

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

**22 MAY 2007
CITY HALL, ROOM 578
9:30 A.M.**

PRESENT

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

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

ALSO PRESENT

Mo Rushdy, Toll Brothers
Chris Pienkowski, Toll Brothers
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Jeff Goldstein
Kevin Romano, Squall Co.
John Leggette
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Craig Deutsch, Harmon Deutsch
Paul Drzl, Harmon Deutsch
Jonathan Dyer, Space Design
Elaine Ulmer, Martin Rosenblum Architects
Jim Coburn, Space Design
Fabio Rivera
Stephen Bonitatibus, Bonitatibus Architects
Diana Bonesteel, Kaiserman Co., Inc
Kenneth Kaiserman, Kaiserman Co., Inc
Gail Selznick, Kaiserman Co., Inc
Jeff Maberry, Kaiserman Co., Inc
Lisa Neely Veyko, Inc
David & Samantha Halpern
Lanny Leibowitz, Architect

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Rivera called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Mses. Pentz and Voith and Messrs. Levy and Thomas joined him on the Architectural Committee. Mr. D'Alessandro joined the Committee while the meeting was in progress.

2420 GRAYS FERRY AVENUE, U.S. NAVAL ASYLUM

Owner: Toll Naval Associates

Applicant: Chris Pienkowski

History: 1830s, William Strickland, architect

Project: Construct four-story townhouses

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a block of townhouses on the campus of the U.S. Naval Asylum. The Commission approved a very similar block for this site in May 2004. Typically, the staff would have deemed the differences between the approved and current plans negligible and approved the revised version at the staff level, but the precise language of the Commission's 2004 approval precluded that possibility. In 2004, the Commission approved "the application as submitted without staff to review details."

The current proposal is very similar to that approved by the Commission in 2004. The earlier iteration was designed for condominiums; this iteration is designed for stacked townhouses. The other primary revision is the deletion of the interior parking. The size of the building's footprint has been reduced slightly. Also, the rhythm and detailing of the front façade has changed slightly. However, the new design is no more or less compatible with the historic site and nearby historic buildings than the earlier design.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to the Commission's May 2004 approval.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Committee. Attorney Brett Feldman and developer Chris Pienkowski represented the application.

Mr. Feldman explained that, with the change in the real estate market, the developer is modifying the design of this new building for the Naval Asylum campus. The building was originally designed to house 24 condominium units, but will now house 18 stacked townhouse units. The newly designed exterior will be very similar to the approved design and identical to other approved designs on the asylum campus. Mr. Feldman explained that the elimination of the basement parking garage will necessitate the addition of a few parking spaces where the entrance to the garage was planned. The parking ratio on the campus as a whole will continue to exceed one space per unit. Several Committee members noted that the new design was acceptable in light of the Commission's earlier approval.

Mr. Levy asked the applicants to identify the location where the goat is buried. Mr. Feldman stated that he did not understand Mr. Levy's question and asked him to elaborate. Mr. Levy explained that the Navy had a goat as a mascot. When it died, it was buried on the campus. Mr. Levy asserted that the burial location is very important and should be determined before the location of the new building is fixed. He stated that the goat has great historic significance and should be commemorated with an appropriate memorial. Mr. Feldman confessed that he was unaware of the historic goat, but offered to research the matter before the Commission meeting. Mr. Farnham asked the Committee members if they would like to condition their recommendation of approval on the commemoration of the goat. Several Committee members urged that their recommendation be unconditional.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to the Commission's May 2004 approval.

113 GAY STREET

Owner: Joseph Vanelli

Applicant: Kevin Romano

History: c. 1855, modified to garage c. 1920, addition late twentieth century

“Linking” building within Manayunk District

Project: Rooftop additions, bay, reopen windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the conversion of a much-altered c. 1860 building, now an automobile repair garage, into a mixed use building with several living units above a ground-floor commercial space.

