

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Room 578, City Hall
31 May 2005**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Ruddy D'Alessandro
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz
Robert Thomas, AIA

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

Also

Michael D. Swiszczy, University of Pennsylvania
Shelley Frater, Equivest Management
Michael Resnic, Blackney Hayes Architects
Harold Lichtman, GLP Architects
Raymond Rola, Raymond Rola Architects
Bill Whalon
Dan Griffith, Wachovia Bank
Mike Maddalo, Sr., NW Sign
Mike Maddalo, Jr., NW Sign
Chris Kytzidis, 560 North 16th Street
Bobbie Burke, 1818 Fairmount Avenue
John Sabatini, Marshall Sabatini Architects
Carolyn Addis, Marshall Sabatini Architects
Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association
Judy Robinson, Woodcock Design
Kevin Fleming
Orest Poslusznij, Soong Associates
Mary C. Matriciano, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Josefa Castineira, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Ramon Castineira, Queen Village Neighbors Association
David W. O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Colleen Cinder, Michael Singer Real Estate
Craig Deutsch, Harman Deutsch Architects
Virgil Procaccino, Owner, 261 South 22nd Street/ 262 S. Van Pelt Street
Arthur Elwood, Owner, 261 South 22nd Street/262 S. Van Pelt Street
Robert Brockway, 1921 Panama Street
John Moore, resident, 261/262/263 South 22nd Street
Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance

Decima Anderson, 262 South Van Pelt Street
 Michael Skolnick, PZA Architect
 John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
 Greg Hill, Brown Hill Development
 Collin Jones, TGG
 Serge Nalbantian, Brown Hill Development
 David Mercuris, The Goldenberg Group
 John Miller
 M. Bacall, Society Hill
 Robert Powers, Powers and Company
 Gregg Pasquarelli, SHoP Architects
 Jonathan Mallie, SHoP Architects
 Colleen O'Keefe, SHoP Architects
 Jane Wilson, Ralph Fey Architects
 Gagan Lakhama, Allied Development
 John Tucker, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
 Kevin Smith, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
 Vicki Leon
 Jane Glenn, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
 David Dinenberg, Metro Development
 Marjorie Stern Jacobs, Esq., Fox Rothschild, LLP
 Robert Powers
 James Rowe, Agoos Lovera
 Molly Rose, Idletime Network
 Craig Mandenberg, Idletime Network
 John VanZeebroeck, Idletime Network
 Tom Brobaker, Owner
 Robert Levitt, Parkominium
 William G. Schwartz, Esq., 231 North 3rd Street
 Joseph Clark, 2502 South Garnet Street
 Adam E. Laver, 1708 Green Street
 Neil Sandvold, Sandvold Blanda, 1709 Brandywine Street
 Fred Duling, 1709 Brandywine Street
 Clay Cann, LR Associates, 633 North 16th Street

Vincent Rivera, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:25 a.m.

3700 Locust Walk, Phi Delta Theta

University of Pennsylvania, Owner

Richard Russell, Applicant

DATE: Designed by Robert R. McGoodwin in 1924. Designated 2/7/1974

PROPOSAL: Remove fire escape and doors, infill openings with windows and brick

This application proposes changes to the 1924 Georgian Revival Phi Delta Theta fraternity house on Locust Walk. The proposed work would be located on the visible, yet starkly plain, rear façade of the property. This application does not propose any changes to the more elaborate facades along Locust Walk or 37th Street.

The proposed changes include the removal of an existing exterior steel and concrete fire emergency stair. The emergency egress stairs would be relocated to the interior of the building. Eight doorways would be rendered obsolete by the removal of the stairs. The

applicant proposes to convert four obsolete door openings to double hung wood windows with recessed brick infill to match the existing and to infill the remaining four openings with recessed brick to match the existing.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Danta described the proposal. Michael Swiszez and Michael Resnic attended the meeting. Mr. Resnic presented photographs to demonstrate the limited visibility of the proposed alterations. Mr. D'Alessandro pointed out that the plans should reflect wood double hung windows, as are being proposed.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

100 North 17th Street aka 1701 Arch Street

1701 Partners, LP, owner

Shelley Frater, Applicant

DATE: Robert Morris Hotel (Wesley Building) constructed in two phases 1914 and 1921.

Designated 1/7/1982

PROPOSAL: Exterior lighting

This application proposes exterior electrical work on the 17th Street façade of the Gothic Revival Robert Morris Hotel. The exterior of this building is clad in highly ornamented white paste terracotta. The Historical Commission approved the installation of recessed lights in the niches at each pier in February 1984. The applicant now wishes to reinstall lights in the same locations. It is unclear however, how these lights were electrified in 1984. The applicant proposes to run an exposed conduit from pier to pier, which would be painted to match the white paste terracotta. (Note: applicant's memorandum in packet mentions attachment of conduit to wood, but it is, in fact, terracotta.)

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the lighting scheme in the existing holes, given that the electrical conduits are run internally through the wall, not strung along the terracotta façade, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Danta explained the proposal. After reviewing the plans, the Committee concluded that the applicant should explore the use of interior conduits owing to the fragileness of the terra cotta. Mr. D'Alessandro offered that the applicant should provide more detailed drawings.

Shelly Frater, the applicant, informed the Committee that over time interior walls had been constructed which rendered the existing holes inaccessible. She also commented that the owner does not wish to incur any additional expense. Ms. Frater cited the lighting recently installed on Roman Catholic High School.

Mr. Rivera thought that the applicant should explore using the existing conduits; the Committee concurred.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend the approval of the lighting itself, but denial of any external conduits, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired].

1617 John F. Kennedy Boulevard, Suite 107

One Penn Management, LLC, Owner

Raymond Rola, Architect/Applicant

DATEI Outstanding Art Deco building constructed in 1930 for the Pennsylvania Railroad Company by architects Graham, Anderson, Probst & White

PROPOSAL: New exhaust louver

This application proposes to install a new exhaust louver in an existing glazed transom. This change would take place along the J.F.K Boulevard façade. There is an existing similar louver over the doorway just to the east of the proposed site in this application. The new louver would match the existing one and have a bronze finish to match the Art Deco window surrounds and door jam. In addition, the applicant proposes to install a black film on the upper portion of the window, which would match the appearance on the other windows.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the louver and window film, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Danta presented the application. Mr. D'Alessandro inquired about the need for the louver. He believed that the intake does not require such a large louver and that the applicant should investigate using the Cuthbert Street façade. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the engineer explore connecting the new system to the existing intake along JFK Boulevard. He also stated that no exhaust should be allowed along the JFK Boulevard façade; only intakes should be allowed on that street facade.

Raymond Rola, the architect, attended the meeting. He explained that he is uncertain about whether enough exhaust can be achieved through the JFK Boulevard façade alone and that the proposed location is a difficult space to exhaust. Mr. Rola offered to install the louver in the soffit which would not be visible. Mr. D'Alessandro and the Committee concurred that the soffit location is an appropriate solution.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the louver as submitted, but approval of a louver in the soffit and the installation of a black film on the upper portion of the windows.

112 Market Street

Jung Wha Ahn, Owner

Harold Lichtman, Applicant

DATE: Designated 10/07/1976; 12/12/2003, contributing to the Old City Historic District

PROPOSAL: Four-story addition on top-story building

This application proposes to add a four-story addition on an existing two-story, two-bay building on the 100-block of Market Street. The building was constructed circa 1840 and had its top floors subsequently removed. In 1988 the Historical Commission approved a new storefront, which remains in place today.

