

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
27 July 2004**

Present

Vincent Rivera, Chair
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Herbert Levy, FAIA
Suzanne Pentz

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

Also

Nan Gutterman, Vitetta Group
Marvin Gerstein, Temple University
Jim Hanson, Vitetta Group
Eric Lautzenheiser, Vitetta Group
Tony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing
Charles Rue, Matrix
Shawn Evans, Atkin Olshin Lawson-Bell Architects
Tom Barton, Barton & Associates
Sam Harris, Sam Harris & Company
Jessica Senker, Sam Harris & Company
Patricia and Rich Singh, 103 Chestnut Street
Rick Cole, Elfreth's Alley
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Ted Watson, 114 Elfreth's Alley
William G. Schwartz, Esq., 48-50 South Front Street
Joe Serratore, 48-50 South Front Street
Ivano D'Angella, 48-50 South Front Street
Philip Ahn, 7 North 3rd Street
George J. Baker, 3204 Belgreed Road
Bob Hawk, National Liberty Museum
Irvin Borowsky, National Liberty Museum
Sandra Kelly, National Liberty Museum
Janice Woodcock, Woodcock Design, 117-21 Chestnut Street
Tina Makouljian, Esq., Ballard Sparrow Andrews & Ingersoll
Stephen Potts, Woodcock Design
Robert Boothroyd, 2202 Brandywine Street
Jean Henry, 220 West Rittenhouse Square
Matt Ahern, Abstract Door
Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance

Thomas P. Witt, Esq., Wolf Block Schorr & Solis-Cohen LLP
 Lew Halas, Tantala Associates, Barclay Condominiums
 James Daley, J.J. White, Barclay Condominiums
 William Gove, Barclay Condominiums
 Craig Rosenfeld, Barclay Condominiums
 Joe Kelly, Barclay Condominiums
 Paula Celletti-Baron, Scannapieco Development Corporation
 G. Ross Wilson, Parkway Corporation
 Joseph S. Zuritsky, Parkway Corporation
 Tom Scannapieco, Scannapieco Development Corporation
 David F. Ertz, Cope Linder Architects
 Al Shapiro, 1530 Spruce Street
 Arcangelo Guida, 1530 Spruce Street
 Michael Del Rossi, Jr., 1530 Spruce Street
 Margaret Armstrong Robb
 Kyle Quinn
 Robin Towey, Michael Shannon Designs
 John Lister, John W. Lister Architects
 Steve Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
 Stephen Verner, Cecil Baker & Associates
 Cecil Baker, Cecil Baker & Associates
 David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinski Architects
 Daniel Neducsin, Neducsin Properties

The chair called the meeting to order at 9: 35 a.m.

1800-18 Park Avenue, Liacouras Walk

Temple University, Owner
 Hyman Myers, Architect/Applicant
 DATE: 1872, David A. Woelper, builder
 PROPOSAL: Construction of new steel building behind facades - final approval

This project returns for final approval of the new construction. The design is similar to that reviewed by the Committee previously, when it recommended approval in concept.

The façades of the historic buildings stand along Park Avenue and wrap around the south elevation. On the south side, behind the façade of 1800 Park Avenue, the new structure will include brick panels and a band of windows at the fifth floor. On the west façade, beginning with 1802 Park Avenue, the building will include a contemporary design with ribbon windows at each floor and bands of EIFS panels. The north façade, which faces the courtyard, will consist of a bowed, two-story bay faced in simulated stone panels and a brick façade punctuated with fixed sash. At the northeast corner, the juxtaposition of the historic façades and new construction is accentuated. A small entrance with a double-leaf glazed door is tucked into the corner and a large “T” for “Temple” hangs at the top for identification.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the general design. Perhaps the relationship between the old and new can be further studied.

Ms. Spina presented the application and apprised the applicants of the absence of a quorum. The applicants chose to proceed without the benefit of a quorum. Ms. Pentz arrived midway into the

discussion to make up the quorum.

Tony Forte, Esq., Jim Hanson, Eric Lautzenheiser, and Nan Gutterman attended the meeting. Mr. Forte gave an overview of the project. Mr. Hanson noted revisions to the design, such as the refinement of the masonry materials to differentiate the old from the new construction and Temple's "T" symbol. Additionally, the windows on the north façade have been altered to have a taller and narrower configuration to retain the spirit of the historic buildings. Mr. Hanson thought that the other façades should have minimal details.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend final approval of the proposal.

