

**THE MINUTES OF THE 538TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

8 JUNE 2007

**1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18029
MICHAEL SKLAROFF, ESQ., CHAIR**

PRESENT

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Eileen Evans, Department of Licenses & Inspections
John Herzins, Department of Public Property
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Vincent Rivera, AIA
David Schaaf, RA
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Assistant City Solicitor, Law Department

ALSO PRESENT

Kevin Romano, Squalco Development, LLC
Jeff Goldstein
Timothy Cahill, Bonitatibus Architects
Lanny Leibowitz, Architect
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Jonathan Dyer, Space Design
Elizabeth Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Chris Pienkowski, Toll Brothers
Scott Baxter, Toll Brothers
Jim Coburn, Space Design
Jeff Maberry, Eric Hafer & Assoc.
John Hunter, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
Craig Deutsch, Harman Deutsch Architects
Lisa Neely, Veyko Design

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sklaroff, the Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 538th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Evans, Leonard, Merriman, Rivera, Schaaf, Sugrue, and Wilds were in attendance. John Herzins of the Department of Public Property served as the designee for Joan Schlotterbeck, the Department's Commissioner.

MINUTES OF THE 537TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Upon a motion proffered by Ms. Merriman and seconded by Mr. Schaaf, the Commission approved the minutes of the 537th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 11 May 2007 by a vote of 8 to 0. Mr. Sklaroff abstained because he did not attend the 537th Meeting.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 MAY 2007

Vincent Rivera, Chair

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

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

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.

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

Mr. Sugrue asked if the Commission had discovered historic photographs of the building. Mr. Baron stated that it had not, but noted that the building itself offered evidence of its historic configuration. Mr. Goldstein reported that documents at the Department of Licenses & Inspections indicate that the addition was constructed in 1988.

Mr. Sklaroff asked whether the Commission's jurisdiction over this property derives from the so-called Manayunk Ordinance or from §14-2007. Mr. Baron stated that the property was designated pursuant to the Manayunk Ordinance. He distributed copies of the ordinance to the Commission. Mr. Sklaroff explained the Commission's jurisdiction to the applicants. Mr. Goldstein noted that the property is adjacent to the boundary of the district. Mr. Sklaroff asked Ms. Evans if the Department of Licenses & Inspections would refer a building permit application for a property designated under the Manayunk Ordinance to the Commission as it would for an application for a property designated under §14-2007. Ms. Evans stated that a Manayunk application would be referred in the normal manner. Mr. Wilds remarked that the Manayunk Ordinance does not require restoration, but promotes compatible alterations. He suggested that the ordinance allows for latitude in the Commission's review. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the Secretary of the Interior's Standards must be applied in this case. Mr. Baron stated that the Standards are not mandated by the Manayunk Ordinance, but should be applied anyway. Mr. Wilds objected and stated that this proposal should not be reviewed as a restoration.

Mr. Goldstein provided an overview of his project. He noted the building's proximity to the railroad tracks, which, he reported, were elevated in the 1920s or 1930s. He stated that the building was a mechanic's shop, it is vacant, and has been neglected. He noted that the conditions are worse on the interior than the exterior. He reported that he wants to save the building and acknowledge history, but also wants to acknowledge its contemporary context with the railroad tracks. He stated that he is seeking to celebrate and acknowledge the presence of the tracks. He contended that it is difficult to see the building owing to the tracks and the setback on Gay Street. Mr. Goldstein displayed photographs and architectural drawings. Mr. Goldstein stated that he plans to extend to the zoning limit of 35', which would be 4' above the current height. He remarked on the lack of outdoor space and the need for decks.

Mr. Sklaroff recounted the three major issues cited by the Architectural Committee: the rhythm of the streetscape, which is uncompromised; the large bay on Gay Street; and the large cantilevered addition on Cresson Street. He asked Mr. Goldstein to address these issues.