The applicant would reopen blocked up windows and the corner doorway and restore the main cornice. A glazed roll-up door would be installed in an existing garage entrance on Gay Street to provide light and air for a café. The garage entrance on Cresson Street would be widened, eliminating a door, to accommodate two cars. The applicant proposes the addition of a large bay near the corner; several buildings in the neighborhood have bays, but this building did not. The modern bay would be glass with an internal wood framework. The plans specify a two-story addition on the section of the building that is, itself, a two-story addition and a one-story addition on the main part of the building. The new third-story section of the new addition would cantilever out slightly over the sidewalk toward the railroad tracks. The addition would eliminate the cornice on the south side of the main building block. It would have a glazed wall creating an internal sunroom. A fourth story and decks would be added to both portions of the building, set back from the facades. The plans specify a green roof. The additions would be somewhat visible from up the hill in Manayunk, but the train platforms and canopies would screen some of the new construction.

The bay and the cantilevered third-story addition would be very large and highly visible, and therefore incompatible with the historic building and district. Scarring on the stucco wall indicates an original window like the others on the façade where the applicant proposes the bay. For historical accuracy, the reopened windows should have a two-over-two pane configuration. Vertically-oriented café windows would be more appropriate in the former garage opening than the proposed glazing. The rooftop additions that are set back from the facades would be inconspicuous.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to the PM-704.2.3-7.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Jeff Goldstein and Kevin Romano represented the application.

Mr. Goldstein explained that the two-story addition was constructed in the 1980s. He noted that the site is difficult to improve because it is adjacent to the railroad tracks and a larger building to the south blocks the views of the bridge. He reported that he is endeavoring to give the neglected building a new life. He explained that he is proposing the side bay to provide a view of the bridge. Mr. Goldstein then stated that the addition on the newer building was an attempt to engage with the rail line. Rather than ignore the rail line, he is attempting to embrace the activity associated with it. He stated that he plans to reopen the infilled windows. He also noted that the roof deck would provide needed outdoor space.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee must be guided by historic preservation standards. He stated that the application presents two problems from an historic preservation perspective, the large bay on Gay Street and the large cantilevering addition. He acknowledged the building has

suffered over time. He also acknowledged that a bay of appropriate size, materials, and scale would not be inappropriate. Mr. Thomas noted that the elevated railroad postdates the building by many years. The streetscape and building have significantly changed. Therefore, subtle changes from the historic appearance are acceptable.

Ms. Voith noted that the spacing of bays and the cornice heights define the rhythm of the neighborhood. She suggested that the alterations and new construction should respect the rhythms of the neighborhood, even if they are executed in a contemporary vocabulary. She stated that the proposal is not appropriate for the area and does not comply with Manayunk's historic preservation ordinance.

Ms. Pentz asked the applicant if he intends to gut the building. Mr. Goldsmith responded that he did. Ms. Pentz cautioned him that the stone buildings of Manayunk were built with a mud or clay mortar; walls built with this mortar are not as strong as other masonry walls. She advised him to brace the walls during construction.

Mr. Goldstein explained that questions remain regarding the original window openings; these questions cannot be answered until construction begins. He assured the Committee that he would restore the window openings to their original dimensions.

Ms. Pentz asked if any evidence of the column at the corner entrance had been found. Mr. Goldstein stated that he does not know if the column is embedded within the infill wall, but the lintel is visible. Mr. Baron stated that some corner storefronts had a masonry pier and a second door instead of a column. He suggested additional investigation.

Mr. Levy voiced concerns about the aluminum-clad windows and suggested wood instead.

Ms. Voith suggested that the applicant restore the nineteenth-century fabric, but treat the new sections as contemporary additions. She suggested that the two parts be distinguished but compatible. Ms. Voith agreed with Mr. Thomas and recommended a bay that would be more compatible to the historic building. She also advocated for the contemporary styling of the additions. She noted Ms. Pentz's concern about mud mortar and posited that the green roof may be too heavy.

Mr. Levy recommended the applicants speak to the Department of Licenses & Inspections about the proximity of the proposed bay to the train platform.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to the PM-704.2.3-7.

