

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
31 August 2004**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz

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

Also

Elliot Shelkrot, Director, Free Library of Philadelphia
Moshe Safdie, Moshe Safdie & Associates
Isaac Franco, Moshe Safdie & Associates
Maurice Finegold, Finegold Alexander & Associates
John Howard, Becker & Frondorf
Vincent Maiello, Kelly/Maiello Architects
James Karmolinski, Kelly/Maiello Architects
Emanuel Kelly, Kelly/Maiello Architects
John Blatteau, John Blatteau Architects
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Adam Laver, Blank Rome
Michael Coran, 2130 Green Street
Phyllis Laver, neighbor
David Krahn, owner, 1900 Wallace Street
Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects
Jackie Ford, Friday Architects
G. Restrepo, 1012 Chancellor Street
Michael Hauptman, Brawer & Hauptman Architects
John Holland, Holland Architects, LTD
Delano Shane, Holland Architects, LTD
Craig Deutsch, Harmas Deutsch Architects
Joan Hooke, 264 South Van Pelt Street
Virginia Beier, 253 South Van Pelt Street
Charles Capaldi, 2113 Locust Street
Kiki Bolender, AIA, 2113 Locust Street
Decima Anderson, 251 and 252 South Van Pelt Street
Art Elwood, AI, 1930 East Marlton Pike, Cherry Hill, NJ
Virgil Procaccino, AI, 1930 East Marlton Pike, Cherry Hill, NJ
Bill Faust, resident
John Amore

Richard Greenwald, Van Pelt Street
 Darin Steinberg, Duane Morris LLP
 Laurie Jacobs, 2102 Spruce Street
 Sylvie Fallot Ftaiha
 Peter Miller, Towers & Miller Architects
 Elizabeth Armour, Delancey Street
 Douglas Seiler, Seiler & Drury Architects
 Steve Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
 Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association
 Louis Acciavatti
 Thomas Cromley, Christopher Beardsley Architects
 Jeff Bladen, 716 Pine Street
 Jennifer Lecher, Agoos/Lovera Architects
 Jon Weiss, Templeton Properties

The chair called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

1901 Vine Street, Free Library of Philadelphia

City of Philadelphia, Owner
 James Karmolinski, Applicant
 DATE: 1925, Horace Trumbauer, architect
 PROPOSAL: Rear addition, cut down window openings – in concept

This application proposes the in-concept approval of a large addition at the rear of the main Free Library building on Logan Square. The proposed addition will be located to the north of the historic building, on the lot now bounded by 19th, 20th, and Callowhill Streets. It will include four subterranean levels, two for parking and two for unidentified uses. The above-ground portion of the building will include four levels, two of which will connect to the historic building. It will connect at the first floor, behind the monumental staircase and through the bookstack; and at the second floor, across two skywalks running from Pepper Hall.

The addition will consist of three main components, a glazed connector band linking to the north façade of the historic building, a solid middle section with cornice lines corresponding to those of the historic building, and a great glazed arc at the north. The connector will allow visitors inside and out to see the north façade of the historic building. The details of the connection to the historic building have not yet been determined; in some drawings, the tips of the pediments project above the glass roof; in others, the pediments are fully covered by the addition.

On the north façade of the historic building, the application proposes cutting down all of the central window openings at the first and second-floor levels. On the first floor, the glazing from two of the openings will be removed and the openings cut into doorways for passageways linking the old and new. No justification for the cutting of the other openings at this level has been provided; the book stacks are behind these windows. At the second floor, all of the central openings will be cut down; the two outer openings will be used for skywalks connecting Pepper Hall to the addition. The other openings will be cut to allow light into Pepper Hall and to provide views between the addition and historic

building.

Staff recommendation: Approval in concept of the overall size, massing, and cornice line of the addition, but perhaps the design is a bit too reverential to the old building. Denial of the cutting down of every window opening at the central rear façade. The window openings must be enlarged at the connection points, but not every historic opening need be sacrificed for the addition.

Ms. Spina presented a brief overview of the application to the Committee. Elliot Shelkrot, the Director of the Free Library of Philadelphia, accompanied the design team, which included architects Moshe Safdie and Isaac Franco of Moshe Safdie & Associates, historic preservation consultant Maurice Finegold of Finegold Alexander & Associates, project manager John Howard of Becker & Frondorf, and architects Emanuel Kelly, Vincent Maiello, and James Karmolinski of Kelly/Maiello Architects.