The applicant would like to execute construction in two phases. Phase One would add one story to the existing building and alter its façade and fenestration. Phase Two would add the remaining two and a half stories. The complete building would be a five and a half-story, two-bay building with a recessed balcony at the fourth-story level and a standing seam metal roof with a dormer.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Rehabilitation Guidelines.

Mr. Danta described the proposal. Harold Lichtman, the architect, and Jung Wha Ahn and Ji Choon Ahn, the owners, attended the meeting. Mr. Lichtman said that the building, which originally had four stories, was damaged in a fire about 40 years ago. After the fire, the upper stories were removed. He said that the overall streetscape consists of four-story buildings. Mr. Lichtman offered that the proposed alterations would include brick, casement windows with divided lights, and a new storefront

Mr. Tyler commented that he is confident that the building once was four stories and he urged the applicant to research the historic building in order to achieve a restoration or design a contemporary addition over the existing structure. Mr. Tyler asserted that the building should not have a pitched roof and that the façade should be kept flush with the neighboring buildings. He accepted the proposed materials. Mr. Rivera stressed that the proposed dormer is inappropriate. Mr. D'Alessandro commented on the appropriateness of Phase One; however, he believes that the cornice height should be respected. Mr. Rivera thought that the proposed construction will have too much of an impact on the streetscape and that the building should be restored to the historic four stories. Ms. Pentz remarked that the proposed balcony is inappropriate. Mr. Tyler concluded that, once the historic research has been completed, the applicant should meet with staff for guidance.

Mr. Lichtman stressed that his intent had not been to give a false historical appearance. After listening to the Committee's comments, Mr. Lichtman offered to withdraw the proposal and resubmit an updated design at a later date.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired]; and the Rehabilitation Guidelines [Not Recommended: Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced feature is

based in insufficient physical, historical, and pictorial; documentation or on information derived from another building.].

153 North 3rd Street

Bill Whalon, Owner

Jesse Carpenter, Applicant

DATE: 4-story 2-bay brick Italianate building with storefront. Built c. 1845 by Joseph Rubicam. Designated 08/16/1978; 12/12/2003, contributing to the Old City Historic District

PROPOSAL: Legalize new doors

This application proposes legalization of a new front door on North 3rd Street. The designation photograph shows a two-leaf paneled and glazed door with a recessed round knob. The surviving muntins show a typical Greek Revival configuration, which would be expected in a building of this era. The door in the designation photograph has muntins that do not extend the entire height of the glazed panel. They only extend about half the length of the panel. This, however, is likely the result of a later alteration, given that the proportions and distribution of the rest of the door, including the upper glazed section, corresponds to a door of this period.

Historical research in the commission's office yielded an insurance survey of 1847 for this property. The insurance describes a two-leaf door with glazed upper panels. The dimensions and distribution correspond to the door in the designation photograph. It thus strengthens the staff's assertion that the door at the time of designation was most likely the original door to this property.

The applicant replaced the door owing to its deteriorated condition. The new door is also a two-leaf design constructed out of solid wood with six true-divided lights. The new handle is a brushed stain steel pull bar.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the legalization, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Danta explained the proposal for legalization and noted that the installed door is not Greek Revival in style. Also, the molding does not match. He noted that the proportions of the glazing and the panels are at issue. Mr. Baron informed the Committee that the historic doors in the designation photo had large panes in the middle with narrower flanking panes on the side and flush panels at the bottom with door handles recessed into the door.

Jessie Carpenter and Bill Whalon attended the meeting. Mr. Carpenter stated that the 2½-inch thick mahogany door was constructed to match the thickness of the historic door. The glazing was intended to replicate the glazing of the existing upper-floor windows. Mr. Whalon said that he used area doors as a basis for this door design as well as the historic photograph.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the legalization, 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 with documentary and physical

evidence.]

1 South Broad Street

Broad One, LP, Owner

Michael Maddalo, Applicant

DATE: Bell, 1926, Gillett & Johnston Foundry, belfry, 1931, John Windrim, architect

PROPOSAL: Signage on bell tower

This application proposes the installation of a new sign at the base of the belfry atop 1 South Broad Street. The bell was installed in 1926 at the Wanamaker Department store. It was moved to its present location in 1931. John Windrim designed the building and belfry, which was planned specifically to hold the 15-ton bell.

In June 2004 the applicant presented a much more elaborate scheme, which included an illuminated Wachovia spiral atop the tower, to the Historical Commission. The Commission approved the proposal as submitted by a close vote of 5 to 4. The applicant now proposes a simpler Wachovia sign on top of the tower where the PNB sign now stands. The new sign would consist of internally illuminated letters spelling "Wachovia" on all four sides of the tower. However, the signs would differ in size. The north and south facing signs would be larger than the east and west facing signs.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided that the sign is curved in the manner of the sign approved in June 2004 to better correspond to the belfry, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Danta described the proposal. Mike Maddalo, Mike Maddalo Jr., and Dan Griffith attended the meeting. Mr. Maddalo noted that the letters of the proposal approved by the Commission on June 2004 had a span of 70 feet, which proved structurally not sound. The larger set of letters currently proposed are flush against the steel and the steel does not allow for the curving of the letters. He said that the building is shorter on two sides and longer on two sides. Mr. Maddalo stressed the importance of the safety issue. He said that a frame exists around the entire building connecting to the steel. The proposed signage would cantilever out on the short sides. Mr. Maddalo stated that the landlord will not allow the approved signage and that Wachovia is limited to the current sign location.

Ms. Pentz thought that the applicant could work more with the shape of the existing belfry as long as the word Wachovia remains within confines of the rectangular shape of the building. Mr. Rivera suggested elliptical signs. Mr. Griffith mentioned that the curved sign would not as visible. Committee members concurred with the possibility of four signs, all five feet tall. The applicant was receptive to this suggestion.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial as submitted, but recommended approval of two signs that respond to the shape of the building or four five-foot tall signs.

560 North 16th Street

Chris Kytzidis, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855 front rebuilt mid 20th century.

PROPOSAL: Install vinyl windows

This proposal requests approval to install two nine-over-nine and four six-over-six vinyl windows in the front façade. Mr. Kytzidis originally proposed wood two-over-two windows in the top floor, where a fire had occurred. He spoke with Ms. Spina over the telephone and was told that he should consider a more contemporary window because the façade is a twentieth-century replacement. Ms. Spina explained the application process to him. He misinterpreted her suggestion to investigate more contemporary windows and ordered vinyl windows with sandwiched muntins.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Kytzidis attended the meeting and explained that he had replaced the façade and installed one-over-one aluminum windows in 1982, before the district was designated. He said that he had been willing to install two-over-two wood windows, but he misunderstood Ms. Spina's comment regarding the possibility of installing more contemporary windows. She did explain to him that he would need to apply for a permit regardless of the window chosen, but he ordered the windows thinking that he would have no problem getting them approved. He said that the context of this building includes many vacant lots. He proposed to remove metal bars in front of the first-floor windows if the Commission will approve his vinyl windows.

Committee members noted that it would not be possible to remove the muntins because they are sandwiched between the layers of glass.

Suzanne Pentz proposed a compromise of allowing the installation of the third-floor windows where the fire occurred but retaining the one-over-one windows on the other floors and removal of the first-floor bars.

The applicant explained that while he was out of town recently his contractor installed all six windows without his permission.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended denial, pursuant to 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 the installation of wood one-over-one windows.