34-44 N. FRONT STREET

Owners: 38 N. Front Street Associates

Applicant: Brett Harman, Harmon Deutsch Architects

History: Buildings constructed as Girard Row, sidewalks originally bluestone

Individually designated and contributing to Old City Historic District

Project: Install brick paving, lighting and street trees, remove marble step

OVERVIEW: The owners of several buildings propose the legalization of the demolition of the existing concrete sidewalk and approval of the installation of a new sidewalk in herringbone-pattern brick with gas lights and street trees. The plans also propose the removal of a marble

step. The trees and lighting should be coordinated with the neighborhood and Streets Department. The original paving here was bluestone; gray concrete would be a good alternative if real bluestone is too expensive.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the brick sidewalk and removal of the marble step, pursuant to Standard 6. In-concept approval of trees and lights.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Brett Harman and developer Poe Leggett represented the application.

Mr. Baron described the rehabilitation of the neighborhood and the issues regarding the sidewalks. He stated that, on this particular block, bluestone survives. Mr. Baron noted that, historically, the sidewalks on the larger streets in Old City were not paved with brick, but rather they with large pieces of bluestone and, in some places, granite, which covered underground vaults. Some of the small side streets did have brick. He recommended bluestone or gray concrete with a gray coloring where the concrete had been removed.

Ms. Voith stated that she could not discern between the existing and proposed pavement in the submitted documentation. Ms. Voith advised the applicants that they should have submitted an existing conditions drawing and a new proposal drawing to avoid confusion.

Mr. Leggett explained that he is redeveloping 38-44 N. Front Street; he has partnered with the owners of 36 N. Front, a condominium building, and 32-34 N Front, an apartment building, to make this joint proposal for the sidewalk.

Ms. Voith remarked that the brick was not an appropriate paver for this location. Mr. Leggett noted nearby brick sidewalk paving at 18 N. Front Street and on the side of his building at Cuthbert Street. Ms. Voith countered that these sidewalks may be illegal or may have been installed before the creation of the district. Ms. Voith suggested that the Committee recommend denial and require an existing condition drawing for any subsequent application. She also suggested that the Committee only recommend approval of bluestone or concrete. Mr. Levy objected to the concrete and suggested bluestone, but in smaller pieces than the historic; he opined that bluestone in the historic sizes may not be available or practical. Ms. Voith stated that bluestone and flagstone are grading based on pressure testing. Ms. Pentz stated that concrete would be a better approximation for bluestone than other options. The applicant stated that he did not like the appearance of the concrete. He also noted that the various utility connections would necessitate significant cutting and piecing of bluestone. Ms. Voith noted that the drawings showed no utility connections; she asked that this information be provided.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the neighbors should coordinate their paving projects. Mr. Leggett replied that some property owners had been contacted, but had not expressed an interest in participating in the project.

Regarding the lighting, Mr. Baron explained that Old City Civic is planning a neighborhood-wide lighting project and that these lights should be coordinated with the larger scheme. Also, because Streets Department seeks to minimize the number of light fixture parts it must stock, the applicants should consider one of the lights already approved for Clinton Street or the Center City District.

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

170 S. INDEPENDENCE MALL WEST, CURTIS PUBLISHING COMPANY BUILDING

Owners: Joe Grasso and Garrett Miller

Applicant: Jonathan Dyer

History: 1910-14, Edgar Seeler ,architect, for Curtis Publishing Company

Individually designated and Significant in Society Hill Historic District

Project: Replace doors, windows, light fixtures, modify canopies

OVERVIEW: The applicant proposes to install frameless glass doors and sidelights in place of the existing framed doors and sidelights on all facades. The applicant also proposes to install "Colonial" light fixtures and new window sash at the first floor. The applicant did not provide drawings detailing the new windows.

The applicant has been provided with a photograph of the original historic doors with frames and small lights on the 6th Street façade. The existing doors, which are not original, feature large single lights within brass frames.

The applicant claims that the two sets of doors on Walnut Street were added during a renovation in the 1980s. They currently have brass frames. The applicant would like to modify the metal canopies over the doors, adding a scalloped glass lip and light bulbs, creating a theater-marquee effect.