109-31 North 2nd Street, and 117-25 Arch Street

MP Residential Properties, LLC, Owner

Anthony Forte, Esq., Applicant

DATE: 109-11: c. 1880; 115-17: c. 1875; 199-21: 1957-58; 123: c. 1880; 1925: 1957-58; terra cotta façade: 1957-58 and expanded c. 1965; 117-25 Arch St: c. 1980

PROPOSAL: Severing of 128 Elfreth's Alley, demolition of all but the facade and construction of 6-story building at 109-25 North 2nd Street, construction of 10-story tower at 117-25 Arch Street, construction of 3-story townhouses on interior of lot - in concept

The Commission previously approved the project in concept in February 2003; however, that approval has lapsed and the design for the new construction has changed. The proposal still calls for severing 128 Elfreth's Alley from this property, demolishing all but the façades, and constructing a new 6-story building at 109-25 North 2nd Street, a 10-story tower at 117-25 Arch Street, and 3-story townhouses in the interior of the property.

The new 6-story building will include aluminum panels and a series of projecting and recessed balconies. The roof provides a strong horizontal element. Overall, the building takes its design cues from the historic Modern façade. There is a five-foot setback from the terra cotta façade, which the Commission previously approved. In earlier versions, the design for the new construction slavishly adhered to the design of the nineteenth-century buildings that exist behind the terra cotta façade. This new design acknowledges the historic Modern façade, but has a more uniform appearance.

The building on Arch Street is very different from the one previously approved. Originally the Commission approved a 15-story tower; now the proposal calls for a 10-story tower. The new brick design has a central glass column and a flared arched cap, which has since been changed to a flat roof.

The three-story townhouses will be on the interior of the lot and will not be visible from any street. The contemporary design has brick and glass with projecting balconies.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the 6-story building, with flatter, smoother details. Approval of the 3-story townhouses. Denial of the 10-story tower on Arch Street.; the design does not take any cues from the surrounding district for its vocabulary and does not relate to the streetscape.

Tony Forte, Esq., Tom Barton, and Samuel Harris attended the meeting. For the new construction at the National Products building, Mr. Barton believes that a contemporary design

comprised of aluminum panels with strong vertical elements is more compatible with the tile façade; however, the Zoning Board is opposed to the proposed materials. Mr. Harris pointed out that the revised design retains the original storefront without penetrating the front wall; only the rear wall will be penetrated for access to the rear courtyard. This access was approved in concept previously. Additionally, more of the historic tiles would be preserved and a close replica of the smaller historic tiles has been found to replace those that have been damaged.

The Committee discussed the contemporary design of the townhouses on the interior of the courtyard. They expressed concern about the design of the doorways, especially because they have very low stoops and have little private space. Mr. Barton commented that although the courtyard is open to the public, it will, in essence, be for the private use of the people in the townhouses.

Discussion then turned to the ten-story building on Arch Street. Mr. Forte noted the special treatment given to the Arch Street façade, which addresses the height issue. Mr. Tyler remarked that the proposed buildings respond to the twenty-first century. Mr. Barton said that the tower's height has been reduced and the design of the upper floors made more contemporary by adding more glass. He offered to work with the staff on issues of height and massing to refine the design. Mr. Tyler believes that the new design of the tower, excepting the void in the middle core, is more complimentary to the Old City District. Mr. Barton explained that the middle core is comprised of spandrel glass to allow for the filtration of light. Mr. McCoubrey thought that the center core is overwhelming; he asserted that a consistent aggressive approach would be to bond the caps at the top.

The Architectural Committee recommended conceptual approval of the overall site plan and demolition, approval of the new design for the National Products building, approval of the townhouses, approval of the ten-story building, but with a revised design that eliminates the core of glass in the middle.

114 Elfreth's Alley

Edward Watson, Jr., Owner/Applicant

DATE: bet. 1751 and 1762 by Thomas Patterson, house carpenter, significant in district

PROPOSAL: Demolish 1-story rear addition, construct 2-story rear addition

The property now has a non-historic one-story addition at the rear. Plans done by the Historic American Buildings Survey dating to 1932 and the model in the collection of the Atwater Kent Museum, created in 1938 through a program of the Works Progress Administration, document that the building originally had a two-story rear ell that extended to the rear property line.