Mr. Safdie presented a thorough outline of the current design as well as its goals and history. He stated that it was his firm's aim to bring the historic Free Library of Philadelphia building back to its old glory, restoring the building and its array of public rooms to their original state. He asserted that guiding principle of the design was to form a singular unified complex from the proposed and existing structures. The expansion, he said, will provide a singular spatial experience where the old flows into the new seamlessly, while maintaining the authenticity of the traditional and contemporary architecture. He stated that the library boards of directors and trustees sought "one cohesive institution," a "holistic" building, rather than two distinct, separate buildings adjacent to, but disconnected from, one another. He explained that the unified complex will be a journey through history, layered from south to north, from the massive gravitas of the existing library to the dramatic and transparent spaces of the new construction to the north. The old and the new will reinforce and complement each other, providing Philadelphia with a major new landmark, reflecting its illustrious past and its optimism for its future. He noted the requirement to maintain the historic main entrance, while simultaneously creating a primary entrance in the addition.

Mr. Safdie explained that a void would connect the two structures. Early versions of the design specified that the north wall of the atrium would parallel the north wall of the historic building. Mr. Safdie found that this configuration appeared like a passage, not a room; he stated that this design did not work. He therefore shifted to a curved wall at the north of the atrium. He justified the cutting down of two windows into doors at the ground-floor rear of the historic building: two paths will run from the main lobby of the old building, through the stacks, to the connecting atrium of the addition. The paths through the stacks will be glazed, allowing visitors to look into the significant, but now-hidden book storage area. He agreed that the other ground-floor windows do not need to be cut down or enlarged. He showed a new drawing depicting only two of the ground-floor windows enlarged for the connections; the other ground-floor window openings remained unaltered in this revised drawing.

Further explicating the design, Mr. Safdie turned to the "urban room" at the north. It will be beyond the "control point" at the northern entrance to the library, allowing the space to be easily used for events and gatherings outside normal library hours. He also noted that he had, from the very beginning of the design process, determined to make the

floor levels as well as the overall height of the addition correspond to the historic building.

Mr. Safdie then addressed the proposed enlargement of the second-floor windows at the center of the rear façade of the historic building. These windows look into Pepper Hall, one of the historic building's most important rooms. He explained that the physical and visual connections between the old and new portions of the building were essential to the success of the project. He reported that he had first considered removing the entire north wall of Pepper Hall and installing a colossal colonnade predicated on the colonnade running across the south façade to create the connection between the old and new. He decided that that intervention was too intrusive. He then considered opening the north wall of Pepper Hall to reduce the physical and psychological barriers between the two zones. Enlarging the window was determined to be the best means of connecting the spaces. Two enlarged openings would connect directly to the addition via skywalks. The others would allow views from the main and mezzanine levels of Pepper Hall to the atrium and vice versa. He stated that the railings at the new openings would replicate the historic railings. Mr. Tyler suggested that he not replicate the historic railings, but instead design a new railing that interprets the historic railings.

Mr. Safdie then discussed the atrium glazing, which will connect the addition to the historic building. He explained that it will connect gently to the old building; the glazing will rise over the historic building and link to the roof behind the pediments and balustrade. He reported that he is investigating Foiltec, a new glazing material that is very light and transparent and requires very few supports or mullions. He stated that a visitor standing in the atrium would only see sky when she looked up.

Noting other aspects of the design, he stated that the proposed truck dock had been hidden inside the building; it was no longer visible on the 19th Street façade. He acknowledged that the east and west elevations of the central section of the addition were not finalized; the facades shown in the drawings and model are merely place-holders. He also stated that the north façade of historic building will be visible from the north through the transparent addition, especially at night. The third floor, sky-room, and terrace would be restored. He concluded, stating that the work on the old building was considered a "job of restoration" except in the basement, where new offices would be installed.

The Committee thanked Mr. Safdie for his thorough and thoughtful presentation. Mr. Tyler stated that he found the argument for unifying the two buildings very convincing. He agreed with the plan to cut two ground-floor rear windows for the passages and all of the second-floor central rear windows for the skywalks and visual connections. Mr. McCoubrey asked if it would be possible to remove the panels below the second-floor windows, but leave the sills. Mr. Safdie and Mr. Franco, his associate, offered to look into the possibility, but added that a mismatch between inside and outside levels may make this approach impossible. Mr. McCoubrey congratulated the architects on a "very sensitive" design. Mr. Rivera stated that he accepted the opening of the historic building at the second-floor rear. Mr. Howard added that the library's boards of directors and trustees sought one unified building; this concept, he asserted, had driven the design from the very beginning.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval in concept of the revised design, which includes the enlargement of only two windows into doors at the first-floor rear and the enlargement of all of the Pepper Hall windows at the second-floor rear.

JF

2130 Green Street

Michael Coran, Owner

Robert Heisler, Applicant

DATE: 1854 altered c.1905

PROPOSAL: Close basement access, replace windows, add window grills, replace front door

This proposal calls for altering the front façade of a rowhouse. Plans call for replacing the windows with single pane windows and the four panel door with a single panel door with a large glass light with security bars. The applicant wishes to close the areaway and install new basement windows and reconfigure the planting area. The staff recommends internal consistency for the restoration with two over two on the ground floor and four over four windows above, a four panel door and the replication of the one basement grate in the restored window to match the existing. The staff accepts the closing of the areaway, but not the addition of bars on the first floor windows and door.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Restoration Standard 7.

