meeting. He presented the Committee with a slightly revised design that adjusted the shape of the canopy, making it symmetrical. Committee members asked Mr. Wagner to explain how the canopies would be connected to the storefront. He explained that in most cases the canopies would connect to wood members; the canopy over the door would connect to cast iron. Committee members discussed the connections and Mr. Levy asked if the applicant could redesign the doorway canopy to avoid the cast iron and connect to wood only. He replied that he could and would update the design so that all connections would be made to wood, not cast iron. During the ensuing discussion about the appropriateness of the contemporary canopies on the historic building, Mr. Wagner reminded the Committee that the current design had been suggested by Committee members at the previous review of the project. He then presented a sample of the proposed transparent orange material for the canopies. Mr. D'Alessandro objected to the color.

Charles Tonetti of the National Park Service expressed Independence National Historical Park's opposition to the canopies. He stated that the canopies would intrude on the streetscape and that they would adversely impact the historic structure. He also expressed concern about the possibility of future signage and lighting on the canopies as well as the precedent set by the canopies. Mr. Tonetti said that he could support an awning over to the business entrance. He presented a letter from Mary Bomar, the park's superintendent, stating the park's official position.

Committee members agreed that the awnings would be appropriate and could easily be removed at a later date. They did suggest that an opaque material be used instead of the transparent material proposed. Three members approved of the color; one member thought the color inappropriate.

Mr. Wagner, the architect, accepted the Committee's recommendation, but could not speak for the business and building owners.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided an opaque material is substituted for the transparent material.

DMH

508 South 3rd Street

Jason Beccaris, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830, new façade, c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Roof deck

This application seeks the legalization of a roof deck reconstructed without a building permit. An informal roof deck consisting of planks laid directly on the roof and a metal railing existed at the time of designation. The applicant removed that decking and railing and replaced it with a deck consisting of a wood structure, wood decking, and wood railing. The new deck is much more visible owing to the new structure, which raises the level of the deck above that of the original deck, and the new wood railing, which is much less transparent than the original metal railing. This rowhouse does not have a rear ell, the most appropriate location for a roof deck. Also, a small penthouse with a door providing roof access was erected many years before designation.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided the front railing is set back from the front façade to a point where it is entirely invisible from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Jason Beccaris, the owner, attended the meeting and stated that the existing deck needed to be replaced because it was damaging the roof. During the replacement, a substructure was added, raising the level of the deck, and the railing material was changed to wood pickets.

The Committee members contended that the front railing should be set back to preclude visibility. They suggested that, if the Commission accepted their recommendation, the staff should visit the site and determine how far the railing would need to be moved back from the front façade to render it invisible.

Mr. Beccaris agreed with the Committee's recommendation to legalize the deck, but prefers not to have to move the railing.

The Architectural Committee recommended legalization of the deck, provided the railing is set back to a point where it is invisible, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and the Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as ... decks and terraces ... when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

DMH

The meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Commission staff