403 South 3rd Street

John Grassi, Owner

John DiNuovo, Applicant

DATE: c. 1827

PROPOSAL: Rear addition and roof deck

This application proposes adding an addition and roof deck to the rear of this row-house. The addition would occupy a space enclosed by the rear ell and a rear addition.

The deck would sit on top of that new addition. The work, except for the deck railing, would be minimally visible from Pine Street. The applicant also proposes to cut several new windows in the existing rear façade of a later addition, which is partially stuccoed.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

The meeting was attended by the architects Mr. Sabatini and Ms. Addis. Mr. Baron explained that the rear additions appear to date from the twentieth century and have been partially stuccoed.

Rebecca Stoloff of the Society Hill Civic Association inquired about the location of the addition.

The Committee members discussed the merits of different materials for the deck. Mr. Riviera stated that the deck should not be constructed of green plywood.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval of the project subject to the construction of the deck with painted Trex, cedar, or mahogany with simple vertical pickets, 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.]

248 South 22nd Street

Abilio Centurion, Owner

Judy Robinson, Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Replace storefront, façade alterations

This submission proposes alterations to the front façade of an Italianate-style rowhouse. In the mid twentieth century, the first-floor residential windows were removed and a storefront window added. The applicant proposes to remove the existing store window and install a tripartite small-pane window with an operable center casement. On the upper floors, the applicant proposes the replacement of the brick molding around the windows. A new door based on a 1920s door from a house around the corner is proposed as a replacement.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Judy Robinson, the architect for the project, attended the meeting. She explained that the home owners like the small pane windows for privacy and residential character. They like the look of a door on a house nearby and propose to replicate that door.

Committee members had concerns about the details of the new window frames, transoms, as well as the size of the glass in the proposed storefront. They did not find the proposed door appropriate to the house.

They discussed alterations to the design which the applicant said she would incorporate into a revised design.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a revised design with a four-panel door and larger panes of glass in the first-floor window, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]

1812 Fairmount Avenue

Kevin Fleming, Owner

Sabrina Soong, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c.1855

PROPOSAL: New façade, cut garage in front wall

This application proposes restoring or demolishing the front façade of this stuccoed row-house and rebuilding it with a garage opening. The brick has been covered in perma-stone; however, past projects have demonstrated that it is often possible to remove this covering and repoint the old brick with good results.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the demolition and addition of the garage, pursuant to Standard 6.

The application was represented by the owner Kevin Fleming and his architects Sabrina Soong and Orest Poslusnyj.

Mr. Fleming explained that he would like to have parking in the building, which will house two residential units and his office. He showed photographs of other buildings on the block with garages in the front façades.

Committee members saw no justification for the demolition of the façade, but did encourage Mr. Fleming to remove the perma-stone and restore the existing façade. They voiced no objection to the rear addition, which Ms. Soong explained would not be visible from a public right-of-way. None of the Committee members supported cutting a garage into the front façade.

Bobbie Burke, whose daughter lives on the block, voiced her objection to the cutting of a garage in the front façade. She pointed out that the other buildings with garages on the block were either new buildings or buildings altered before the creation of the district. She asked if the applicant met with the neighborhood group. The applicant responded no, but that he had received zoning approval.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended denial of the demolition of the façade and the addition of the garage door, but approval of the rear addition and the removal of the perma-stone from the façade, 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 a property...].

620 South Hancock Street

Ramon and Josefa Castiniera, Owners/Applicants

History: built c. 1880

PROPOSAL: Install vinyl windows, six panel door, replace marble lintels and sills

The applicants propose to change the windows on this rowhouse. Currently, the building has wood two-over-two windows on the first floor and wood one-over-one windows on the second floor with storm windows. The applicants have owned the house for many years, but have lived in a nearby house they own. They plan to move into this house soon and they would like to install six-over-six vinyl windows with snap-on muntins and a new six-panel door. They would like to repoint the façade and install new stone lintels or rotate the existing ones because the stone is eroding. They claim an economic hardship.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

The application was represented by Ms. Matricianni and her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Castaniera. Ms. Matricianni explained that they investigated the cost of the wood windows and found them too expensive. She provided pictures of other buildings in the area with vinyl windows. She said that the door and windows were in poor condition and drafty. She explained that her parents have limited income and would like to install new windows that will look attractive and be easy to clean.

The Architectural Committee recommended wood two-over-two windows and a four-panel door. They explained that if the owners are unable afford that solution they should consider repairing the existing windows and installing new storm windows. Mr. Riviera explained how the weight boxes could be insulated and new sash installed without removal of the existing frames. Mr. Baron offered to work with the applicants on finding a less expensive replacement window. He said that there are wood windows with a paint-like coating that carries a warranty. Committee members expressed a concern that removing the marble sills would be both expensive and damaging to historic fabric.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended denial, 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.].

1101 Spruce Street

Michael Singer, Owner

David Singer, Applicant

DATE: 1889, Brown & Day, Architect

PROPOSAL: Legalize storefront alterations

This submission proposes legalizing the installation of small-pane café windows in a storefront that had had large single panes of glass. After car crashed into and damaged the storefront, the café owner replaced the windows without a permit. The owner of the building, Mr. Singer, proposes to partially restore the transoms of the storefront and raise the sign above the transom to bring back some of its historic character.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 10.

Mr. Singer and Ms. Ginder represented the proposal. It was explained that Mr. Singer proposes to restore the transom section of the windows and had replaced the iron bars damaged in the accident.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended legalizing the new storefront, subject to the restoration of the transom, pursuant to 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.].

1921 Panama Street

Robert and Linda Brockway, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1985, Contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Residential Historic District

PROPOSAL: Modify entryway

This application proposes altering the front doorway and side panels from a vaguely Japanese design to a Colonial Revival design. The applicant offers two possible Colonial Revival designs. The door and panels would not be replaced but rather modified with the addition and subtraction of wood elements. Previous to designation, the building had a Colonial Revival doorway.

Staff recommendation; Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Brockway, the owner, and Mr. DuBree represented the application. They explained that they found the current doorway very much out of keeping with the neighborhood. Mr. DuBree planned to add Fypon elements to the existing door to create one of the two proposed designs. He said that the building originally had two doors for separate units, which have been combined. The owner wishes to avoid the expense of changing the interior of the house.

The Committee members deemed neither design appropriate. They did not think the amount of projection or the use of Fypon appropriate to the building. Mr. D'Alessandro in particular had concerns about the inaccuracy of the drawings, noting the second-floor balcony. Members thought the applicant should retain the existing design, recreate the design shown in the 1986 photograph, or develop a new design with staff assistance.

Mr. Thomas joined the two other members, examined the documents and agreed with their recommendations.

The applicant agreed to withdraw the application to work with staff on a more appropriate design and drawing.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended denial, 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.].

226 Fitzwater Street

Steve and Dawn Levi, Owners

Craig Deutsch, Architect/Applicant

Owners: Dawn and Steve Levi

Applicant: Craig Deutsch

DATE: 1807

PROPOSAL: Architectural Committee review of rear addition details

This application proposes the side façade details of a third-story addition at the rear of the rear ell of this brick rowhouse. At its March 2005 meeting, the Commission approved the addition, provided the facing material of the west or side façade is better differentiated from the existing stucco party wall, with the Architectural Committee to review details.

The applicant has proposed two schemes for the finishing of the side façade at the addition. The first scheme proposes a 5.5"-wide project band of darker stucco framing the addition. The second scheme proposes a 1.25" reveal framing the addition.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the second scheme, the 1.25" reveal, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. The three Committee members present, Ms. Pentz and Messrs. Thomas and D'Alessandro, agreed that the second scheme was the more appropriate of the two.