The applicant proposes removing the doors with brass frames and the decorative cast metal spandrel panel on 7th Street to install an open all-glass curtain wall. The applicant claims that this area had no doors, but was originally open.

For the Sansom Street facade, the applicant proposes to remove the original metal-paneled and small-pane original doors and replace them with all-glass doors.

The standards do not sanction the removal of historic fabric, even if that historic fabric is not original. Standard 4 asserts that: "Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved." For historic entrances with non-historic doors, the standards sanction new doors that match the originals. The standards sanction new doors in keeping with the character of the scale and materials of the original building at non-historic openings. The window application is incomplete. The light fixtures are not appropriate because they imply a false history.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 3, 4, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Property owner Joe Grasso and designers Jonathan Dyer and Jim Coburn represented the application.

Mr. Baron summarized his overview, stating that the standards do not sanction the removal of historic fabric. For historic entrances with non-historic doors, the standards sanction new doors that match the originals. At non-historic openings, the standards sanction new doors in keeping with the character of the scale and materials of the original building. The window application is incomplete. The light fixtures are not appropriate.

Mr. Dyer stated that the doors slated for replacement are not original to the building, but were installed during the 1984 renovation. He pointed to the Witherspoon Building as an example of door replacement. The canopy at the Barclay, which was built in 1928, is the inspiration for the

proposed canopy. Ms. Voith asked if the Commission had approved the door replacement in 1984. She stated that the new doors should replicate the historic doors.

Ms. Voith and Mr. Thomas suggested that the doors facing Independence Hall should be reconstructed to match the historic. Ms. Voith stated that the all-glass doors proposed for Walnut Street are not compatible with the rhythm and scale of the building. She rejected the canopy alterations and recommended something cleaner, less fussy.

Mr. Levy asked about the work done in the 1980s. Mr. Baron explained that the building was designated in 1974, prior to the rehabilitation.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance opined that the big glass doors are not appropriate for this building. He echoed Ms. Voith's comments and supported the staff's recommendations.

Ms. Voith recommended the Sansom Street doors should be retained and painted. Mr. Grasso explained that this would be a private entrance to the tenant space.

Mr. Grasso also explained that the 7th Street elevation was originally a drive-through entrance to the inner court and never had doors. He stated the doors in this opening are not original and block the view into the Atrium. This view is a key to the successful rehabilitation of the building.

Most Committee members supported the applicant's idea to use an all-glass system in the area that was historically open. Mr. Rivera disagreed, however, and contended that glass doors with thin metal frames would be more appropriate.

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

1. the all-glass doors on 7th Street, provided the historic doors on 6th Street are reconstructed; and,
2. the refurbishment of the marquees with the substitution of glass for the plastic skirt

The Committee recommended denial of:

3. the removal of the framed doors on Walnut Street;
4. the addition of glass scallops to the marquees;
5. the removal of the original doors on Sansom Street;
6. the "Colonial" light fixtures; and,
7. the new windows, owing to incompleteness.

The Committee makes these recommendations, pursuant to Standard 3, 4, 6, and 9.

223-227 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: 223-227 Chestnut Street L.P., El Medina, George Manosis, Kevin Kelly, principals

Applicant: Craig Deutsch, Harman Deutsch, Architects

History: c.1855, pressed tin front added to 227 c. 1890

Project: Restore facades, add penthouse

OVERVIEW: This property consists of two c. 1855 commercial structures that have been combined. The owners seek to rehabilitate them into a day spa. The facades would be restored with new windows based on a 1925 photograph. Missing tin façade panels would be replicated in resin or fiberglass. The penthouse on 223 would be slightly enlarged, but would only be minimally visible. The fire-escape at the rear would be modified to meet code requirements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 6, 9, and 10 and the Roof Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Craig Deutsch represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the original cast iron facade has a pressed tin overlay. He noted the structural problems and the concerns about the heavy pieces attached to the facade. He reported that the applicants propose to restore the facade, but to use a lighter material where pieces are missing.