Mr. Baron presented the application and noted that an insurance survey gave specifications of the historic windows for the properties in this row built in 1854. Mr. Baron apprised the Committee of the letter submitted by the Spring Garden Civic Association stating its opposition to the exterior bars on the windows and the installation of a historically incorrect door.

John Blatteau, the architect, and Michael Coran, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Blatteau presented photographs of the neighborhood to show the variety of windows, which he thought negates the precedent for true divided light windows. He said that the proposed metal grill design is based on a neighboring house. Mr. Blatteau stressed the importance of acquiring ventilation through open windows, which for safety reasons cannot be left open. Additionally, he pointed out the diversity of doors on the block and his belief that none of the existing doors are original. The proposed closing of the basement areaway would give way to some greenery in that area. Mr. Blatteau noted that the existing grills and railings along the property line are elaborate; however, he proposes a simplified railing and grill. Mr. Coran, the owner, said that he is willing to comply with the recommendation for the revised window configuration. He noted that the two important issues for him and his wife are a front door with glazing and the exterior grills.

Committee members discussed the two main issues of the front door and exterior grills at length. They thought it important to be consistent with regards to the exterior window grills, which have been denied in the past. The Committee suggested that the applicant could accomplish lighting in the door with a four paneled door with the two upper panels glazed. It suggested interior grills for the windows.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

1. *Windows with a two-over-two and four-over-four window configuration;*
2. *Four paneled door with the two upper panels glazed.*
3. *Simplified design of basement grills, with the retention of the original;*
4. *Close basement access,*
5. *Denial of the exterior grills on the front windows.*

With staff to review details.

DH

1935 Spring Garden Street

Daniel Kilpatrick, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Repair brownstone with non-color integrated material

The proposal involves refacing the brownstone details of the building with a cementitious mortar and coating the patches with a paint-like coating. The applicant also wishes to have the building repointed.

The staff recommends the repair of the brownstone with a mortar that has an integral color and a composition that allows the moisture to evaporate from the masonry. Sound brownstone should not be covered, but left exposed. If the applicant wishes to make a hardship application, he should supply appropriate financial information.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the pointing subject to staff review of a field sample; denial of the brownstone repair pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the application; it was noted that the applicant was unable to attend the meeting. Mr. Baron informed the Committee that the brownstone has been patched before and is in poor condition in places. The applicant submitted drawings showing different molding shapes and door surround configurations. The Committee agreed that the applicant could work with staff to match the correct shapes. It discussed various appropriate masonry repair options and concluded that if this proves to be a burden, then the applicant can seek relief through the financial hardship process.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the pointing subject to staff review of a field sample; denial of the proposed brownstone repair 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...]

DH

1900 Wallace Street

David Krahn, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof deck on rear ell

Mr. Baron explained this proposal: the applicant seeks to legalize a deck on the rear ell. The deck has visibility on this corner property.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to review of a door and Standard 9.

David Krahn, the owner, asserted that he had no knowledge of the historic status and urged the Committee to give careful consideration to his proposal.

Committee members discussed the legalization and concluded that the erected deck has a simple design on the rear ell. They expressed their concern about the illegally installed door for access to the deck. Members thought that the door's configuration should match the window it replaced. Mr. Rivera commented that the typical window would have wide frames and be six-over-six, which would make the installed door compatible.

Mr. Baron asked the Committee to comment on the owner's request concerning a window, which is not part of the current application. The owner infilled the bottom of the window with brick and installed a small vinyl window. He undertook the work to accommodate a new kitchen counter that runs in front of the window. The Committee members agreed that they could not recommend approval of the change in the window opening; however, since it is not part of the current application, they recommended that the applicant submit an application to legalize this work. Mr. Krahn stressed that the window opening was changed to accommodate a kitchen counter in that location.

The Architectural Committee recommended the legalization of the deck and access door.

DH

1709 Brandywine Street

Fred Duling, Owner

Arlene Matzkin, Architect

DATE: c. 1920, rear addition c. 1940

PROPOSAL: Demolish non-contributing building, build new 3-story, multi-unit building with parking – final approval

This project to demolish a garage and construct a new house is similar to a design previously approved in concept.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to the Commission approval in concept of January 2004.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal and read a letter from the Spring Garden Civic Association, which expressed its opposition to the façade design. The Association asserts that the design is inappropriate for the Spring Garden neighborhood.

Arlene Matzkin and Jackie Ford, architects, attended the meeting. Ms. Matzkin said that submission had been revised to reflect the concerns of the Zoning Board. The revised submission reduces the height and depth, with the stoop lowered ½ foot and the parking lowered by ramping into the basement.