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to approve the second scheme, the 1.25" reveal, 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.].

262 South Van Pelt Street and 261 South 22nd Street

Christian Street Partners, Owners

Craig Deutsch, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 262 S. Van Pelt – 1921; 261 S. 22nd – c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Amend approved plans; add four feet to rear of building

In November and December 2004, the Commission approved a complex project to reconstruct an L-shaped building with facades on 22nd and Van Pelt Streets as three separate townhouses at 261 and 263 S. 22nd Street and 262 S. Van Pelt Street. The approval included demolition at the center of the building, dividing the single structure into three. The approval also included new rear facades for all buildings and third-story additions on two of the three buildings. A two-and three-story brick party wall running east-west along the north property line from Van Pelt to 22nd Street was retained and extended up to three stories at the Van Pelt end.

The approved townhouses at 261 S. 22nd Street and 262 S. Van Pelt Street are 66' deep. The developers would like to add four feet in length to each building, making them 70' deep. The approved rear facades would be relocated but otherwise unchanged. The north party wall, which is brick and minimally visible, is three stories at the east and west ends and two stories at the center. At the west, at 261 S. 22nd Street, the north party wall is three stories in height to a depth of 85'-6". Therefore, the party wall would not be altered for the proposed extension of the building. All changes for 261 S. 22nd Street would take place behind the existing party wall out of the view of the public. At the east, at 262 S. Van Pelt Street, the north party wall is three stories in height to a depth of 66'; therefore, the party wall would need to be altered for the extension of the building 70'. A four-foot-wide section of the north party wall would be raised in brick from two to three stories. The rears of the buildings are not visible from the south.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the four-foot rear additions to 261 S. 22nd Street and 262 S. Van Pelt Street, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. The architect for the project, Craig Deutsch, explained that the additional four feet would improve the layouts of the rooms at the rears of the buildings.

John Moore, the neighbor to the north on Van Pelt Street, said that many of the neighbors opposed the expansion. Although the property at South Van Pelt Street does not need zoning approval for the expansion, the house on South 22nd Street would require a variance for the additional four feet and the neighbors plan to oppose the request. The neighbors supported the original development because of the creation of open space at the rears of the buildings; they believe that these additions infringe on that open space. He noted that others wished to attend the meeting but could not.

Mr. Thomas reiterated that the Architectural Committee must evaluate projects based on the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards* and their impact on historic resources. He noted that the proposal would not negatively affect any historic fabric. Mr. Moore countered that the additional square footage would impact the massing and bulk of the buildings and that the developer made an agreement to keep a certain amount of open space at the properties.

Mr. Farnham notified the Committee that the owner of 264 South Van Pelt called the

office to say that she could not attend the meeting, but asked to record her opposition to the project because it would adversely affect her property. He also notified the Committee that Mr. Deutsch, the architect, had assured him that the current applications address only the four-foot rear additions and no other aspects of the three townhouse projects.

Virgil Procaccino, the developer for the project, noted that the open space would be landscaped.

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval of the proposal to add four feet to the rear of 262 South Van Pelt Street, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval of the proposal to add four feet to the rear of 261 South 22nd Street, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

2121 Porter Street

Dominic Chiacchiere, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1914, James & John Windrim, architects

PROPOSAL: Replace tile roof with asphalt shingles

This application proposes removing the original red clay tile roofing and replacing it with red Slateline asphalt-fiberglass shingles. The house at 2121 Porter is a twin in a row of six California Mission style houses. All six retain their original clay tile roofs. The clay tiles are significant, character-defining features. After 90 years, they have reached the ends of their lives; however, their replacements will be problematic. Replacement in kind would be extremely expensive and appropriate substitute materials are not available.

The roof planes of the front cross gable as well as the roof of a side bay are visible from the public right-of-way, Porter Street; the rear sections of the roof behind the peak of the gable running parallel to the street are not. After several discussions and a site visit, the staff approved a permit application to replace the rear sections of the roof with red Slateline shingles, provided all reusable tiles are salvaged for potential reuse on the front sections of the roof.

The owner of 2125 Porter, a slightly different building two doors to the west that originally had a slate roof, applied to the Commission in 2000 to replace the slate with asphalt shingles. The Commission found that to require the replacement of the slate in kind would induce a financial hardship. That finding led to the amendment of the Commission's Rules & Regulations. The following was added to Section 6.3.c.1, which

addresses staff roofing approvals: “the staff may also approve the replacement of slate roofs, with the exceptions of mansards and turrets, with a substitute material that approximates the color and shape of the historic slate.” Since that amendment, the staff has typically approved Slateline or Grand Slate asphalt shingles in the appropriate color as the “substitute material” for rectilinear slate. The amendment to the Rules & Regulations did not address clay tiles roofs because no acceptable substitute exists for the roofing that was historically available in myriad shapes and colors. As more and more tile roofs, which last approximately 100 years, require replacement, the Commission will repeatedly face the same difficult problem: require prohibitively expensive repairs or replacements in kind or lose significant, character-defining features.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the replacement of the front clay tiles with asphalt shingles, but approval of the repair of the front tiles with tiles salvaged from the rear, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6, and the Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the application. Dominic Chiacchiere, the owner, stated that he would like to save the historic appearance of the roof, but he has suffered with many leaks. The underlayment has failed. To preserve the historic roof, all of the tiles must be removed to fix the flashing and underlayment. This would be a very expensive job. The Committee members brainstormed about various options for substitute materials for the clay tiles and conceded that they did not know of any substitute on the market that could mimic the visual appearance of the clay tiles, especially along the gable edge. Mr. Thomas suggested wood shingles, but noted the problems associated with them.

Mr. Thomas then explained that the Committee only evaluates projects based on the technical aspects and the Secretary of the Interior’s *Standards*. He noted that the Commission utilizes other criteria in its evaluations. He suggested that the applicant present his case to the Commission.

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend denial, pursuant to 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, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.] and the Roofs Guideline [Not Recommended: Stripping the roof of sound historic material such as slate, clay tile, wood and architectural metal.].

Mr. Thomas left the meeting.

204-214 West Washington Square

Brown Hill Development, Goldenberg Group, Owners

David Mercuris, Goldenberg Group, Applicant

DATE: 1927-29, Ralph Bencker, architect

PROPOSAL: Add penthouse, balconies, and doors – in concept

This in-concept application proposes several alterations and additions to the N.W. Ayer Building, an Art Deco office building on the western edge of Washington Square. The

Commission individually designated the ornate limestone building as historic in 1974 and classified it as significant in the Society Hill Historic District in 1999. The building currently houses a restaurant in the southern half of the lobby and offices on the upper floors. A second restaurant or retail space would be added to the lobby. The upper floors including the penthouse addition would be dedicated to residential use. Parking would be added at the basement and mezzanine levels.

N.W. Ayer & Son, the first and one of the most important advertising agencies in the United States, was founded in Philadelphia in 1869. N.W. Ayer coined some of the most renowned slogans in advertising history including: "When it rains it pours," for Morton Salt in 1912; "I'd walk a mile for a Camel," advertising Camel cigarettes for R.J. Reynolds Tobacco in 1921; "A diamond is forever," for De Beers in 1948; "Reach out and touch someone," advertising long-distance telephone service for AT&T in 1979; and "Be all you can be," for the United States Army in 1981. N.W. Ayer moved to New York City in 1973.

To add the parking, an existing loading-dock door along St. James Street would be widened for a garage door; an adjacent window would be converted to a pedestrian door; and several mezzanine windows at the sides and rear would be replaced with louvers.