The proposal calls for demolishing the one-story addition and constructing a two-story addition that has the same width as the historic rear ell, except for a bay window at the first floor. The addition would be brick with cast-stone sills and the bay will have cedar siding and a pent roof that extends over a single-leaf door. The windows will consist of single and coupled six-over-six and one-over-one windows. On the rear elevation, the second floor will include a double-leaf door leading to a balconette. The roof of the addition will be a half-gable with asphalt/fiberglass shingles.

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

Ms. Spina explained the proposal and noted that the HABS drawings and WPA model show that the rear ell penetrated the cornice line and that the proposed addition would replicate the original roof line.

Shawn Evans of the Elfreth's Alley Association conveyed the association's support for the project. Mr. Evans disclosed that Elfreth's Alley Association owns an interior as well as an exterior easement on the property and that the Association is working with the owner to ensure that the transition between the new and the old is done with minimal impact on the historic fabric.

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

48-50 South Front Street, 103 Chestnut Street

Allied Holdings LLC, Equitable owner

William G. Schwartz, Applicant

DATE: 48: c. 1840; 50: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation, 2-story rooftop addition with decks

This proposal returns with a two-story rooftop addition instead of the previously proposed three-story addition. As before, the addition would be faced with a curtain-wall system with large expanses of glass windows topped by metal panels. The proposal also calls for roof decks at each level. The existing buildings only stand 44'-6" tall; the proposed height of the addition is 26'-0" not including the mechanicals. Although the new proposal is one story shorter than the previous one, the overall height of the addition is only four feet shorter. The façades of the historic buildings would ostensibly be restored; some of the restoration details shown in the plans, for example the storefront transoms at 48 S. Front, are incorrect. Although the proposal calls for setbacks at each level, the addition and decks would be highly visible from Front, Chestnut, and other streets.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and Roofing Guideline.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and noted that the streetscape of Old City consists of low-scale buildings.

William G. Schwartz, Esq., Joe Serratore, and Ivano D'Angella attended the meeting. Mr. Schwartz offered that the height of the proposed addition had been reduced since the previous meeting. He noted that anything less than two stories would not be viable, owing to the cost estimates for the restoration of the buildings. Mr. Serratore argued that the building has very few defining features; but with the retention of the scale of the window configuration, the proposed addition would fade without changing the building's historic appearance. He believes that visibility would be minimal owing to the addition's setback. Mr. D'Angella compared the

proposed addition to the addition on the Saunders Building. He believes that within the next ten years, the streetscape will change dramatically. Mr. Schwartz clarified that the proposed application is for conceptual approval.

Ms. Spina countered that the Saunders Building is much larger in scale and the context of Washington Square much different than this diminutive building along Chestnut Street. Mr. Tyler said that owing to the building's exposure from all directions, it could not accept even a one-story addition. He commented that the proposed addition would seriously compromise the historic integrity of the building.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, spoke in opposition to the proposed addition. He reiterated that if denying the proposal renders a hardship, then the applicant should pursue his option of submitting an application to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Mr. Gallery cited the *Standards* to further emphasize the inappropriateness of the proposed addition.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal, 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 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 Roofing Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

7 North 3rd Street

Bruce Feinberg, Owner

Philip Ahn, Applicant

DATE: c. 1845; commercial front added, c. 1930; glass tiles in storefront replaced with ceramic tiles, 1988

PROPOSAL: Legalize illuminated sign

Without a permit or Historical Commission approval, the tenant installed an internally-illuminated plastic box sign on an existing bracket. The sign measures 6 feet by 4 feet, 5 inches and projects a total of 7 feet, 6 inches.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Ms. Spina presented the application and informed the Committee that the Old City District had not reviewed the proposal and asked for the denial of the application.

Philip Ahn, the owner, attended the meeting. He did not know the sign company had not applied for the proper permits.

Ms. Pentz inquired if the brackets existed previously and Mr. Ahn responded in the affirmative. Mr. McCoubrey offered the owner a suggestion of re-using the sign by putting the plastic sheets flat against plywood.

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.].

102 North 2nd Street

Alan Karpo, Owner

George Baker, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840-50

PROPOSAL: Install lottery window, remove bulkhead

The owner proposes to install a sliding glass window within the large plate-glass storefront window and replace the single-leaf door with another single-leaf door that swings in the opposite direction. The proposal also includes removing the historic central basement bulkhead and infilling the area with concrete. The owner wants the changes to be able to sell lottery tickets to disabled patrons.