Mr. Goldstein stated that his client wanted to be true to the history of the building, but also produce something extraordinary. He stated that the project required something extraordinary to overcome the negative aspects of the site, especially the train. He stated that the size and scale of the rooms must be remarkable. Mr. Sklaroff asked the applicants if they could create an "extraordinary" project with a smaller addition and bay. Mr. Goldstein replied: "We're going for it!" Mr. Sklaroff asked the applicants if they would be willing to redesign the addition and bay and submit the new designs for a review by the Architectural Committee. Messrs. Sugrue and Wilds suggested that the Commission continue the discussion of the current design.

Mr. Sugrue asked for legal advice on the extent of the Commission's discretion under of the Manayunk Ordinance. Owing to Mr. Reuter's absence, Mr. Sklaroff explained that the Manayunk Ordinance mandates that the staff conduct the reviews. He also noted that the standards with which reviews must be conducted are "unclear," giving the Commission considerable latitude.

Mr. Wilds deemed the cantilever addition appropriate, but expressed concern about the large bay. He suggested that a 4-foot projection would be more appropriate than the proposed 6-foot design.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the proposal as submitted, provided the bay on Gay Street projects no more than four feet from the building façade, with the staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion.

Mr. Baron asked if the motion included the revised two-over-two windows. Mr. Wilds stated that his motion granted the staff the authority to review this detail.

Mr. Schaaf judged the 6-foot bay to be acceptable, but objected to its design, which does not provide operable windows for air circulation. Mr. Sklaroff responded that requiring appropriate circulation would exceed the Commission's jurisdiction.

Mr. Sugrue asked the applicant if he would accept the reduction to the size of the bay. The applicant stated that he could devise an acceptable bay of the smaller size.

Ms. Leonard and Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the applicants consider the implications of the projection on their zoning and the Art Commission reviews.

ACTION: The Commission voted unanimously to adopt Messrs. Wilds and Rivera's motion to approve the proposal as submitted, provided the bay on Gay Street projects no more than four feet from the building façade, with the staff to review details.

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

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

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 of the designed housed condominiums; this iteration houses stacked townhomes. 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.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Sklaroff recused owing to his firm's involvement with Toll Brothers. Mr. Sugrue took the gavel. Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Commission. Attorney Brett Feldman and developer Chris Pienkowski represented the application.

Mr. Feldman explained that, at the Architectural Committee meeting, Committee member Herb Levy had asked if the developer would safeguard the remains of the Navy's mascot, a goat, which are rumored to be buried on the campus of the Naval Asylum. Mr. Feldman reported that the developer had commissioned extensive archaeological studies at the start of the project and had not discovered any evidence of the goat.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, pursuant to its May 2004 approval. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7 to 0. Mr. Sugrue abstained. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

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

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.

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.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Sklaroff took the gavel. Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Architects Jim Coburn and Jonathan Dyer and property owner Joseph Grasso represented the application.

Mr. Dyer stated that his client accepts the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and will work with the staff to develop an appropriate window application. Mr. Grasso stated that he will replace the exterior doors on 6th Street based on the interior doors, while are extant. Mr. Baron noted that the files contain a photograph of the exterior doors, which should guide the restoration. Mr. Sugrue stated that the accurate restoration of the 6th Street doors is a condition of the Architectural Committee recommendation. He and Mr. Wilds noted that the staff will have an opportunity to review the details of the doors and all other aspects of the submission. Mr. Schaaf asked about the extant door frames in the 7th Street entrance. Mr. Baron responded that they are not historic.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the all-glass doors on 7th Street, provided the historic doors on 6th Street are reconstructed; and refurbishment of the marquees with the substitution of glass for the plastic skirt; and deny the removal of the framed doors on Walnut Street; addition of glass scallops to the marquees; removal of the original doors on Sansom Street; "Colonial" light fixtures; and new windows, owing to incompleteness; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 3, 4, 6, and 9. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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

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.