Mr. Deutsch stated that the rear fire escape would be altered to bring it up to code. The building would house a unisex salon and a bar and restaurant. Mr. Deutsch stated that an existing flagpole could be reused for signage. A banner is also proposed.

Committee members cautioned Mr. Deutsch that they would find the fiberglass or resin an acceptable substitute for some façade panels, but not Fypon.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal with the signage hung from the existing flagpole, with the staff to review details.

5122 TABOR ROAD

Owner: Fabio Rivera

Applicant: Fabio Rivera

History: Early nineteenth-century; designated 11/29/1960

Project: Legalize demolition of front porch, construction of deck, and painting of the façade

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the demolition of the front porch and the construction of a new wider pressure-treated deck in its place. It also proposes legalizing the painting of the façade a desert sand color. This work was done without the approval of the Commission or a building permit. Violations were issued in July and November 2006.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. Property owner Fabio Rivera represented the application.

Mr. Rivera, the owner, claimed that the porch roof had collapsed after a heavy snow. The damaged porch roof was removed. He stated that he was unaware that the property was designated as historic and did the work without a permit. The Historical Commission requested that the Department of Licenses & Inspections inspect the property and issued a violation if appropriate. The Department issued a violation. The owner, after receiving the violation, applied for a permit to legalize his repairs, which the Department issued in error. The Department later revoked the permit. Mr. Rivera claimed that the porch was not original to the house and that approximately 70% of materials in it were new. Mr. Rivera noted changes to the neighboring property including the painting of the shutters.

Mr. Baron explained to the owner that historic features often need to be repaired or replaced but explained that it is possible to replicate the historic form as prescribed by the Standards. Mr. Rivera responded that he did not like the porch, which made the interior dark.

Mr. Thomas explained to the applicant that this is an early nineteenth-century building. The houses in the row were owned by the mill and rented to workers. The porch in the picture with its standing seam tin roof and beveled posts was historic. Mr. Thomas stated that the Standards require the restoration of the porch. He noted that he agreed with the staff's recommendation. He advised the applicant to discuss any special circumstances with the Commission. Mr. Thomas noted that the porch could be accurately reconstructed with new materials. The Committee also expressed concern about the large deck built in place of the historic porch, which covers an areaway.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

2114 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: Paul Hoyer and Helen Leibowitz

Applicant: Martin Jay Rosenblum

History: c. 1860-1879

Project: Remove existing second story roof deck, extend second story to align with existing first story, and construct a solarium on the third story.

OVERVIEW: An earlier iteration of this application proposed the demolition of an existing roof deck at the second-story level and the extension of the second story to align with first-story bay. In March 2007, the Commission approved in concept the massing of the rear addition with a bay at the second floor and a greenhouse at the third floor. The current applicant requests the final approval of the rear addition. The redesign is a more contemporary version of a rear bay and is differentiated from the existing structure. The bay would be a painted metal clad material with wood casements and transoms. The wood cornice remains the same as the previous application. The new addition would be clad in a cement fiber board material. This application also proposes revisions to the earlier greenhouse design. The current application proposes to extend the glass and metal windows down to meet the bay and construct a small deck above the bay with a cable railing. Cypress is a common alley that is abutted by the rears of buildings on Spruce Street and Delancey Place.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The design complies with Commission's March 2007 approval in concept.

DISCUSSION: Mr. D'Alessandro joined the Committee; Mses. Voith and Pentz and Mr. Thomas excused themselves from the meeting.

Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. Elaine Ulmer of Rosenblum Architects represented the application.

Ms. Sell explained that this revised proposal complies with the Commission's approval in concept as well as its suggestions proffered during that review. She also stated that this design is more contemporary than the previous iteration.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to the Commission's March 2007 approval in concept.

122 NORTH LAMBERT STREET

History: Built c. 1860, designated 4/28/1970

Owner: Stephen Bonitatibus

Applicant: Stephen Bonitatibus

Project: Construct fourth-story addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a fourth-story mansard addition with a dormer. The addition would span the main block of the house. The side elevation of the addition would be clad with a brick veneer. On the roof of the rear ell, a wood frame sunroom and a roof deck are proposed. These alterations would be highly visible from the public right-of-way. On the rear ell, a third-floor bay window is proposed, matching the existing bay on the second floor; it would provide more interior space in a third-floor bedroom. This application also proposes the installation of shutters on the front façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval of shutters with the appropriate historic configuration, as well as the third-floor bay addition, but denial of the fourth-floor addition, sunroom, and roof deck, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. D'Alessandro joined the meeting. Ms. Coté presented the proposal to the Committee. Stephen Bonitatibus, the owner and architect, represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the staff objected to the fourth-story mansard because it would be highly visible and would significantly change the style of this Italianate building. He noted that this rowhouse stands at the end of a row and the addition would be conspicuous from the public right-of-way. He claimed that any fourth-floor addition erected on this building would be conspicuous and therefore would not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

Mr. Bonitatibus stated that he needed to add the space for his growing family. He claimed that the addition would not adversely affect the block and noted that the adjoining property is a garage. He also stated that adding a mansard to a rowhouse is the historical way to enlarge this type of building. He reported on the great diversity of nearby buildings, noting that they have all been renovated over the years. He cited the six-story Moore School of Art dormitory and a five-story rowhouse at the corner. Mr. Bonitatibus stated that he would not have proposed this addition if the block was in its original condition.

Mr. Baron stated that the continuity of the intact row and streetscape should be preserved and that a fourth-floor rooftop addition was inappropriate on this building because it stands at the end of an intact three-story row. The proposed addition does not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards and would set an adverse precedent. Mr. Bonitatibus disagreed. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested setting the addition back. The applicant stated he has tried various schemes but they appeared forced and fussy. He concluded that the traditional mansard was the best option after considering other possibilities. He asserted the Committee was not offering options or suggestions.

Mr. Levy opined that the bow window on the mansard was inappropriate; the owner replied that the bow window was an appropriate response to the segmental-arch windows below. Mr. Rivera concurred with Mr. Levy and suggested a simpler line. He suggested that the applicant avoid mimicking the existing building. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that he favors the staff recommendation, which is approval of the shutters with the appropriate historic configuration, as well as the third-floor bay addition, but denial of the fourth-floor addition, sunroom, and roof deck, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: By a vote of 2 to 1, the Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided the design is simplified and the muntins are deleted from the windows.

201 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: Kaiserman Company, Inc.

Applicant: Jeffrey D. Mayberry

History: 1955, Samuel Oshiver, architect; contributing to RFRHD, 2/8/1995

Project: Cut through-wall HVAC

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install wall HVAC units on the south or Chancellor Street side elevation from the 18th floor to 26th floors. Openings would be cut and steel lintels would be inserted below the window sill to support the units. The units would be flush mounted on the exterior wall with an architectural grill, which would be beige to match the existing brick.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the proposal to the Committee. Jeff Maberry and Kenneth Kaiserman, and Diana Bonesteel, the manager of Rittenhouse Claridge, represented the application.

Mr. Kaiserman provided a history of the 1950 building. It has a two-pipe heating and air conditioning system, which means that different sections of the building cannot be heated and cooled simultaneously. He explained that upper floors on the south side of the building overheat in cold weather. These new units would allow residents to run the air conditioning while other areas of the building are heated. Mr. Mayberry claimed that the units would be minimally visible owing to the height of the upper floors.

Mr. Rivera asked if the openings would be new. Mr. Mayberry explained that the proposal calls for new openings; however, they have been discussing using the existing vent openings. Mr. Levy asked if it would possible to center the new openings to correspond with existing features. Mr. Maberry stated that that could be done. Mr. D'Alessandro confirmed that the units would be flush against the wall. Mr. Riviera verified that that the applicant was willing to remove the existing vents and expand the opening for the new units, centering them in the fenestration pattern.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the units are placed in the expanded openings of the existing vents and centered below the windows.

2036 RITTENHOUSE SQUARE

Owner: David Halpern

Applicant: Lisa Neely

History: c. 1880; designated in 1995; contributing

Project: Construct third-floor addition and side-yard addition.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-floor addition on an existing two-story carriage house. The addition would be set-back approximately 10 feet from the front parapet. This space would be used as an outdoor deck area. The applicant proposes to either repoint the inside face of the parapet wall or install a fiber reinforced cement panel. The addition itself would be of contemporary design and would extend the entire length of the property. The façade facing Rittenhouse Square Street would be a glass wall system with powder coated steel and a reversed seam aluminum panel. The access door to the deck would have a small glass awning over it. The applicant proposes a second deck on the roof. This deck would not be visible from any public views. The applicant also proposes to replace two windows in the front façade. Currently the second floor has two louvered panels framing a central casement window. The applicant proposes to replace these louvered panels with casement windows to match the existing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Property owners David Halpern and Samantha Chakin and architect Lisa Neely represented the application.

Mr. Levy questioned the need for a second deck. Ms. Halpern explained that outdoor spaces are a premium in the city and that this deck would allow them to have private space for entertainment. She also added that the proposed deck would not be visible from any public right-of-way. Ms. Neely stated that the building already has a third-floor addition. She seeks to expand it to increase livable space. On the front elevation, the louvered panels would be removed.

Mr. Baron suggested that the staff review a mock up and report on the level of visibility to the Commission. Ms. Neely stated that the adjacent property has a temporary 6-foot fence set back 10 feet from the front façade. She suggested that the staff use this fence to gauge visibility.

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

1708 LOCUST STREET

Owner: Paul Singer

Applicant: Lanny Leibowitz

History: c. 1840 Greek Revival house, refaced in 1902

Contributing to the Rittenhouse/Fitler Historic District, 1995

Project: Construct fourth floor and side yard additions.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to the side and rear of this property. The applicant proposes to construct a fourth-floor addition over an existing three-story rear ell. The addition would be clad in brick to match the existing rear ell. The construction of the addition would require the demolition of the roof over the rear ell. The applicant proposes to reconstruct the half-gable roof and chimney on the fourth-floor addition. The applicant also proposes to

construct a side-yard addition. This addition would be located in the *piazza* space between the main block and the rear ell. This addition would be mostly invisible from public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the side-yard addition, denial of fourth-floor addition, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Lanny Leibowitz represented the application.

Mr. Rivera asked for clarification on the connection between the fourth-floor addition over the rear ell and the main block of the house. Mr. Leibowitz explained that the addition would not connect to the main block and that it would be confined to the rear ell only. He clarified that the drawing was not a full elevation. Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the side-yard addition would be visible from the rear alley. Mr. Leibowitz answered that the side addition would not be visible. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he believed that the fourth-floor addition should be slightly recessed to maintain a reveal and better read as an addition. Mr. Leibowitz agreed with the comment.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the fourth-floor addition over the rear ell is recessed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

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

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new

works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

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

PM-704.2.3 Repair: Original architectural features such as cornices and bays shall not be removed. Deteriorated features shall be repaired where possible. Replacement material where necessary shall duplicate the original as closely as possible.

PM-704.2.4 Facings: Refacing of facades, bays, cornices with inappropriate materials such as aluminum siding, or brick veneer shall be prohibited. Existing inappropriate facade facings shall be removed at the termination of the useful life of the facing. Any inappropriate facing material lawfully in existence shall not be repaired or altered in any substantial manner.

PM-704.2.5 Elements: Original window and door openings, sills, lintels, and sashes shall be retained and repaired whenever possible. Replacement elements shall match the original appearance in proportion, form, and materials as closely as possible.

PM-704.2.6 Storefronts: Original existing storefronts contributing to the character of the district shall be retained and repaired. New storefronts shall be compatible with the proportion, form and materials of the original building.

PM-704.2.7 Design: Additions, alterations, and new construction shall be designed so as to be compatible in scale, building materials, and texture, with contributing buildings in the historic district.