In April 2002 the Historical Commission approved a handicap-access ramp for the property. This would be a simpler and more architecturally appropriate solution for the owner's needs.

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

Ms. Spina explained the project. George Baker, the architect, said that the owner no longer wishes to install the ramp. Committee members agreed that the ramp would be a better alternative, not only because it is architecturally more appropriate for the building, but it also would allow handicapped patrons full access to the store, not just to lottery tickets at the window.

Beth Richards of the Old City Civic Association remarked that she questions whether the building is zoned for take-out.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.]; Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

321 Chestnut Street, National Liberty Museum

National Liberty Museum, Owner

Sandra Kelly, Applicant

DATE: 1901, Hewitt Brothers; 3rd floor added, c. 1910

PROPOSAL: Signage

The Liberty Museum returns for more signage. The Museum has removed all of the illegal signage and installed the two banners and one sign at the front that the Historical Commission approved in 1997.

The Museum now proposes three new signs for the building. Two will be black plastic panels attached on the window grilles below the banners; they will feature quotes about the Museum. These measure 6 feet, 3 inches by 5 feet. The third sign will be attached to the rear of the building, facing Franklin Court and measure 9 feet, 5 inches by 1 foot, 3 inches. The National Park Service has written a letter in support of the rear sign.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the sign on the rear of the property, but denial of the signs on the front, pursuant to Standard 9.

Irvin Borowsky, Sandra Kelly, and Bob Hawk attended the meeting. Ms. Spina explained the application and noted that the illegal signage and lights have been removed. She also presented photographs showing the stone repair of the penetrations with epoxy for concrete; the method of repair raises concern, especially in the area of the cornice where the lights were removed. Committee members concurred that removal of the epoxy would exacerbate the situation. They said that horizontal cornices usually have flashing or a lead cap and suggested its installation for long term maintenance. They noted that any more work to the cornices will require a building permit and Commission approval.

Mr. Borowsky argued that the signs are needed to give presence to the museum and attract more walk-ins. He said that the signs would cover the bars, which he believes negatively effects the historic features. Ms. Spina informed the Committee that the National Park Service supports the rear signage but oppose the front signs. She pointed out that the building would be overwhelmed by the proposed signage. Committee members reminded the applicant that the Commission approved the removal of the bars. Mr. McCoubrey said that the building has a wonderful civic presence which would be aided with the bar removal and, because the windows are at street level, they are perfect for interior signage. The Committee concurred.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the sign on the rear of the property, but denial of the signs on the front, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]

117-21 Chestnut Street

Chestnut Street, LT, Owner

Stephen Potts, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c.1840 with alts c.1885, c.1900 and c.1950

PROPOSAL: 2-story rooftop addition, roof deck

The proposal sent to the Committee members involves adding two stories to this building. The drawings indicate that the new floors will have visibility from certain angles and staff thinks the public will see them. Also the horizontal fenestration does not complement the existing architecture. The staff would find a single additional story acceptable if the designers pull it back to a point where it would not be visible from any public right-of-way. The architect should propose to restore the base of the building based on the photograph showing the early twentieth-century combined front. The staff should review details for any new windows and doors.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and stated that he had visited the site to determine visibility. Based on this site visit, the applicant submitted revised plans at the Committee meeting. The new plans eliminate the second story of the eastern most portions of the penthouses which minimizes visibility greatly. The remaining point of visibility will soon likely be eliminated through new construction. In addition the applicant now calls for restoring the storefront portions of the building to the period around 1900 when the buildings were combined and using a more vertical fenestration on the addition.

Tina Makouljian, Esq., Stephen Potts, and Janice Woodcock, architects, attended the meeting. In response to Mr. Levy's query about constructing the elevator penthouse internally, Mr. Potts responded that the penthouse may possibly be eliminated with the new type of hydraulic elevator. Ms. Woodcock disclosed that the window configurations have been revised. She noted that a first-floor storefront bay would be cut into a door which the Committee thought appropriate.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised proposal, with the 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 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.]

2202 Brandywine Street

Kevin and Monika Klatt, Owners

Robert Boothroyd, Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Legalize vinyl siding on visible rear ell

This proposal involves a request to legalize vinyl siding on a rear ell visible from both Brandywine and Spring Garden Streets.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron presented the application. Robert Boothroyd, the applicant, attended the meeting and informed the Committee that the work had been completed when he was approached about acquiring a permit. He thought that the alterations do not have visibility from Brandywine but are visible from Spring Garden.