Adam Laver, Esq., representing neighbors, which have not reviewed the revised plans, met with the owner and expressed their concern about the façade's compatibility. He said that the choice of materials for the exterior will have an adverse effect on the character of the neighborhood and is incompatible. Mr. Laver intimated that Councilmen Cohen and Clarke support the neighborhood's concerns about the project. Mr. Tyler commented that the telephone calls from two council staff members merely requested information about the project.

Phyllis Laver, resident and next door neighbor, said that since the neighborhood consists of stone and brick, subtleties should be bought back with a sympathetic choice of materials. She believes that the proposed new construction would be better suited in another area. The building has a brick base but has glass and Hardiboard above that level.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, pointed out that the Ordinance as well as the Rules and Regulations are not clear on the review processes after the demolition of a non-contributing building. Mr. Tyler distinguished between the level of review of a property with a building, even if subsequently demolished, on it and a vacant lot at the time of the designation of an historic district, then new construction would only be a 45-day review and comment. He said that in his view that the legislative history indicates a full review in the former instance.

The Committee concluded that it and the Commission had approved the proposal conceptually, and that it would stand by that decision.

The Architectural Committee recommended final approval of the proposal.

DH

2010-12 Chancellor Street

Acorn Property Development I, LLC, Owner

Jackie Ford, Architect

DATE: c.1880

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation, addition on 2012 with roof deck, "green" roof

This proposal involves renovations to two former carriage houses with facades on both Chancellor and St. James Streets. On Chancellor Street the applicant proposes new windows and doors which, for the most part, do not conform to historical designs. On the St. James Street façade, the plans show the walls stuccoed with the cutting of a garage door and the cutting, infill and moving of window and door openings. The applicant seeks to add a third floor set flush with the façade. The rooftop additions to 2010 Chancellor include an ell shaped structure and a deck, set back from Chancellor Street and a planted "green roof" forward of that. A double window would be cut into the side of 2012 Chancellor Street.

The staff thinks that the openings on the front façade should receive historically appropriate windows and doors with staff to review details. The St. James Street façade should be pointed rather than stuccoed, and the applicant should attempt to reuse existing and historic openings for the windows. The addition should be set back from the façade.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

The meeting was attended by the architects Arlene Matzkin and Jackie Ford. The Committee looked at each area of the project in turn. On the front façade on St. James Street, the Committee favored redesigning the former carriage doors to match more clearly a cross buck design with a vertical astragal found on typical carriage houses of this type throughout the neighborhood. On Chancellor Street, the Committee favored leaving 2012 Chancellor Street unstuccoed, with repair of the brickwork. They asked that the area below the first floor windows be recessed. On the south façade of 2010, they agreed to a stucco surface but asked that the second floor windows and hayloft door be retained. They urged that the new garage door have more of the character of a carriage door. They agreed to the addition but recommended that it be set back slightly from the Chancellor Street façade.

Ms. Matzkin agreed to these changes.

A neighbor and architect Peter Marino asked that the project keep all of its parking on the rear on St. James Street as proposed.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal contingent upon:

1. *The Chancellor Street large openings receiving traditional carriage type doors;*
2. *The St James Street façade of 2010 receiving a carriage type roll up door and retention of the second floor openings;*
3. *The St James Street façade of 2012 being repaired and repointed rather than stuccoed;*
4. *The addition having a setback of approximately a foot and one half.*

With staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize 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.]

RB

1708 Pine Street

Stephen Fox, Owner

Don Ventresca, Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Cut down basement windows, install sidewalk grates, repave sidewalk with brick

This application calls for cutting wells in the sidewalk for the elongation of the basement windows. The wells would be covered with grates and the sidewalk would receive brick

pavers. These sidewalks typically had bluestone pavers. Tinted concrete could be used to suggest that material. The drawing shows incorrect 12-over-12 pane windows and paneled shutters.

Staff recommendation: Denial Standard 6 and 9.

The applicant did not attend the meeting.

Dan McCoubrey thought the window wells inappropriate, but the other members found them acceptable.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the brick sidewalk, but approval of the sidewalk wells and repaving in bluestone or concrete tinted to resemble bluestone, 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...]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]

RB

1712 Rittenhouse Square

B. Swarbrick, Owner

Lanny Leibowitz, Architect

DATE: c. 1840, altered c.1890

PROPOSAL: Roof deck on visible rear ell

This application proposes a deck on a rear ell with a substantial setback from the street at the rear of the property.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron presented the application. The applicant did not attend the meeting.

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

RB

2304 St. Albans Street

Marie Carbo, Owner

Delano Shane, Applicant

DATE: c. 1867

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitate rear bay with deck, windows

This applicant proposes the reconstruction of a rear dormer and bay, presently covered in stucco, and the building of a rear deck on a one story shed.