At the front façade, part of the large window in the northern bay would be converted to a door for access to the new restaurant or retail space. A simple glass and metal canopy, perhaps free-standing, would be added the center bay.

At the roof, a large mechanical penthouse constructed in the 1950s would be demolished and additional mechanical equipment would be removed. In the place of the penthouse and mechanical equipment, a three-story residential penthouse and a mechanical room would be added. It would be framed in steel and clad in glass, metal mesh, and solid panels.

The metal mesh at the penthouse would flow down over the south façade like a veil, tying the addition and historical building together and shading balconies that would be added in the light well. Mechanical equipment would be cantilevered over the top of the light well. The addition of the balconies would require the conversion of windows to doors. The developer also proposes to lower the sill heights of windows at the rear of the light well and to cut four new windows in the south façade at the second-floor level.

Staff Recommendation: Approval in concept of the penthouse, provided that it is reduced in height to two stories and that it is more vertically oriented like the historic building; denial of the veiling metal mesh on the south façade and the cantilevered mechanical equipment; approval in concept of the balconies and related alterations; approval in concept of the parking and other rear alterations; approval in concept of the retail door in the front window; approval in concept of a light, transparent, freestanding, metal and glass canopy; approval in concept of the four new windows in the south façade, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham explained to the applicant and public that the Committee lacked a quorum. No one objected to proceeding. He then briefly explained the multi-faceted proposal for converting this building to condominiums. David Mercuris, representative for the developer, the Goldenberg Group, said that he has set up meetings with the Society Hill and Washington Square Civic Associations to discuss the development. The building

presently houses Class C offices and has mechanical systems that date to 1958. The developers are planning to invest over \$50 million in the property.

Serge Nalbantian of Brown Hill Development, a partner in the development, then described the proposal. Using visuals, he explained to the Committee members that changes to the original building would include a canopy at the front door; altering a storefront window to a door for a new commercial space; changing the existing garage door to accommodate a larger door; enlarging a service door on the rear; and installing louvers in the windows at the mezzanine floor at the rear. Mr. Mercuris emphasized that the louvers would be installed behind the existing window frames with mesh to minimize their impact on the façade.

The primary proposed alterations to the building are the balconies at the recessed portion of the south façade; a three-story residential penthouse with additional space for mechanical equipment; and a veil that hangs down the southern façade. Mr. Nalbantian noted that the extant mechanical penthouse stands twenty-one (21) feet above the parapet wall at its highest point. The proposed penthouse addition will stand fifty (50) feet above the highest point. The penthouse will be set back 6 feet from the parapet wall.

The proposed penthouse will house three units with roof decks and a cooling tower. The architect specifically designed the addition to contrast with the historic building and imagines a jewel-like box with metal screening and panels. Mr. Nalbantian explained that the building will be lighted to accentuate its architectural details and the penthouse will appear like a lantern on the square.

Mr. Tyler opined that the proposed changes to the lower portion of the building and the balconies appear to be appropriate for the building. He noted that the Commission approved similar balconies on the Barclay. However, he contended that the penthouse should not be Art Deco, but should be more like the architecture of the extant building. Mr. Tyler suggested using setbacks to minimize its impact. Mr. Farnham quoted the building's original architect, Ralph Bencker, who wrote that he rejected an early scheme with setbacks and chose instead to design a more monolithic building.

Ms. Pentz remarked that the shape of the penthouse was appropriate for the building, owing to the original building's massing, but she objected to its size and height. Mr. McCoubrey concurred and agreed with the idea of not carrying the limestone up through the penthouse. He noted that the penthouse is an extremely complicated three-dimensional object and was therefore difficult to visualize with two-dimensional plans. He suggested that the developer fabricate a model. Others suggested that renderings would help as well. Both Committee members agreed that the veil detracted from the original building and should be removed and that the cantilevered mechanical equipment posed problems.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance said that he was under the impression that the applicant was going to withdraw the application after the Architectural Committee meeting and not proceed to the Historical Commission. If the applicant did not withdraw the application, Mr. Gallery objected to proceeding with the review without a quorum. Mr. Gallery had not raised any objection to proceeding without a quorum when Mr. Farnham polled the applicants and audience at the start of the review. He opined that the project has the potential for establishing a policy for the Commission; it is the first major multi-

level penthouse addition reviewed positively by the staff and may set a precedent for tall penthouses on other buildings. Mr. Gallery then quoted from the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards* concerning rooftop additions, saying that the proposed design does not comply with the guidelines. He called the building "overly programmed" and recommended to the developer to lease parking spaces in a neighboring lot instead of expanding the parking onto the mezzanine level of the building.

Becky Stoloff of the Society Hill Civic Association noted that the developer is planning to present the project to the civic association. She stated that she believed that the developer would withdraw the application to allow for the neighborhood's review.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Commission table the application to allow for the generation of better documentation such as a model or renderings and to allow the developer an opportunity to present the project to the appropriate civic associations.

205 Race Street

Brown Hill Development, Owner

Serge Nalbantian, Brown Hill Development, Applicant

Construct residential building on vacant lot – 45 day review and comment

This application proposes the construction of a 10-story building at the corner of N. 2nd and Race Streets. The Commission's jurisdiction is limited to 45 days of review-and-comment. A building stood on the site when the Old City Historic District was designated in December 2003, but a valid demolition permit had been issued for the site before the Commission's district designation notice letters were mailed in July 2003. The building was demolished legally after designation, leaving the lot vacant.

In the new building, the basement would be dedicated to parking, the first floor to commercial use, and the upper floors to residential use. The parking for the retail spaces would be accessed from Florist Street, a service alley at the rear. The parking garage would be accessed from 2nd Street. The innovative building would be clad with zinc panels, clear and grey glass, metal mesh, and cement board. The facades would be enlivened with the revelation of the structure and the innovative interior layout, which consists of interlocking two-story volumes like Le Corbusier's landmark Unité d'Habitation in Marseilles, France. The south facade would be further animated with hanging pods or projections.

Staff Comment: This application represents some of the most innovative and interesting contemporary architecture proposed recently for Philadelphia. Its parking will be appropriately situated in the basement. The street-level facades will be enlivened with the activity occurring behind large storefront windows. The upper facades, with their varying materials, colors, transparencies, and reflectivities, will likewise be lively. Although 10 stories tall, it will not overwhelm its neighbors, which include not only three and four-story historic building, but also larger industrial buildings and the Ben Franklin Bridge. It is appropriately situated and massed on the site. It will contribute considerably to the historic district in the present and will undoubtedly be deemed historic in its own right in the future. This project will set a very high standard for new construction in the Old City Historic District.

Mr. Farnham explained that the Committee lacked a quorum. He asked if the applicants or anyone in the audience objected to proceeding without a quorum. No one objected. Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. He stated that Commission's jurisdiction is limited to 45 days of review-and-comment. Greg Hill and Serge Nalbantian of Brown Hill Development and Greg Pasquarelli, Jonathan Mallie, and Colleen O'Keefe of SHoP Architects represented the application.

Mr. Pasquarelli presented an informative overview of the project. He explained the unusual but effective location of the building on the site, the parking system, the location of the mechanical equipment, and the connection of the street-level space to the surrounding streetscape. He discussed the material choices and colors.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance acknowledged that the proposed building is imaginative, but asserted that it is not compatible in size, scale, color, or material with the neighboring buildings. He questioned the staff's enthusiastic recommendation in light of its recommendation of denial for 101 Walnut Street, which appears next on the Committee's agenda.

Mr. Tyler explained the legislative intent behind the 45 day review-and-comment sections of the ordinance and *Rules & Regulations*. He noted that the Commission's jurisdiction was limited for new construction on vacant lots to allow for innovative architecture.

Ms. Pentz of the Committee asserted that the proposed building would be an enhancement to the historic district. Mr. McCoubrey supported the design, stating that it was compatible with the surrounding industrial buildings and the bridge.

The Architectural Committee recommended that the Commission comment favorably on the proposed design.

101-113 Walnut Street

101 Walnut Street, LLC, Owner
John F. Tucker, Architect/Applicant
PROPOSAL: Construct 11-story tower

This application proposes a revised plan for the construction of an 11-story residential building with parking at the ground level. The lot, which is located at the northwest corner of Front and Walnut Streets, is currently vacant. The buildings that once stood at 103-105 and 107-109 Walnut Street were individually designated on 26 May 1970. On 13 December 1995, the Commission approved the demolition of the buildings, provided a "fence wall" was constructed. The buildings were demolished, but the required wall was never built. In December 2003, the Commission created the Old City Historic District; the lot was included in the district and classified as "non-contributing." The Commission, however, has not rescinded the earlier individual listing and therefore maintains plenary or full jurisdiction.

The Architectural Committee reviewed a similar proposal for a building on this site at its April 2005 meeting. It recommended denial of the proposal because the proposed work was not compatible with the character of the historic district including the neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape. The applicant revised the proposal,

slightly modifying the street-level façade and substituting slate for concrete for the exterior cladding, before presenting it to the Historical Commission at its May 2005 meeting. The Commission remanded the revised proposal back to the Committee because it did not have the benefit of the Committee's recommendation.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9; and Section 14-2007(6)(k)(.4). Despite the minor revisions, the proposed building is not compatible with the surrounding buildings, historic district, or streetscape in materials, features, size, scale, proportion, or massing. The building will overwhelm its smaller historic neighbors. The unbroken walls, garage door, and overhanging balconies will detract significantly from the pedestrian experience.

Mr. Farnham explained that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. He asked if the applicants or anyone in the audience objected to proceeding without a quorum. No one objected. Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Committee. Developer Gagan Lakhama and architect John Tucker represented the project.

Mr. Tucker explained the revisions to the design including the lobby changes, the arcade along Walnut Street, the change to a slate cladding, the reduction of the second-story section over the parking, and the eight-foot reduction in height. Mr. Lakhama noted that this building would be 160 feet in height; the heights of the Society Hill Towers are 293 feet and the height of the Beaumont is 190 feet. He contended that the building was now more pedestrian friendly and that the garage door was no longer visible. He stated that he had met with John Gallery to plan the revisions including the slate cladding. He also noted that the surrounding parcels will, in all likelihood, remain parking lots for the foreseeable future. When asked why the building is massed with a tall thin tower to the east and a large parking compound to the west, he explained that the design had been dictated by the zoning regulations. He added that the regulation require that 20% of the lot remain open. He said that the building makes sense financially and architecturally. Concluding, he stated he would meet with neighborhood representatives on 7 June 2005.

Mr. Tyler asserted that the design had not changed significantly. He claimed that the scale of the surroundings at this site is very different than that at 205 Race Street. He noted the difference in massing as well. The building proposed for this site is a tower; the building proposed for 205 Race is not, even if it is nearly the same height.

Mr. Lakhama stated that he had not pursued a rescission of the individual designations for this parcel because he wanted to work with the Commission to develop an approvable building. He stated that he may seek rescission.

Marsha Bacall, a resident of Society Hill Towers, stated that the proposed building would be incompatible with the area. She claimed that it would obstruct one of the primary connections to Penn's Landing.

Becky Stoloff of the Society Hill Civic Association noted that the Commission had suggested at its most recent meeting that the developer meet with community groups to discuss the project. She asked that no action be taken on the application until the developer has met with the Society Hill Civic Association. Mr. Tyler reminded the audience that the developer has no legal requirement to meet with the interested civic groups.

Ms. Pentz of the Committee asserted that this proposal, although superficially similar, is, in fact, very different from the proposal for 205 Race Street. She opined that the revisions were not sufficient to produce a building that would be compatible with its surroundings. Mr. McCoubrey agreed, stating that the massing as a tower is not appropriate.

The Architectural Committee 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 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 Section 14-2007(6)(k)(.4), which mandates that “in making its determination as to the appropriateness of ...construction , the Commission shall consider ... the compatibility of the proposed work with the character of the historic district ...including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape.”

1428-34 Chestnut Street, Packard Building

Chest-Pac Associates, L.P., Owner

David Grasso, Applicant

DATE:

PROPOSAL: Signage and lighting

The proposal calls for a new commercial storefront, signage, and lighting for the commercial tenant in the building.

The new storefront on Chestnut Street includes two sets of double-leaf, fully-glazed doors. These will replace a non-historic aluminum storefront system. However, the plans do not detail the material of the proposed doors. The plans also show a new sign in the spandrel area, but do not show the historic spandrel that exists and the notes say that the existing window system above the entry will remain. The inconsistencies must be remedied.

The signage includes two banners on the Chestnut Street façade and one banner on the 15th Street façade, centered over the mezzanine windows. The attachment details show that the poles will be attached in the limestone face and secured to the back-up masonry with expanding anchor throughbolts. The banners will have gooseneck lights for illumination, requiring boring into the stone for the electrical conduit. A metal sign will hang in the central Chestnut Street entrance and will suspend from the ceiling of the recessed portal; however, the plans do not include any attachment details.

The lighting of the façade includes blue LED lighting at the 26th floor, which this tenant will also occupy, and around the Chestnut Street entry portal. Blue lights will also be emitted from the mezzanine windows. The plans do not include attachment details for the LED.

Several of the awnings that the Commission approved previously will get new skins that depict the tenant's logo on the face and its name on the skirt.

On the rear, Sansom Street façade, the service entrance will be expanded for a second service entrance for the restaurant.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the storefront, only if the historic spandrel remains; service entrance, and awnings pursuant to Standard 9. Approval of the lighting only if attached in mortar joints, with staff to review attachment details, pursuant to Standard 7. Denial of the banners as proposed, pursuant to Standard 7. The banners should not have illumination because this requires too large a hole in the stone for the wiring and they should not bisect the mezzanine windows. Approval of banners if they are moved away from the windows and do not have lights, with staff to review attachment details to minimize the damage to the limestone facing, pursuant Standard 7.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. She explained to the applicants and audience that the Committee lacked a quorum, but that the review could proceed if no one in the room objected. No one objected and the review proceeded. Preservation consultant Robert Powers, architect James Rowe, attorney Marjorie Stern Jacobs, Esq., David Dineberg of Metro Development Company, and Molly Rose, Craig Mandenberg, and John VanZeebroeck of Idletime Network represented the application.

Mr. Rowe explained that they would replace the non-historic storefront on Chestnut Street. Ms. Spina stated that the architectural drawings show the removal of the historic spandrel above the doorway. Mr. Rowe confirmed that the historic spandrel would not be removed, but would be retained. Ms. Spina asked that the drawings be corrected to show the retention of the spandrel. Mr. Rowe countered that its removal is not stipulated by the architectural drawings, which, in fact, call for its retention.

Mr. Rowe provided an overview of the signage. Ms. Spina explained that she objected to the lighting on the banners because it necessitates the drilling of large holes in the limestone façade. Mr. Rowe corrected that the lighting was not the determining factor for the hole sizes; the structural requirements of the banners determined the hole sizes. He added that the pipes proposed for the banners are typical of such applications. He explained that the conduits for the lighting would be routed through the pipes that will hold the banners. He also noted that he had not positioned the pipe holes over the mortar joints because that would have resulted in drilling into twice as many stones. The mortar joints are very thin; drilling at the joints would produce cuts into the stone both above and below the joints.

Mr. Tyler noted that he had met with the applicants and suggested flags rather than banners. Ms. Pentz of the Committee stated that she deemed the banner appropriate. Mr. Tyler replied that the applicants had proposed an “overkill” of signage. Mr. McCoubrey of the Committee stated that he would recommend approval of the banners.

Mr. Rowe offered overviews of the other signage. He explained that the large sign above the Chestnut Street doorway would mount in mortar joints. He noted the “Foundation” and “Loading” signs. He pointed out the “folk art” on the insides of the awnings.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval as submitted.

529 Delancey Street

N. Venture and T. Brubaker, Owners

Jane Wilson, Architect/Applicant

History: 1804; front façade re-faced in tapestry brick, 1920s; façade stuccoed and cornice altered, mid-1960s

PROPOSAL: Restore front façade, cut new openings in side, rear façade and roof

At the Commission meeting last month, Ralph Fey, the architect for this proposal, noted that he made changes at the request of the owner. Therefore, the Commission remanded the application back to the Architectural Committee. For the side façade, the proposal now calls for a single window at the first floor. Although stuccoed, this façade dates to 1804; however, the area has already been compromised for a wall air-conditioner.

On the rear, the proposal includes creating a one-room addition at the first floor, cutting a two-story bay that projects from the second and third floors, and opening the rear roof for a deck (instead of the previously proposed shed dormer). Like the dormer, the addition of the deck would require the removal of a large amount of historic fabric that dates to 1804.

The application also calls for reconstructing the front façade according to its 1804 appearance by removing the stucco and tapestry brick façade and following a fire insurance survey for guidance.

The first floor windows in the drawing have a nine-over-nine configuration, but the windows probably would have had six-over-six based on their dimensions, and the dormer window would have had a six-over-six window not a four-over-four window. Also, the cornice line should be revised. The current profile dates to the tapestry-brick façade; it needs to be lowered to match the cornice level at the rear of the building which dates to 1804. The drawing needs to be revised to a ¼ - inch scaled drawing that has a detailed cornice profile, door surround and window details.

Staff recommendation: Approval of cutting the window on the side elevation and the changes on the 1st, 2nd and 3rd floors on the rear elevation, pursuant to Standard 9 and Reconstruction Standard 4. Denial of the roof deck, pursuant to Standard 2, 9 and 10

Ms. Spina presented the proposal to the Committee. Tom Brubaker, Ralph Fey, Jane Wilson and Nick Ventura attended the meeting. Ms. Spina informed the applicants that the committee had no quorum. The applicants had no objections to proceeding without a quorum.

Mr. Fey requested an explanation of the standards on which the denial of the roof deck was based. Ms. Spina proceeded to read the definition of Standards 2, 9, and 10 to Mr. Fey. Mr. Fey acknowledged that it was their intention to make the space work for the owners while respecting and appreciating the historic fabric of the building. He pointed out that the proposed changes to the rear façade would only be visible from a small alley and only during the winter months when no foliage blocks the view. Mr. Ventura explained that the proposed work would not undermine the historic character of the building, but that it would actually enhance it owing to the existing conditions of the rear façade. He pointed out that, at present, doors exit on the second and third floors in place of the original windows. These doors however do not open onto a deck or

balcony. Mr. Fey then explained the necessity of reinforcing the roof trusses. Ms. Pentz examined the photographs brought in by the applicant and mentioned that apparently lath that held a ceiling and walls had been removed at some point, which might have made the structure of the trusses less rigid and weaker. Mr. Fey acknowledged that, in fact, a ceiling had been removed owing to water damage and advanced deterioration. Ms. Pentz pointed out that the shape of the hip roof was the key element in this project. She expressed her approval of the changes that the applicant had made to move the deck further into the mass of the structure, thus keeping the shape of the hip and making the alteration less visible from the side façade.

Mr. McCoubrey seconded Ms. Pentz's point and suggested the approval of the deck as well as all as the approvals recommended by the staff.

Mr. Fey mentioned, in response to Ms. Spina's earlier introduction regarding the doorframe and windows, that more research would be conducted on the cornice and doorframe so as to match as closely as possible the original configuration. Ms. Spina pointed out that the staff would gladly work with them on those details.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the facade restoration, side opening, and rear deck, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and Reconstruction Standard 4 [Reconstruction will be based on the accurate duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by documentary or physical evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different features from other historic properties. A reconstructed property will re-create the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color, and texture.].

4163 Main Street

Michele David, Owner

Vicki Leon, Applicant

History: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Façade additions

In November 2003, the owner of the property applied to Historical Commission to demolish the front façade of this building and construct a new contemporary façade. At the Architectural Committee, his attorney argued that the historic façade was not conducive to commercial use. The Committee recommended denial of the application, but noted that the first floor was non-historic and offered suggestions for a more open storefront design. The owner then withdrew the proposal before Commission voted.

On 11 March 2004, the owner submitted an engineer's report to the staff stating that front wall was unsafe and required reconstruction along with a violation from the Department of Licenses and Inspections. On 5 April 2004, staff approved a permit application to rebuild the front wall to match the historic wall at 2nd and 3rd floors with segmentally-arched, two-over-two windows, a reinstalled historic cornice, and a stucco finish. The first floor would have had a central, double-leaf, fully-glazed door flanked by

large storefront windows. In April and May 2004, staff also approved new interior walls and roof framing, interior demolition and a cut through the party wall to 4161 Main Street.

Instead of building the front wall according to the approved plan, the owner built a front façade similar to the proposal denied by Committee in 2003. The owner applied to have the contemporary façade legalized in April 2005 and the Historical Commission denied the legalization. The owner has appealed the decision to the Board of License and Inspection Review, but the hearing has not been scheduled.

The current application includes two designs to alter the contemporary façade slightly as remediation for not rebuilding the structure according to the approved plan. One plan calls for adding a bracketed cornice like the one that existed on the historic building that stood on the lot and a fan light in the spandrel between the 2nd and 3rd stories. Some landscaping would be added in the sidewalk. The second option includes square panels in the spandrel between the 2nd and 3rd floors and a sign above the 1st floor. This option would also have a plaque with information about the historic building that once stood on the site.

Staff recommendation: Denial, owing to the Historical Commission's denial of the legalization of the building façade on 8 April 2005.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Vicki Leon attended the meeting. Ms. Spina informed the applicant that the committee had no quorum. The applicant had no objections to proceeding without quorum.

Ms. Leon requested to read a written statement to the Committee. Ms. Leon became emotional and was unable to finish reading the letter. Ms. Spina proceeded to make copies of the letter and distributed them to the Committee members, all of whom read it. Ms. Leon mentioned that the contractor had led them to believe that given that the façade was structurally unsound and had been taken down, a new façade could be put in its place without Commission approval. Mr. McCoubrey mentioned that it seemed clear to him that this project should be sent to the Hardship Committee. He mentioned that the Architectural Committee was a technical body whose recommendations were not best suited to the specific circumstances of this project. He also mentioned that the applicant could choose to take the project to the Commission and then be referred to the Financial Hardship Committee.

Kevin Smith, of the Manayunk Neighborhood Council, stated that although he understood the difficult situation in which Ms. Leon finds herself at present, this new façade was, nonetheless, out of place within the Manayunk streetscape. He also stated that the current façade had been denied by the Commission. Mr. Tyler mentioned that this property is under the Manayunk Ordinance, which would not allow it to be referred to the Hardship Committee. He pointed out that if the Commission denies the proposal it would have to be appealed to the Board of Building Standards. Ms. Spina countered Mr. Tyler's assertion and stated that an appeal would be heard by the Board of Licenses and Inspections Review instead.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended denial of the two proposed schemes owing to the Historical Commission's denial of the legalization of the building façade on 8 April 2005.

231-35 North 2nd Street

2nd Street Parkominium, L.P., Owner

William G. Schwartz, Esq., Applicant

PROPOSAL: Relief from requirement to use cast-iron in mural

In September 2002, the Historical Commission approved the construction of the parking garage on the condition that the 18 salvaged cast-iron pieces from the façade of 233 North 2nd Street be integrated into a mural on the south side of the property, with a plaque explaining the mural, with staff to review attachment details. The garage sits on the southern property line; in order for the cast-iron pieces to be attached, they would have to project over the property line.

Since that time, the contractor discarded all but six of the pieces of the cast-iron. Also, the neighboring property owner, the Delaware River Port Authority, has refused to allow the encroachment of the cast-iron pieces. The owner is now applying for relief from the condition to have the cast-iron pieces incorporated into the mural. All other conditions of the permit, i.e. the mural and plaque explaining the mural, will be met.

Staff recommendation: Approval on the condition that the owner installs the cast-iron pieces on another part of the building. The rear façade and the eastern half of the north façade provide space for placement, as well as the interior of the first-floor waiting room.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. William Schwartz, Bob Levitt, and Michael Ricoletto attended the meeting. Ms. Spina informed the applicants that the Committee had no quorum. The applicants had no objections to proceed without quorum.

Mr. Schwartz expressed reservations regarding the staff's recommendation. He mentioned that the pieces could not relate without a mural. Ms. Spina explained that the intent was to save the remaining pieces. Mr. Levitt pointed out that a new building was going to be constructed on the north parcel, which would make it impossible for the pieces to be displayed there. Ms. Spina noted on the property plan a parcel that would allow pieces to be placed at the rear and the applicants conceded that the pieces could be placed in that location.

Mr. Schwartz proceeded to explain the circumstances under which most the pieces had been discarded. He stated that, based on their own investigation, the cement contractor had discarded the pieces even though he had been warned not to. Mr. Schwartz also mentioned that the attachments of the remaining six pieces would require a strong connection with the façade.

The Committee discussed the alternative locations for the pieces on the building. Mr. Levitt mentioned that the side alley had an easement and they could not encroach on it with the cast iron pieces. Ms. Spina then stated that the pieces should be mounted on the back wall, even if they were not visible in that location. Mr. Levitt asked if the pieces could be used on another property. Ms. Pentz answered that these pieces belonged on this specific location and that this is where they should remain.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval on the condition that the six remaining historic cast-iron pieces are installed on the rear façade.

2502 Garnet Place

Joseph and Rosemary Clark, Owners

Robert Pisani, Applicant

History: 1910, James & John Windrim, architects

PROPOSAL: Two-story rear addition

This application calls for a two-story rear addition, visible from Porter Street. The applicant proposes to infill the space between the rear ell and the neighboring property, altering the solid/void relationship of the rear design. The addition follows the roof lines of the existing rear ell and has asphalt shingles, like the existing roof. It will have stuccoed walls and a recessed porch like the one on the rear ell. The addition will not alter the existing roofline and will not encroach into the rear garden or the side garden that is visible from Garnet Street.

The Historical Commission approved a rear addition that was much larger in scale for the 1700 block of Porter Street, which has raised ire and dismay in the neighborhood. As a result, the Commission staff has fielded nearly 100 phone calls and complaints, and the amount of work in the district performed without building permits has increased. The rise in property values in the neighborhood has fueled more inquiries into the enlargement of these buildings; the desire for additions in this district has increased greatly.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Joseph Clark, Robert Pissani, and Vincent Novello Jr. attended the meeting. Ms. Spina informed the applicants that the Committee had no quorum. The applicants had no objections to proceeding without quorum.

Mr. McCoubrey requested clarification on the location of the proposed addition. Ms. Spina specified that the rear garden, side alley, and roof line would remain in their present form. She pointed out the proposed addition would respect the original structure in its design and materials.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

1709 and 1711 Brandywine Street aka 1712 Green Street

Fred Duling, Owner/Applicant

Built: Non-contributing garage, built c. 1920; demolition approved by PHC, 2004

Construct two new houses with front garages

The Historical Commission previously approved a four-story, multi-unit building for this property. The present proposal calls for two houses with garages on the lot, separated by a central brick chimney. The houses will have brick fronts, stuccoed sides and rears

and two-story bays projecting over the garage doors. The other openings have two-over-two windows. The parapet wall has a simplified cornice and hides the roof deck for each house.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to standard 9 and 10

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Fred Duling and Neal Sandvold attended the meeting. Ms. Spina informed the applicants that the committee had no quorum. The applicants had no objections to proceeding without quorum.

Ms. Spina specified that the Commission had plenary jurisdiction over the site and the new construction. Ms. Pentz requested an explanation of the roofing material over the bay windows. Mr. Sandvold explained that it would be roofed with a standing seam copper roof. He also mentioned that there might be minor changes on the rear elevation owing to options requested by potential buyers.

Mr. Laver, a neighbor, mentioned that the developers were working with the civic association and neighbors. He stated that they have no objections to the proposal.

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

633 North 16th Street

Thomas Kelly, Owner

Jonathan Williams, Applicant

New construction on vacant lot

This application calls for the construction of a new house on a vacant lot. The house will have a brick façade, two-over-two windows, four-panel door with sidelights, and an exaggerated segmentally-arched transom. Multi-light doors with balconettes would open on the 2nd and 3rd floors. A single-car garage would have a wood-paneled door with a multi-light transom, though the property has a double-car-width curb cut.

The Historical Commission previously denied a design for this property. Two key elements prompted that denial: the garage and the fact that the house occupied the full width of the property when all of the other houses on the block are twins, not rowhouses. This design does not remedy those two problems. In fact, the house to the north has a cornice with a return that will be compromised with the construction of this building.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2, 9, and the Setting Guidelines.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Clayborn Cann attended the meeting. Ms. Spina

informed the applicant that the Committee had no quorum. Mr. Cann had no objection to proceeding without quorum.

Ms. Spina asked Mr. Cann if there were any easements on the alley between the twins. Mr. Cann answered that there were no easements. He also explained that the Spring Gardens Civic Association had requested changes to the design. The association asked that the new construction harmonize with other new construction in the area. The designers responded to their request by changing the original two-car garage to a one-car garage. The civic association also specified the color of the window trim, cornice, and wood elements.

Ms. Pentz stated that she would recommend denial again. Mr. McCoubrey seconded Ms. Pentz's comment. He mentioned that the doorway should be flipped so as to match its twin and that the alley should be maintained.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, 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 new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and the Setting Guideline [Introducing new construction into historic districts that is visually incompatible or that destroys historic relationships within the setting.]. The new construction should follow the block's pattern of twins and this property should match its mate, but with a simplified and contemporary design.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron
Jorge Danta
Jonathan Farnham
Diane M. Hughes
Laura M. Spina