Ms. Pentz asked about the prior condition before the vinyl siding was installed. Mr. Boothroyd responded that it was believed to have been clapboard. Mr. Boothroyd commented that Home Depot, the installer, is willing to rectify the situation. Committee members concluded that once the siding is removed, then a determination of the previous and replacement material can be assessed.

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 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.]

220 West Rittenhouse Square

220 West Rittenhouse Square Condominium Association, Owner

Robert Doughty, Abstract Door Company, Applicant

DATE: c. 1958

PROPOSAL: Legalize replacing front doors

This proposal calls for the legalization of a new sliding door in place of the original hinged doors.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented this application. He explained that the condominium association of 220 West Rittenhouse Square had had the historic hinged doors replaced with a sliding door before securing a building permit and without Historical Commission approval.

Matthew Ahren of Abstract Door Company said that he saw nothing historic or special about the hinged doors. The replacement door is a slider rather than hinged and has a vertical muntin. The association selected this door without consulting the condominium owners.

Jean Henry, an owner and resident, opposed the application. She informed the Committee that the association had not take this matter up with the members and, unlike the hinged door, does not readily accommodate wheelchairs.

After some discussion about the door, the feasibility of replicating the previous door, and the locus of responsibility for securing a permit, Mr. Ahren stated that he would install a hinged door at cost. Mr. Levy noted that this offer was between Abstract Door Company and the association, not the Committee.

The Committee recommended denial of this application for 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 by documentary and physical evidence.]

237-247 South 18th Street, The Barclay

Barclay Condominium Association, Owner

Albert Tantala, Applicant

DATE: 1928, architects, J.E.R. Carpenter

PROPOSAL: Legalize and alter vents and alarms on east facade of building

This application, only slightly changed from last time, involves the legalization of large ducts which rise out of the sidewalk on the east side of the building and an alarm box. The Committee and Commission denied a similar application last meeting. Staff will attempt a site visit to consider other solutions.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron introduced this submission to the Committee. Craig Rosenfeld, the building's manager, explained that the Barclay had become a condominium in 1974 and that its condominium documents were not compliant with current practice. For example, it did not provide for the common ownership of space for utilities. He acknowledged that the permit as issued limited the scope of work to the interior and that the actual installation exceeded that permit in the rush to complete the project. These two considerations resulted in the present condition.

Mr. Baron asked if the lines could run through the basement and exit out a window. Mr. Rosenfeld responded that this would still necessitate using a first-floor space in private, not common, ownership.

Following further discussion, Mr. Rosenfeld agreed to explore other means to accommodate these ducts and alarm box.

The Committee recommended denial of this application, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize 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.]

After the Committee voted upon its recommendation, Mr. Rosenfeld advised it that he would withdraw this application as he sought a solution to the problem.

258-62 South 17th Street and 1706 Rittenhouse Square Street

Parkway Corporation, Owner

Thomas P. Witt, Esq., Wolf Block, Applicant

DATE: 1706 Rittenhouse Square Street built c. 1920 with c. 1960 storefront addition

PROPOSAL: Demolition of 1706 Rittenhouse Square, construction of 31-story residential building with underground parking at 58-62 South 17th Street and 1706 Rittenhouse Square Street

The proposal calls for the demolition of a contributing building at 1706 Rittenhouse Square Street and the construction of a 31 story condominium tower on the site of an open lot and the row-house structure.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the demolition of the existing contributing row-house pursuant to Standard 10. The staff recommends that the applicant consider retaining the contributing structure, but cutting the garage entrance into the 1950s storefront and retaining three walls of the building as proposed for 1618 Locust Street.

Mr. Baron presented this application. He explained that the owner is seeking the Commission's approval of the demolition of 1706 Rittenhouse Square Street to provide space for the underground garage entrance to the proposed development. The Parkway Corporation has included a financial hardship application with its application. He noted that the incorporation of 1706 into the design would render this facet of the proposal an alteration, not a demolition, and obviate the need for a hardship appeal.

Mr. Wilson and Mr. Ertz both told the Committee that this will not work, for 1706 has a width of but 16 feet and the entrance requires 18 feet. Mr. Zuritsky added that it must facilitate two cars at a time and that the interior geometry requires more than 16 feet of width.