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 visibility. The fire-escape at the rear would be modified to meet code requirements.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. No one represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that the applicant had informed him that the property owner is no longer proposing to enlarge the penthouse. Mr. Sugrue asked Mr. Baron to provide additional information on the proposed Fypon material. Mr. Baron responded that it is a dense foam material. He explained that the building has a cast-iron façade that was covered many years ago with a tin façade. The applicant is proposing to replicate the missing pieces of the façade in Fypon because the material is very light. He does not want to add additional weight to the façade, which is failing. Mr. Baron noted that Fypon is not the best material for the task; it will not match the historic façade accurately. He suggested that fiberglass would be more appropriate. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the application proposes Fypon or fiberglass. Mr. Baron noted that the architectural drawings specify fiberglass.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal with the signage hung from the existing flagpole, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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

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

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.

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

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the legalization application, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9. Mr. Herzins seconded the motion.

Mr. Wilds examined the designation photographs and noted the standing-seam metal roofs on the porches. He suggested that the standing-seam metal roofs might postdate the houses themselves. He then stated that three of the porch roofs now appear to have been reroofed with a different material. He asked if the Commission had approved these alterations. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission had not.

Mr. Sklaroff remarked that the historically appropriate remediation would be the removal of the deck and the restoration of the porch with roof. Mr. Wilds responded that the Commission might require the recreation of the porch roof, but allow the deck to remain, thus restoring the historic porch roofline when viewed from the street. Mr. Sklaroff agreed that that may be an acceptable compromise.

Mr. Sklaroff asked the applicant to comment. Mr. Rivera claimed that he had seen photographs in which none of the houses in the row had porches. He stated that the City purchased the properties after a fire and constructed the porches. He reported that he has owned his property for about six years. He noted that his neighbor, who has been resided in his house for more than 35 years, may know when the porches were installed. Mr. Baron stated that the porches are very old, if not original. He relayed the comments of the Architectural Committee member Robert Thomas, who had asserted that the chamfered posts and standing seam roofs indicate that the porches date to the middle of the nineteenth century. Mr. Wilds objected to the demolition of the porch and suggested that it be recreated to match those on the neighboring properties.

Mr. Rivera, the owner, stated that the porch roof was in poor condition before he removed it. He explained that he received a violation after demolishing the porch. He applied for and received a building permit legalizing the demolition, but the Department of Licenses & Inspections realized it had not forwarded the application to the Commission and revoked the permit.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization is currently subsidizing and overseeing the restoration of the adjacent property owner's porch. He objected to the legalization of the demolition of this porch and offered to help Mr. Rivera restore his porch through the Historic Home Repair Program.

Mr. Rivera, the owner, stated that he had no intention of restoring his porch. He had removed it to allow more light into the house and does not want to block the sun with a restored porch. Mr. Sklaroff explained to the applicant that the Commission has a responsibility to protect historic properties in the city. It must base its decisions on history. Mr. Rivera stated that he would organize his neighbors to remove all of the porches on the row. Mr. Rivera argued that his deed did not indicate the historic designation. Mr. Sklaroff noted that it would not, but pointed out that his title insurance would have required him to comply with all zoning laws including the City's historic preservation ordinance. Mr. Rivera again stated that he does not want the porch; he wants light.

ACTION: The Commission voted unanimously to adopt the motion proffered by Messrs. Wilds and Herzins to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the legalization application, 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.

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

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.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Jennifer Arnoldi represented the application

Mr. Wilds asked the applicant to explain the differences between the earlier design and this revision. Ms. Arnoldi stated that the previous design was brick and the new bay matched the nineteenth-century bay. This application proposes wood siding, not brick, and the bay is simpler and includes more glass.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, pursuant to the Commission's March 2007 approval in concept. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

201 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: Kaiserman Company, Inc.

Applicant: Jeffrey D. Maberry

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

Project: Cut through-wall HVAC

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.

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.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. Jeff Maberry, Diana Bonesteel, Gail Kaiserman representing the application.