Staff recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, and the deck rail to follow the outline of the shed, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron presented the application. Delano Shane, the applicant, attended the meeting and agreed with the staff recommendation.

The Committee recommended approval of the revised deck proposal presented at the meeting with staff to work with the applicant to develop the correct historic details for the bay, windows and dormer 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.]

RB

2110 Chancellor Street

Ara Chalian, Owner

Matthew Huffman, Architect

DATE: c. 1867

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation, 3rd-story addition – final approval

This application proposes the final approval of the construction of a 1-story addition atop a 2-story carriage house at 2110 Chancellor Street. It also proposes the restoration of the historic façades. The Commission approved the proposal in concept in December 2002, provided the HVAC equipment is not visible.

The carriage house is uniquely positioned as is indicated by the included map. Its east façade faces the eastern leg of the 2100-block of Chancellor Street; its south façade faces Van Pelt Street. It shares party walls to the north and west. The carriage house is not visible nor would the proposed addition be visible from the western leg of the 2100-block of Chancellor Street.

During the review in concept, the applicant explained that the addition would enhance, not detract, from the vista down Chancellor Street because it would block the view of an unattractive addition as well as a large roof deck and several air conditioning condensers on an adjacent building. He also asserted that the design of the addition complied with the Secretary of Interior's Standards because it was both differentiated from and compatible with the historic carriage house. Additionally, he noted that the Zoning Committee of the Center City Residents' Association voted not to oppose the project provided the proposed metal panels on the Chancellor Street façade be changed from a brick color to metallic gray color.

The revised design submitted for final approval is almost identical to the approved in-concept design. The only significant change is a shift from an undefined panel system to stucco at the south façade. As mandated in the Commission's in-concept approval, the HVAC equipment is hidden from view; it will reside in a cleverly designed mechanical alcove at the northwest corner of the building.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to the Historical Commission's approval in concept.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Michael Hauptman explained that the design was the same as the one previously approved by the Commission except that the previously undefined panel materials were now defined as flat grey stucco. He explained that the project had been approved by the Center City Residents Association and the Zoning Board of Adjustment pending the approval of the Historical Commission.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance noted that he did not attend the in-concept reviews of this project, but that he would have objected to this proposal if he had. He asserted that the design does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He also contended that it did not conform to the Commission's precedent. He said that the addition was large, visible, and not in harmony with existing building. He concluded that it was inappropriate and requested that the Committee recommend denial.

Susan Pentz stated that she had voted to recommend denial at the in-concept review, but now favored the design. She conceded that her vote to recommend approval was a departure from previous Committee decisions.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend final approval, with staff to review details.

JF

261-263 South 22nd Street aka 262 South Van Pelt Street

George Paouls, Owner

Craig Deutsch, Applicant

DATE: 261 South 22nd Street, c. 1880

263 South 22nd Street, c. 1920

262 S. Van Pelt Street, date unknown

PROPOSAL: Demolition of three contributing buildings, construction of three, 3-story buildings with garages – in concept

This application proposes in concept the demolition of three buildings and the construction of three residential buildings with garages and decks in their places. All three buildings are listed as Contributing to the Rittenhouse-Filter Historic District.

The application proffers no financial hardship or public interest argument to justify the demolition. Also, the submitted plans are incomplete, even for an in-concept application.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, owing to incompleteness and pursuant to 14-2007 (7) (j) and Standards 2, 6, 9, and 10.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. He emphasized that the proposal does not differentiate between existing fabric and new construction. He asserted that there is no way to determine what will be demolished and what will be retained from the plans presented. Architect Craig Deutsch and developer Arthur Elwood attended the meeting. Mr. Deutsch explained that the application does not propose complete demolition, but only partial demolition. He stated that the owner wants to return the property to a true R10 use from a commercial use. He also reported that he met with the neighbors on 30 September 2004. Joan Hook, a neighbor who had attended that meeting, stated that several neighbors had attended the meeting, but that their attendance in no way signaled an approval of the project. In fact, she requested that the Committee accept the staff's recommendation and deny the application outright. She added that Ridgeway Printing, the current commercial tenant at the property, is a fine neighbor.

Mr. Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he too had questions about the extent of the demolition. He furthermore contended that the proposed design is not compatible with the district. He maintained that it is out of character with the Rittenhouse-Fitler neighborhood. He concluded that the Alliance "strongly objects" to the proposal and requested that it be denied.

Ms. Pentz asserted that the design was not appropriate. Mr. McCoubrey recorded that he agrees with the staff recommendation of denial.

John Moore, an abutting neighbor, declared that he has numerous concerns about the proposal. Ms. Hook noted that a "dedicated conservation easement" exists in the area, but could not provide details. Bill Faust, another neighbor, contended that the easement question should be clarified. He also questioned the ability of the developer to construct the new buildings without harming the neighboring structures. Mr. Rivera stated that the contractors performing the work would be responsible for safeguarding the surrounding buildings. Charles Capaldi, another neighbor, inquired into the Commission's rules on demolition. Mr. Farnham provided a brief summary and offered to provide more details after the review.

Committee members declared the plans inadequate, even for an in-concept review. Mr. Farnham advised the applicants to prepare existing, proposed, and demolition plans that precisely define the extent of demolition and new construction.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness and pursuant to 14-2007 (7) (j) [No permit shall be issued for the demolition ... of a building ... within an historic district which contributes, in the Commission's opinion, unless the Commission finds that issuance of the permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.]; 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 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.].

JF

2102 Spruce Street

Robert and Laurie Jacobs, Owners/Applicants

DATE: 1860

PROPOSAL: Cut windows in rear mansard

This application proposes alterations to the rear mansard roof of the rowhouse at 2102 Spruce Street. An existing door and window would be removed and three windows and a door installed in their place on the 4th-story, south-facing, mansard façade of the rear ell. A new window would be added to the west-facing slope of the mansard. A window in the main block of the house at the 4th-story, mansard level would be removed, the opening enlarged, and a new window installed. The new door and windows would be wood, true-divided-light units. Skylight would be added to the main block of the house. They would not be visible from any public right-of-way.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the skylights and the west-facing and main-block windows, with staff to review details, but denial of the south-facing, rear-ell windows and door, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Peter Miller and owner Laurie Jacobs represented the project. Mr. Miller noted that the skylights are shown on the reflected ceiling plan, but not on the elevations. The Committee, staff, and applicants discussed the visibility of the areas where the work would take place. Mr. Farnham reported that he and Mr. Tyler had recently visited the site. He stated that the upper portions of the mansard are minimally visible. Mr. Tyler added that they would be more visible if the deck railing were removed; he considers the deck railing a temporary, not permanent, addition to the property. Mr. Farnham contended that visibility was not the only criterion upon which to judge the project; he stated that the mansard is significant and that the proposed alterations to it at the south façade of the rear ell would detract significantly from its “mansardness” with the removal of the slate roof.

Committee members suggested installing two windows and a door, not three windows and a door, at the south façade of the rear ell mansard. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the two windows and door be installed at the eastern end of the mansard, leaving the corner untouched to retain the character of the mansard. Other Committee members

agreed. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested keeping the windows to the east of a line extended up from the western edge of the bay. Mr. McCoubrey reiterated the importance of mansard corner. Mr. Miller stated that he would prepare drawings showing two windows, not three, at the south elevation of the rear ell mansard.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the skylights and the new mansard windows and door, provided the westernmost window at the south elevation of the rear ell mansard is deleted from the design, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

JF

2219 Rittenhouse Square

Gary and Midge Dawson, Owners

Laurits Schless, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Cut garage door in Latimer Street façade, replace deck railing

This application proposes cutting a garage opening in a non-historic rear addition that faces Latimer Street. This block of Latimer Street is a narrow alley with rears and garages on its entire length. The new garage door would be wood and include fenestration. The application also proposes replacing an alley door with a new wood, vertical-board door and a deck railing with a wood, vertical-picket railing.

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

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one attended the meeting to represent the project. Committee members reviewed the drawings and deemed the proposal acceptable because only rears and garages face the block and because no historic fabric will be lost.

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

JF

2031 Walnut Street

FSB, LLC, Owner

Sylvie Fallot Ftaiha, Applicant

DATE: c. 1855-1860

PROPOSAL: Decks on roof and at rear

This application proposes roof decks on the rear ells at the 3rd and 5th-story levels. The application is incomplete. Elevation drawings of the north and east facades of the rear ell showing the decks should be provided. This is especially true for the upper deck, which will, of necessity, stand high above the pitched roof. Also, photographs note that windows will be converted to doors, but no further information has been provided. Information about the new doors as well as the loss of any historic fabric should be provided.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, owing to incompleteness.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Sylvie Fallot Ftaiha attended the meeting to represent the project. The applicant distributed a north elevation drawing to the Committee and staff. In response to inquiries about the lack of information on doors, the applicant stated that she had not yet identified suitable doors. The Committee reviewed the structural drawings. Ms. Pentz, Mr. D'Alessandro, and Mr. Rivera agreed that the structural design was seriously flawed. They insisted that the applicant retain a qualified engineer to reassess the plans. They also agreed that better drawings and photographs were needed before any thorough review could be undertaken. They noted several inaccuracies in the drawings. They also noted that the chimneys were not shown on some of the drawings and that they might require alterations for the decks to meet code. The applicant agreed to reduce the size of the upper deck; she stated that she would pull it back to the south behind the chimney. Concluding, she stated that she would withdraw this application and submit an improved one.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial.

JF

2019 Rittenhouse Square

John Quinn, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875; c. 1920

PROPOSAL: Install windows on front and rear facades, change front door

This application proposes significant alterations to the front and rear facades of this property. The building was constructed in the mid nineteenth century as a rowhouse and converted about 1920 into a Renaissance Revival commercial building.

At the front, a planter would be removed at the sidewalk and the non-historic first-floor doors and windows would be removed. The entrance would be shifted from the center to the west bay and a new door with transom, steps, and handrail installed. New six-over-six windows with panels and transoms would be installed in the center and east bays. A new planter would be installed at the sidewalk before the center bay. At the upper floors, the windows would be replaced with six-over-six, double-hung windows. The historic windows would have been casements. Any transoms would have corresponded to the windows below; the proposed do not.

At the rear, the application proposes removing the non-historic facing, stuccoing the

façade, and installing a new door and six-over-six vinyl windows; transoms would be installed at the first floor. The rear façade faces a dead-end alley; one-over-one or simulated-divided light windows would be acceptable in this location, but they should be wood or aluminum-clad and, if divided, should have three-dimensional, not flat, muntins.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided the front window and transom designs are improved to replicate the historic windows and the rear windows are wood or aluminum-clad with three-dimensional muntins, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 6 and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal for this building which is a combination of the Art Deco and Classical Revival Styles. He noted that the staff believes that the front windows were originally casements, but did not know if they were multi-paned or large, single-paned casements. John Quinn, the owner, stated that he and his wife preferred the double-hung windows because they considered them more residential in nature than casement windows. They also preferred multi-paned to single-paned windows. The Committee members agreed with the staff, saying that the front windows probably were casements. They could be multi-light casements, as long as the panes had a more vertical than horizontal orientation. For the first-floor windows, the Committee members said the proposed panels below are acceptable, but the transoms should have a mullion as well as muntins.

Discussion then turned to the rear elevation. The Committee members agreed that the design was acceptable, but that the windows should be wood or aluminum clad, not vinyl.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the design of the rear façade, with the windows and door to be wood or aluminum-clad wood, and approval of the front façade with casement windows, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.] and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]

LS

241-43 Chestnut Street

William Caton, Owner

Douglas Seiler, Architect

DATE: 1852, Stephen Button, architect, cast-iron storefront by Daniel Badger of Architectural Iron Works, New York, significant in district

PROPOSAL: Cut windows in west party wall

The proposal calls for cutting windows in the former party wall of 241 Chestnut Street for two different condominium owners. The proposed windows are coupled, four-over-four metal-clad wood windows, like those approved for the addition at the rear of this building. These will be highly visible from Chestnut and 3rd Streets.

Staff recommendation: Approval of single window openings instead of coupled, with

staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Staff would prefer one-over-one windows to demarcate these as new openings, but understand the owner's desire for consistency of window type on the façade.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Douglas Seiler, the architect for one of the condominium owners, stated that two condominium owners have very different desires for the windows. His client would prefer four round windows that echo the round windows in the Wilson Eyre building at 243 Chestnut Street, while the owner of the upper unit wants large picture windows with no mullions or muntins at all. He presented a drawing that illustrated showing the true desires of the condominium owners. The architect for the second owner was not present. Ms. Spina noted that the staff made clear to both architects prior to the meeting that whatever design was proposed, both floors should have the same design for consistency.

The Committee members stated that they did not think the revised design was appropriate for the building. Smaller, single window openings with one-over-one, double-hung windows would be acceptable. Also, in keeping with the previous recommendations for other buildings on Chestnut Street, they did not think the window south of the chimney should be cut.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of single, one-over-one double-hung windows on the upper floor and one-light awning windows on the lower floor, with no windows south of the chimney, 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].

LS

214 Delancey Street

Bryan Miller, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1756 by John Goodwin, carpenter; front façade restored, c. 1957

PROPOSAL: 3rd floor addition on rear ell, rear decks – in concept

The concept proposal calls for adding a third story to the rear ell of this intact Georgian house. The main section has a gambrel roof with a shed roof dormer, and the rear ell has the original half-gable roofline. To accommodate the addition, the roofline would be extended from the ridgeline, demolishing the roof at the rear. The rear wall of the house and rear ell are presently stuccoed; the plans call for the addition to be stuccoed as well. Two wood balconies would extend off the rear ell at the second and third floors with double-leaf doors.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. The owner did not appear; however, Ms. Spina noted that the owner purchased the property at a sheriff's sale, and wants the addition for more room for his family. Ms. Pentz said that the significance of the historic fabric simply dictates that Committee deny the application. The other Committee members agreed. Steven Weixler of the Society Hill Civic Association echoed the Committee's

views, saying that the Civic Association would be against any addition to this property that would damage such a significant historic house.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend 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 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.], 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.].

LS

716 Pine Street

Jeff Bladen and Margot Palley, Owners

Christopher Beardsley, Architect

DATE: c. 1809 by William Thackara, plaister [sic] for Robert A. Thackara, druggist; raised to 4

stories and new Italianate façade, c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Demolish garden wall and construct carport

The proposal calls for demolishing a stucco garden wall and garage and building a carport on a street that has several garages already. The carport would have stuccoed CMU walls, a wood cornice and paneled wood doors. A pyramidal skylight would sit at the middle of the roof.

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

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Thomas Crowley, representing the architect, and the owner, Jeff Bladen, were present. Mr. Bladen noted that the height of the new garage will match the height of the garage to the east and the color of the stucco will be champagne.

The Architectural Committee voted to approval the proposal, 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 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.]

LS

1825 Porter Street

Joseph Rollo, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1907, James & John Windrim

PROPOSAL: Legalize roll-down gate at rear

Ms. Spina introduced this application. Without a permit or Commission approval the owner installed a metal roll-down gate at the rear of the property, which faces Roseberry Street. Although they are out of the historic district, houses on Roseberry Street face this work.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. Other means of security or fencing could be installed instead that would maintain the openness and suburban quality of these yards.

The applicant did not appear before the Committee.

Members of the Committee questioned the extent of openness in the block. In response, Ms. Spina showed photographs of the block and referred to a neighbor's opposition to the proposal.

The Architectural Committee voted to adopt the recommendation of the staff to deny the application, 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.].

RT

1723 Porter Street

Louis Acciavatti, Owner

Liz Pisano, Applicant

DATE: 1906, James & John Windrim

PROPOSAL: Rear deck and balcony, rear garden wall with garage door

Ms. Spina described this submission. The Commission approved a two-story rear addition on this property several months ago. The applicant returns with several modifications. The owner now wishes to add a balcony at the second floor and a deck at the first floor. At the rear property line, the proposal calls for a new garden wall with a roll-down garage door and a flush metal pedestrian door. The question of openness along Rosewood Street, the north boundary of the Girard Estate Historic District, forms a part of the consideration of this application.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the balcony and deck with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of the garden wall and gates as proposed pursuant to Standard 9. The gates in the rear should have an open quality, such as picket fencing.

Mr. Acciavatti mentioned that he also wishes to install outside steps to his basement at the rear of the house. In his response to the staff's recommendation, the applicant presented photographs of the walls, parking pads and gates in the 1800 block of Roseberry Street and distinguished it from the 1700 block. In this context, he described his seeking to erect three brick piers and a pedestrian door and a roll-down garage door.

After some Committee discussion, Mr. Tyler asked if the use of brick piers with gates that retained a sense of openness offered a solution. The Committee, applicant and staff explored several options.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the balcony, deck and basement steps with staff to review details and approval of the introduction at the rear of three brick piers slightly more than two feet in width with a metal, picket pedestrian door and gate 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.] 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.].

RT

1010 Arch Street

Jennifer Lecher, Architect

DATE: 1902, William Prichett, architect

PROPOSAL: Cut windows on west side

Ms. Spina presented this submission to the Committee. It entails the cutting of windows on the west side. One group of windows will be fixed light, one-over-one aluminum, to differentiate them from the original two-over-two windows on the same façade. These windows match those on the east façade that the Commission approved several months ago. Another group of eight will be single light, hopper windows.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the one-over-one windows only with staff to review details, and denial of the single light hopper windows pursuant to Standard 9 and 10.

Members of the Committee questioned Ms. Lecher on the size, location and function of the hopper windows. She replied that they would occur at a mezzanine level. Exploration of levels and treatments followed in an effort to find a more sympathetic window treatment.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the one of over windows 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.] It also voted to table the hopper windows until a future meeting and the submission of plan, section and detail drawings.

RT

1429 Diamond Street

Jonathan Weiss, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1889, attributed to Angus Wade, architect; John Stafford, builder

PROPOSAL: Stucco rear ell

A previous owner altered the rear ell of this building by closing down the window openings and infilling them with plywood and CMU. Now that the neighboring house has been demolished, the rear ell is visible from Diamond Street. The current owner wishes to add a sand-finish stucco to the rear ell. The interior has been finished for the reduced window openings and it would be expensive to reopen the windows to their historic sizes.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the stucco, pursuant to Standard 7. The brick should be pointed and the plywood and CMU infill painted a red color to match the surrounding brick.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal to the Committee. The Committee discussed various ways to treat the infill around the windows. Mr. Weiss agreed to explore options to pan the plywood around the windows and will work with the staff on the details.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 7 [Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.]. The brick should be pointed and the plywood and CMU infill painted a red color to match the surrounding brick.

RT

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron
Jonathan Farnham
Diane M. Hughes
Laura M. Spina
Richard Tyler