The requisite 18-foot width in the 16-foot frontage would require the demolition of the east wall of 1706 at grade. Most agreed that this would yield an unsatisfactory design.

Mr. Scannapieco briefly described the architecture of the building and its appropriateness.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia supported the denial of this application on architectural grounds and its referral to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

The Committee recommended the denial of this application on architectural grounds and its referral to the Committee on Financial Hardship, 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.]

1530 Spruce Street

Al Shapiro, Owner

Michael Del Rossi, Jr., Applicant

DATE: 1898, Thomas Bennett, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace wood windows with aluminum

This application proposes the replacement of 200 wood windows with aluminum windows in this residential building on Spruce Street. Two types of one-over-one windows would be replaced. What is labeled the Type A window (single and coupled) would be replaced above the cornice line at floors 5, 6, 7, and 8. The Type B window (in the bays) would be replaced at floors 2 to 8. A similar application was reviewed by the Committee in June 2004, but was withdrawn before the Commission meeting owing to a recommendation of denial. The applicant returns with revised drawings and a custom extrusion for window types A & B.

Staff recommendation: The staff finds the substitution of aluminum acceptable if the dimensional differences between materials are found to be close. The applicant now shows custom panning extrusions closer to the originals than the design seen last month for the type B windows; however, the meeting rail is still an inch wider than the wood windows. Removing the putty slope to reduce this dimension will create a sash without a putty slope reveal between the glass and the sash frame. 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.]*

Mr. Baron explained the applicant's revised proposal. He noted that with the revised plan the custom extrusion reduces the change in the glass width; however, there is still a substantial difference in the meeting rail.

Arcangelo Guida, Kyle Quinn, and Al Shapiro, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Shapiro believes that the differences in the width of the original and the revised plans are minimal; he added that he would incur an additional expense for the custom extrusion. Customization of the

extrusion calls for cutting out the wood at the perimeter and since the B windows on the upper levels are clad in copper, a bond breaker would be required between the two materials. He noted that the lower-level windows would be restored and upper-level windows replaced as well as the sills and that the windows in the light court will not have visibility. Mr. Quinn said that the windows would be two colors; antique bronze and green. Mr. Levy expressed concern about the cutting of the aluminum and copper.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with staff to review details such as color.

1223 Pine Street

Kendall Cameron, Owner

Robin Towey, Applicant

DATE: built c. 1830, storefront altered c. 1905

PROPOSAL: New shed dormer addition at rear, rebuild roof deck

The proposal calls for demolishing the rear slope of the roof and constructing a new roof addition and roof deck all highly visible on this corner building. The adjacent buildings where owners have undertaken similar work sit farther from the corner and have much less visibility.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 9.

Robin Towey, the applicant, discussed with the Committee the possibility of re-opening the historic window, if there is evidence of its existence. She pointed out that the deck on the rear ell exists but that the owner wishes to extend the dormer further to the sides and create a new access to the deck.

Committee members remarked that this property has received extensive alterations and any further allowance would be too overwhelming and visible.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the simple deck railing, the re-opening of the historic window, provided that evidence of it exists, but denial of the shed dormer addition, 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.].

1001-13 Chestnut Street, Victory Building

Philadelphia Management, Owner

Deanna Collins, Architect/Applicant

DATE: built c.1870 altered c 1890

PROPOSAL: New doors, illuminated signage

The proposal calls for new metal doors for the first-floor corner and illuminated projecting and flat wall signs for Starbucks.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standard 9.

John Lister attended the meeting to represent the application. He informed the Committee that he also wishes to apply for a single-leaf ADA door on the Chestnut Street façade in the location of an existing double-leaf window. Mr. Lister noted that the new door would lead to an interlocking lift. The signage would include halo lighting.

Mr. Baron expressed concern about the effect of the alteration on the possible restoration of the decorative railing and thought that more information should be provided about the proposed alterations. Committee members thought that since doors existed on the 10th Street elevation, that this elevation would better accommodate the new ADA door. Mr. Lister responded that the interior configuration at this location renders the installation of a lift problematic. Mr. McCoubrey suggested double doors with an operator. Mr. Lister said that this also would be problematic.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal including a single-light ADA door with side lights and no divisions in the door, with staff to review details.