Mr. Wilds asked about the dimensions of the existing and proposed vents. Mr. Mayberry stated that the existing vents are 6" by 16". The new vents would be 16" by 42". Mr. Sklaroff asked if they would maintain the symmetry. Mr. Mayberry stated that they would. Mr. Maberry displayed a sample of the grill they planned to use. Mr. Sugrue asked if the current air conditioning system could be reconfigured for zones. Mr. Maberry stated that it could not. Mr. Wilds asked if the air conditioning unit for each residence would be placed inside the building. Mr. Maberry stated that it would be. Mr. Schaaf asked if he could replicate the color of the brick on the grills. Mr. Maberry stated that he could and would.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, provided the units are placed in the expanded openings of the existing vents and centered below the windows. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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.

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

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.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Initially, no one represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion.

Mr. Wilds asked the members of the Architectural Committee if they had discussed the employment of casement windows on the front façade. He asserted that it would change the cadence of the streetscape. Mr. Danta replied that the Committee did not discuss this matter. He added that the property owners wish to replicate the existing, non-historic casements.

Mr. Sklaroff noted that the application proposes one addition and two decks. Mr. Wilds asked what portions of the new construction would be visible. Mr. Danta responded that the front wall of the addition would be partially visible from the public right-of-way.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance reported that the applicant had suggested that the Commission use a fence on the roof of an adjacent building to determine visibility. The location of the fence approximates that of the proposed addition. Mr. Gallery stated that he had visited the site and learned that the fence is clearly visible from the public right-of-way. He asserted that the upper three or four feet of the front elevation of the addition would be visible to the public. He noted that the proposed overhang at the addition, which would be closer to the street, would be even more visible. He suggested that the addition be set back four more feet from the street.

Mr. Danta explained that the buildings on the block are two to four stories in height. He noted that the adjacent building to the east is a four-story garage; therefore, the addition will be visible from the west only. Mr. Wilds contended that the application raises enough questions to deny it in its current form and ask the applicant to provide a mock-up. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the building stands in a row of historic two-story buildings that should not be changed. Mr. Schaaf

disagreed and read the proposed building as a mediator between the shorter and taller buildings. Mr. Sklaroff stated that it should not break the two-story pattern. Mr. Wilds noted that no one attended the meeting to represent the application.

The architect and applicant, Lisa Neely, arrived to represent the application. Mr. Sklaroff explained to her that the Commission had already conducted a lengthy discussion. He stated that the Commission appeared disposed to requiring a mock-up to judge visibility. Ms. Neely replied that although Mr. Baron had suggested the mock-up at the Architectural Committee, but the Committee members had rejected that suggestion as unnecessary. Ms. Neely stated that she has based her visibility assumptions on the adjacent neighbor's temporary fence, which she claimed was not visible from the street. Mr. Gallery disagreed with her and asserted that the fence is highly visible.

Mr. Herzins asked for a restatement of the Commission's policy on roof decks. Mr. Sklaroff explained that the Commission prefers decks located on rear ells, not on main blocks of rowhouses. He stated that visibility is also taken into consideration when reviewing decks.

Mr. Wilds asked about the size of the third-story addition. Ms. Neely explained that it would replace the extent, smaller third-story addition. It would be 66 feet deep. Mr. Wilds suggested that the proposed addition be set back an additional four feet to 14 feet. He opined that the larger setback would not significantly reduce the size of the addition. Ms. Neely argued that the fence on the neighboring house is not visible. Mr. Wilds replied that many disagree with that assessment. Mr. Sklaroff stated that a mock-up would resolve the visibility question. He suggested that the Commission avoid speculation on visibility; he suggested tabling the application until the next meeting to allow for the review of the results of a mock-up. Mr. Wilds agreed and stated that the mock-up should account for the full addition and overhang.

Ms. Neely argued that the streetscape is quite varied and asked why the Commission might require that the addition be invisible to the public.

ACTION: The Commission voted 6 to 2 to adopt the motion proffered by Mr. Sugrue and Ms. Merriman to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application. Mr. Wilds and Ms. Leonard dissented.

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.

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

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.

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

Mr. Wilds asked why the Committee recommended recessing the addition on the rear ell. Mr. Danta replied that the recess was intended to differentiate the new from the historic. Mr. Danta clarified the location of the side-yard addition for the Commission members. It would house a bathroom.

MOTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, provided that the fourth-floor addition over the rear ell is recessed. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion.

Mr. Schaaf asked why the stairway to the fourth-floor addition was not depicted in the architectural drawings. Mr. Leibowitz stated that he had not finished the drawing. Mr. Danta verified that Mr. Leibowitz had explained to the Committee that the rear wall, roof, and dormer on the main block would not be altered for the stair.

Mr. Schaaf questioned the recess at the rear of the rear ell, where the addition would meet the historic ell. He stated that the recess would cause maintenance problems. He stated that it was not a good design choice. Mr. Rivera agreed. Mr. Sklaroff asked if there was another means to differentiate between the old and new construction. Mr. Leibowitz stated that he could use a different brick on the addition. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance supported a flush design with a change in brick color or pattern.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Messrs. Rivera and Wilds withdrew their motion to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, provided that the fourth-floor addition over the rear ell is recessed.

ACTION Mr. Rivera moved to approve the proposal, provided the addition on the rear ell is constructed of brick that differs from the extant brick and the rear wall of the addition is flush with the extant rear wall of the rear ell. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

122 N. LAMBERT STREET

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

Owner: Stephen Bonitatibus

Applicant: Stephen Bonitatibus

Project: Construct fourth-story addition

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.

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.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Tim Cahill represented the application.

Mr. Cahill stated that Stephen Bonitatibus, the architect and owner of this property, was unable to represent the application.

Mr. Wilds strenuously objected to the adoption of the Architectural Committee's recommendation. He stated that adding a full fourth story to this building was inappropriate. Mr. Cahill responded that it would not be highly visible. He claimed that it was a narrow street and that there were many tall buildings in the area. Several Commission members observed that the neighboring buildings are only three stories. Mr. Wilds contended that the addition of a fourth-floor mansard would significantly alter the streetscape. Mr. Cahill suggested that the change would not be significant. Mr. Sklaroff noted that it is an important building. Mr. Cahill asserted that the building itself is not historic, but only contributes to a district. Several Commission members corrected him, noting that the building is not in a district, but was designated individually.

Mr. Wilds postulated that, if this proposal is approved, every owner on the block would seek to add a fourth floor, irrevocably altering the historic streetscape. Mr. Cahill explained that a smaller addition set back from the front façade would not provide the space the owner desired. He reported that the building is approximately 16 feet wide. At the rear, he is proposing an addition at the third floor and a deck at the fourth. Mr. Wilds noted that the house is already very large.

MOTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, provided the design is simplified and the muntins are deleted from the windows. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the addition would not be appropriate to the historic building. He noted that it would be highly visible because the building stands at the end of the row. He also pointed out that this building is one in an ensemble of related buildings. The doors, windows and cornice lines are all the same in the ensemble. Changing this building would destroy the historical character of the entire row. He also objected to the windows and the new brick on the side wall. He recommended denial of the proposal.

FAILED MOTION: By a vote of 2 to 6, the Commission rejected the motion proffered by Messrs. Rivera and Schaaf to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, provided the design is simplified and the muntins are deleted from the windows. Ms. Evans, Leonard, and Merriman and Messrs. Sklaroff, Herzins, and Wilds dissented.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to deny the proposal. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7 to 1. Mr. Rivera dissented.

REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE HISTORICAL COMMISSION STAFF FOR MAY 2007

Jonathan E. Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director

Mr. Farnham presented the report to the Commission. When asked if they had questions about the report, the Commissioners replied that they had none.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 11:28 a.m., Mr. Wilds moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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.