227 South 6th Street, Lippincott Building

Irv Green, Condominium Owner

Steven Verner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1900, William Prichett, architect

PROPOSAL: Alter Locust Walk entrance

This application proposes alterations to an entrance to this condominium building. The entrance on Locust Walk will lead into a private condominium unit rather than a lobby space for the building. This doorway originally led to the internal fire-escape that was open on all floors. The arched windows on the upper floors did not have glazing originally and the photographs submitted by the architect show that the entrance did not have doors.

The condominium's owner wishes to remove the existing door and transom and install a double-leaf frameless glass door. The plans show two options for the sidelights: one would remove the entire sidelight and install a single pane of glass; the second would keep the panels below and install glass in the upper portion.

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

Jane Green, the owner, and Cecil Baker and Steven Verner, the architects, attended the meeting. Mr. Baker contended that research shows that doors did not exist originally in the openings; however, the extant doors are in keeping with the architecture of the building. He argued that the proposed alterations are an enhancement to city living. Mr. Baker described the differences of Scheme A and B.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that the previous alterations have become significant to the building; however, he believed that since the windows in the upper floors were designed to reflect the openings originally were not glazed, he thought the doorway should be treated the same. He suggested that the proposed door be recessed as far back from the plane of the wall as possible.

Steve Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association, inquired if the glass would be clear or translucent. Mr. Verner responded that the door would receive clear glass.

Margaret Robb of the Society Hill Civic Association asked the applicant if she has considered the possibility of vandalism. In response, Mr. Verner said that the proposed doors would be laminated glass doors for security.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of scheme A, recessed as far as possible.

4113-15 Main Street

Daniel Neducsin, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 4113-15: c. 1930; 4119, 4121, 4123 & 4125: c. 1860s

PROPOSAL: Demolition of 4117-25 Main Street, rehabilitation of 4113 Main Street, construction of 4-story building at 4115-25 Main Street - final approval

The Commission approved the demolition of 4117-25 Main Street in concept on the condition that the owner return with a new, more contemporary design that retains the boiler plant. The proposal has returned for final approval. It is very similar to the last design, except that a series of 2-story bays replaces the recreated historic façades at 4117 to 4125.

The proposal calls for the rehabilitation of the boiler plant at 4113 Main Street, infill construction at 4115 Main Street, the complete demolition of 4117-25 Main Street, and the construction of a four-story building with a single commercial space on the first floor and residential units above.

The rehabilitation of 4113 Main Street involves removing the brick panels below the steel windows and inserting plate-glass storefront windows.

The new four-story building will sit on the properties at 4115-25 and have set backs at the third and fourth floors. The design at 4115 consists of an aluminum curtain wall at the first floor and multi-light windows at the second floor. The rest of the façade is a series of four two-story stucco bays with plate-glass windows at the first floor and multi-light, industrial sash at the second floor. The door to the commercial space is a double-leaf, fully-glazed unit.

The Station Street façade will have stucco with single-paned windows, a recessed balcony at the third floor, a standing-seam metal roof, and a metal railing. The rear of the power station will have glass and metal panels in the garage door. The entrance to the residential units will be a double-leaf, fully-glazed door.

The plans are not annotated and no details are given for the windows, doors, or materials.

Staff Recommendation: Denial. The current proposal is out of scale with both Main Street and Station Street; the four-story massing is too large and overwhelms the streetscape. For the Main Street façade, the design lacks cohesion, especially with the curtain wall at 4115. On the Station Street elevation, the proposed simply follows function without regard to the buildings that face the façade.

Daniel Neducsin, the owner, and David Amburn, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Amburn noted that the setbacks have been revised. They now are 25 feet from the front façade on the 3rd floor and 15 feet on the 4th floor. Owing to the sloping of the lot, the Station Street façade appears as three stories. He said that the materials would consist of aluminum and glass with Arristone (cast stone) material, which respects the streetscape. Mr. Amburn noted that additional

windows have been added to the rear of the property. He said that the proposed aluminum pergola would shadow the windows and be a softening element for that level. Mr. Neducsin was opposed to the pergola.

Committee members concurred with Mr. Neducsin about the pergola. They suggested that a fifth bay on the Main Street façade be added for symmetry. They also suggested that the two end units at the fourth-floor level be set back an additional 4 to 6 feet from the front façade to further minimize the massing on Main Street.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a revised submission, with the addition of a bay on the Main Street façade, the elimination of the pergola, the addition of windows on the rear, and the addition of 4 to 6 feet more of setback from the front facade at the end units on the 4th floor.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary