

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

**VINCENT RIVERA, CHAIR
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
31 JANUARY 2006**

PRESENT

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Herbert Levy, FAIA
Robert Thomas, AIA
Daniela Voith
Daniel McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Officer
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

ALSO PRESENT

Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance
Michael Loonstyn, Owner – 532 N. 22nd Street
Joseph Loonstyn, Owner – 532 N. 22nd Street
Gerry Gutierrez, Group G, Inc
Alan Rubin, Spring Garden Civic Association
Bill Greenlee, 15th Ward Leader
Diana Henze, owner, 2403 Panama Street
Rachel Schade, Schade & Bolender Architects
James Garrison, Hillier
Joe Ritchie, 218 S. Delhi Street
Bruce Lesser, 227 S 6th Street
Charles Loomis, Loomis McAfee Architects
J.P. Donohue, Loomis McAfee Architects
Aileen Banner, Richard Thom, AIA
Daniel Collins, FESPP
Michael Schade, AOL-B Architects
Barry Jacobson, Mattress Giant
Monica Harrower, PennDOT
Wali Zaman, Pennoni Associates
Harry Laspee, Pennoni Associates
George Lyons, Chestnut Hill Historical Society
Tim Shaaban, Urban Space Development Inc.
Brian Thrippleton, Urban Space Development Inc.
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Tim Wood, Chestnut Hill Historical Society
Van Strother, New Covenant Church
Laura Siena, West Mt. Airy Neighbors

Catherine K. Franklin, Philadelphia Historic NW Coalition
William G. Schwartz, Esq.
Elizabeth Amisson, AD Marble & Co.
Harry Laspee, Pennoni Associates
Larry Link, PennDOT
Tim O'Brien, PennDOT
David Waxman, Rector Street Associates, C.P.
John Hogan, 7500 Germantown Neighbors
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
John Mascaro, Mascaro Construction
Lydia Grose, SEPTA
Tony Boharg, SEPTA
Joanne Mekis, The Mermaid Inn
Robert Vosburgh
Farah Jimenez, Mt. Airy USA/Philadelphia Historic NW Coalition
Jerry Roller, J.K. Roller Architects
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Edwin Rivera, Queen Village Neighbors Association
David W. O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Audrey Jaros, 421 Catharine Street
Joseph G. Brin, 746 E. Passyunk Avenue
Robert Powers, Powers & Company
Gregory Dudzek, 515-517 S. Juniper Street
Jayant Goyle, 515-517 S. Juniper Street
Kenneth Waide, Neighbors to 421 Catharine Street
Alexander Taylor, BRP Development Corp.
Meredith Marshall, BRP Development Corp.
Geoff Flournay, BRP Development Group
Mark Wieand, Bowers Lewis Thrower
John Bower, Bower Lewis Thrower
Jessica Zeigler-Cihlar, John Milner Associates, Inc.
Neale Quenzel, John Milner Associates, Inc.
Allison Fritch, Tackett & Company
J. Tackett, Tackett & Company
Sheldon Bell, Bower Lewis Thrower
Robert Downs, Yaron Properties
Mark Jakatt
Savvac Novosidik
Gail Harrity, Philadelphia Museum of Art
Bob Maloney, Philadelphia Museum of Art

CALL TO ORDER: Ms. Pentz called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

1723 PORTER STREET

Owner: Louis and Mary Lou Accivatti

Applicant: William Schwartz

History: 1906, John Windrim, architect

Project: legalize rear addition

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to legalize a rear addition that is taller than that approved by the Commission. The twin stands on the north side of Porter Street; the rear is entirely visible from Roseberry Street. This property has a long and complicated history with the Commission.

In September 2003, the current owner purchased the property. Soon thereafter, he demolished the historic rear porch without a permit or Commission approval. In November 2003, he submitted an application to the Commission for the construction of a two-story rear addition and numerous other alterations to the building. The Commission legalized the demolition and approved the addition on 12 December 2003. On 16 December, a staff member met with the owner at the site to discuss the project, the Commission's approval, and the processing of the application. That meeting is summarized in a letter to the owner dated 17 December. The Commission's staff placed the approval stamp on the drawings and permit application on 18 December. A side elevation included as part of those approved drawings clearly showed the roof of the addition aligning with the roof of the historic building; the elevation drawing dimensioned the height of the addition as 23'-5". A section drawing included with the plans dimensioned the height of the addition as 25'-8 5/8". The location of the section was not indicated on any of the plans or elevations; without a context, the dimension is therefore meaningless.

In 2004, as the addition was under construction, neighbors and representatives of the local civic association called the Commission to report that the work was not complying with approved plans. A subsequent inspection showed that the owner did not comply with conditions related to staff reviews of windows, pointing, and painting removal for the historic portion of the building. Moreover, several aspects of the rear addition did not comply with the approved plans. The rear façade under construction differed significantly from the approved plans. In July 2004, the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued violations because the owner failed to obtain Commission approval and permits for the revisions to the plans. In August 2004, during the construction, the owner submitted an application to the Commission to legalize the new design for the addition that included a deck, balcony, and basement entrance. The additional height of the building was not addressed with this application. On 10 September 2004, the Commission approved the balcony, deck, and basement steps as well as some modifications to a rear fence. The Commission's staff placed the approval stamp on the drawings and permit application on 4 October 2004.

In late 2004 and early 2005, the owner continued to work on the building, exceeding the Commission's approvals and the Department's permits. An approved window was not included in the side façade of the addition. Most importantly, the addition was erected more than 2 feet above the approved level, the roofline of the historic building. On the original addition plans approved on 18 December 2003, the height of the rear addition is dimensioned on the side elevation as 23'-5". A side elevation is not included and the height of the rear addition is not dimensioned on the revised plans approved on 4 October 2004. On the current plans, the height of the rear addition is dimensioned on the

side elevation as 25'-9"; it is 2'-4" taller than originally approved. The Department issued additional violations including a stop work-cease operations order effective 9 February 2005.

The owner and his legal counsel appealed the order to the Board of License & Inspection Review. City Council President Verna and the Girard Estate Area Residents, the neighborhood's civic association, opposed the legalization of the rear addition as built. The Board heard the appeal on 24 May 2005 and rejected it, affirming the City. The owner has appealed the Board's decision to the Court of Common Pleas; that appeal is pending.

The current application describes the proposed work as:

Amendment of Plan #3698-C-03 and Building Permit #162555 issued 12-29-03 to conform to as built plan for rear wall of two (2) story addition.

The proposal as presented in the description appears flawed. A representative of the applicant's counsel has stated that the applicant is seeking to legalize all aspects of the addition, not merely its "rear wall." Also, the submitted architectural drawing, which includes side and rear elevations, depicts the basement vinyl slider windows in the historic portion of the building that were installed without the Commission's approval. A representative of the applicant's counsel has stated that the applicant is not seeking to legalize the basement windows or any work to the historic portion of the building with this application. Also a typographical error in the drawing proposes to "clean and repaint brick." Instead of "repaint," it should read "repoint."

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Architectural Committee recommend denial of this legalization application pursuant to *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. The addition, which is not compatible with the size, scale, proportion, and massing of the historic building, does not comply with Standard 9. Pursuant to §6.3.d.4 of the Commission's *Rules & Regulations*, the staff also enters a recommendation directly to the Commission. The staff recommends that the Commission table this application for a period not to exceed six months to allow the Court of Common Pleas to hear the pending appeal.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham explained that the Committee lacked a quorum. He asked the applicant and audience if anyone objected to proceeding without a quorum. William G. Schwartz, the attorney for the owner, and the audience did not object to proceeding without a quorum. Mr. Farnham presented the application to the members of the Committee. During his presentation, Mr. Thomas and Ms. Voith joined Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro, creating a quorum.

Mr. Farnham distributed letters to the Committee and applicant from Council President Verna and the Girard Estate Residents Association opposing the legalization of the addition.

Mr. Schwartz presented his client's case. He claimed that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued violations to his client because he had added the rear deck and balcony to the addition without the Commission's approval or a building permit. He stated that the owner had sought and received the Commission's approval and the requisite permits, but the violations were not cleared. He reported that he had appealed the violations and cease operations order to the Board of License & Inspection Review.

Mr. Schwartz claimed that the Commission had violated his client's due process rights because it had not held the requisite hearing when it issued the cease operations order. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission neither has the authority nor issued the stop work-cease operations order.

Mr. Schwartz further claimed that the rear addition as built is only 3/8-inch taller than approved by the Commission. Mr. Farnham disputed this claim. Mr. Schwarz acknowledged that the plans approved by the Commission were not accurate; the junction between the historic building and the addition was not depicted accurately. The elevation included with the plans approved on 18 December 2003 shows the roofline of the rear of the historic building and front of the addition aligned. The height is dimensioned as 23'-5". Mr. Schwartz noted that a section drawing included in the same set dimensions the façade height at 25'-8 5/8". Mr. Farnham apprised the Committee that the section is not located on any drawing in the approved plans and is therefore meaningless because it does not refer to any specific point on the façade. He also asserted that the contradictory plans should be invalidated, not employed to validate the design change. Mr. Schwartz submitted an elevation drawing of the addition as built, which shows that the addition is more than two feet taller than the historic building. Mr. Thomas explained that it was not the Committee or Commission's role to verify dimensions in the field, but to rely on the documents submitted by the applicants. The approved elevation depicts the roofline of the addition aligned with that of the historic building. Ms. Pentz agreed, saying that the Commission had accepted the elevation drawing at face value and believed that the addition would align with the historic building. She suggested that the addition should be altered to conform to the approved drawing. Ms. Voith noted that the addition is more than two feet taller than the historic building. She agreed that the addition should be reduced in height to align with the cornice line of the main section.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the legalization, 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.]*.

Following the statement of the recommendation, Mr. Schwartz asked the Committee if anything at the property posed a danger. He claimed that only a dangerous condition justified a cease operations order. He also claimed that a cease operations order could only be issued after a hearing. The Committee explained that it did not have the expertise or authority to identify a dangerous condition or issue a cease operations order. It informed Mr. Schwartz that such activities were outside its purview.

1214 ARCH STREET

Owner: 1214 Arch Associates, L.P.

Applicant: Tim Shaaban, Urban Space Development

History: The A.H. Mershon Building, Milligan & Webber, architects, 1907

Project: Infill windows and add light well with balconies in party wall; infill and add windows and doors in rear wall

OVERVIEW: This application proposes adding a light well with balconies in the east-facing party wall; removing the rear façade and adding brick infill, windows, and garage and pedestrian doors; and rebuilding the storefront on Arch Street.

The application proposes cutting a large vertical notch from the second to the eighth floors at the mid-point of the east-facing party wall and adding an aluminum and glass light well with balconies in the notch. The east party wall is highly visible from 12th and Arch Streets.

In 2002, the Commission reviewed an application to infill and add windows at the same east party wall. It approved the addition of numerous windows, but denied infilling several historic windows. The Commission required that the windows be retained, but suggested that they be blocked from the inside, if necessary, to accommodate the new interior plans. The approved work was not undertaken. Also note that the Board of Building Standards granted a variance in 1999 allowing the retention and addition of windows in the party wall, provided the openings were sprinklered and would be sealed if a building was constructed on the adjacent lot. A ramp to the parking garage to the south now runs across the adjacent lot.

The rear façade faces Cuthbert Street, a service alley bounded on the south by a large parking garage. Currently, the building's brick and concrete frame is exposed on the exterior; the ground floor is infilled with stucco and loading dock doors; the upper floors are infilled with metal and glass panel systems. The infill is not original, but was added later, probably in the middle of the twentieth century. The non-historic infill would be removed and replaced with brick. A metal garage door and two pedestrian doors would be added at the ground floor; coupled double-hung or casement windows would be added at the upper floors.

The storefront would be rehabilitated. Initially, the application proposed new doors replicating the historic doors in the outer bays; a revised application submitted at the Architectural Committee meeting proposes non-historic single-leaf doors with sidelights. The storefront window with transom would be altered to accommodate an interior partition that divides the interior space and runs up to the storefront window. A center mullion would be added to the storefront window to hide the end of the wall; the three-light transom would be converted to a two-light transom, also to hide the wall.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the lightwell, provided the historic party-wall windows are retained; approval of the rear façade, provided the brick infill is recessed slightly to reveal the original brick and concrete frame; approval of the storefront alterations, provided historic double-leaf doors are installed and the historic, three-light transom is retained and restored; with the staff to review the details; pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9, and 10 and the Storefronts Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Committee. Tim Shaaban, the

engineer for the project, submitted a new design for the storefront. He is now requesting approval of single-leaf doors with sidelights in place of the historically appropriate double-leaf doors he proposed originally. He claimed that the double-leaf doors would meet not ADA requirements. The Committee members suggested that he install single-leaf doors that mimic the appearance of double-leaf doors. These doors would meet the accessibility requirements and preserve the historic appearance. Mr. Shaaban accepted the Committee's proposal.

For the storefront windows, Mr. Shaaban explained that he wanted to substitute a two-light storefront window and two-light transom in place of the historic single-light storefront window and three-light transom; the new configuration would accommodate the division of the interior for the lobby and retail spaces. The Committee discussed various floor-plan options that would allow the retention of the historic window configurations. Mr. Thomas noted that the present proposal includes a number of hard turns in the lobby area, but curved wall may be better. Ms. Voith suggested devoting two-thirds of the storefront window to the retail space, allowing the retention of the historic window configurations. Some suggested using the storefront window as a shallow display space for the retail section, allowing the lobby to occupy space directly behind the window, but not the window itself. The Committee asserted that the applicant could easily retain the historic windows by redesigning the interior space behind the windows.

On the side elevation, Mr. Shaaban said that he is not proposing the removal of the historic windows. He explained that he did not include the windows on the side elevation drawing with the new lightwell, but he plans to retain them. He is proposing closing the side or party-wall windows from the interior, but not altering their exterior appearance.

On the rear, the Committee agreed that the existing window system is not historic fabric. It agreed with the replacement of the glass and aluminum panel system with brick infill and windows provided the brick is slightly recessed. The Committee also agreed that the garage and other doors were acceptable on the service alley.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Committee voted to recommend approval of the lightwell, provided the historic party-wall windows are retained; approval of the rear façade, provided the brick infill is recessed slightly to reveal the original brick and concrete frame; approval of the storefront alterations, provided the historic, three-light transom is retained and restored and provided the historic double-leaf doors or single-leaf doors replicating the historic doors are installed; with the staff to review the details; pursuant to 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 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.]; and the Storefronts Guideline [Recommended, Identifying, retaining, and preserving storefronts—and their functional and decorative features—that are important in defining the overall character of the building.]

7241-7652 GERMANTOWN AVENUE AND 7200-7600 WINSTON ROAD

Owner: PennDOT

Applicant: Larry Link, PennDOT

History: Germantown Avenue: tracks for Route 23 trolley, 1858-59, repaved with granite block around the track system, 1874, repaved with granite block, 1920; Winston Road: paved with herringbone-patterned granite block; repaved with herringbone-patterned granite block c. 1978

Project: Replace granite block paving in tracks with concrete

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconstruct these blocks of Germantown Avenue, a street in the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. The street currently has granite block and two sets of tracks for the Route 23 Trolley line. This stretch of Germantown Avenue has a mix of materials, with one block consisting of granite block paving on the sides and concrete in the track area, another block with the reverse paving pattern and a stretch with full-width concrete. The rest of the project area has granite block from curb to curb. Recently SEPTA paved asphalt over the track area. The reconstruction will consist of relaying the granite block on the sides of the cartway, but installing concrete in the area along the tracks. The concrete will be untinted and plain concrete to match similar blocks along the Avenue and be consistent with previous approvals of the Historical Commission. One new feature will be added at 7500 Germantown Avenue in front of the New Covenant Church. At this location, Germantown Avenue has a curve and becomes much wider than other portions. The proposal includes installing a recessed granite curb along this stretch to demarcate the roadway from the parking area.

Winston Road is paved with small, approximately 3-inch, square granite blocks installed in a fan or herringbone pattern. They were installed as part of a reconstruction project in the early 1970s. However, the size of the blocks proves too small to be a stable paving and many of the blocks have popped up with the weight of traffic and weather conditions. The proposal calls for replacing these with larger cubed blocks that match the size of granite blocks that predated this reconstruction, based on a photograph from 1968. The new blocks again will be re-laid in a herringbone pattern.

The project also includes new lighting, sidewalks and other street improvements; however, these alterations fall outside of the Commission's jurisdiction. The Street Paving Thematic District encompasses the cartways only. The curbs and everything outside the curbs are not designated.

The Historical Commission reviewed the reconstruction of the 3700-4000 blocks of Germantown Avenue in 1999 and 2000. At that time, the Commission created an AD-hoc Committee to explore the possibility of reusing the granite block within the track area. The Committee concluded that the use of the new T-rail precluded the use of the granite block in the track area. The Committee also discussed the treatment of the

concrete in the track area. It was agreed that untinted, plain concrete proved to be the most maintenance-free and consistent along Germantown Avenue. The applicant has submitted a detailed report that discusses the availability of girder rails (which are currently in place) and the associated costs and problems with installing granite block in the track area. The conclusions presented in this application are consistent with those found by the Ad-hoc Committee in 2000.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 3, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Committee. Several people representing the application appeared including Larry Link, Tim O'Brien, and Monica Harrower of PennDOT, Harry Laspee and Wali Zaman of Pennoni Associates, the engineering consultants, and Elizabeth Armison of A.D. Marble & Co., the historic preservation consultant. Mr. O'Brien stated that SEPTA representatives were also in attendance, but he did not identify them.

Mr. Laspee provided an overview of the project.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance raised a point of order. He asserted that the Committee should not proceed with the review because the Commission had tabled a similar application for the 5200-5400 blocks of Germantown Avenue for more information. Mr. Farnham replied that this was a separate application, not the application that had tabled; the Commission was bound to process it and take some action. He added that he believed that this application provided the information lacking in the earlier application.

Mr. Thomas explained that he served on the Commission's Ad-Hoc Committee that investigated these issues in 1999 and 2000. He noted that there were several points the Committee discussed including the types of rails, the height of those rails, and their availability. He did not believe that any primary factors had changed since the Committee reviewed the matter and issued its original recommendation.

Mr. Thomas asked about the plans for Winston Street. Mr. Laspee stated that Winston Street is now paved with small granite blocks in a fan pattern, but had had large granite blocks in a fan pattern. He provided an historic photograph showing the large blocks. Mr. O'Brien noted that the scope of work has changed since the application was submitted. PennDOT is no longer proposing to perform work on Mermaid Lane or Winston Road as a part of this project. The agency is working with Chestnut Hill business and community groups on a plan for those streets. When that plan is set, an additional application will be submitted to the Commission. At the request of Mr. D'Alessandro, Mr. Laspee annotated a plan of the project, indicating that no work is currently proposed for Mermaid Lane and Winston Road; the work will be limited to Germantown Avenue.

Joann Mekis, a representative of the owner of the Mermaid Inn on Winston Road, expressed concern that the granite block paving along Winston Road and Mermaid Lane would not be preserved. Mr. O'Brien assured her that it would and explained that he is proposing now work to that street with his amended application. Leonard Reuter of the Law Department asked if either side street was part of the state highway system. Mr. O'Brien stated that they are not part of the state system; he added that PennDOT would work with the City's Streets Department on a reconstruction plan for Winston Road and Mermaid Lane. Mr. Reuter asked if the Germantown Avenue project would be federally

funded. Mr. O'Brien stated that it would be. Mr. Reuter reminded him of the requirement for a Section 106 review by the State Historic Preservation Office. Mr. Farnham stated that he had already received the Section 106 Determination of Effects Report for PennDOT's consultant.

Mr. O'Brien stated that PennDOT would remove the asphalt paving that SEPTA laid over the granite blocks and tracks on the blocks between Gowen Avenue and Cresheim Valley Parkway in November 2005. He announced that the work would take place in 2007. When asked about the rails, Mr. O'Brien noted that SEPTA has determined that the extant girder rails have reached the ends of their lives and cannot be reused.

Catharine Franklin of the Philadelphia Northwest Coalition claimed that other transit authorities in the United States purchase girder rail from Europe. She also claimed that the proposed T-rail is not economic over the long term because of the degradation of the concrete. She cited that many of the problems associated with granite block are not related to the block itself, but to the mortar. She asserted that if mastic is used, then these problems are alleviated. She also asked if these blocks of Germantown Avenue had been built on fill. She postulated that unstable fill could be the cause of a many of the settlement problems. Mr. O'Brien agreed about the concern for the fill and said that the project includes a total reconstruction of the street to address the substrate issues. He also noted that the timing of the street construction would coincide with the bridge work proposed for Cresheim Valley Drive. He also said that the use of federal funding for the project may not allow the purchase of rail made outside the United States.

George Lyons of the Chestnut Hill Historical Society stated that a lack of maintenance by the very agencies proposing the project could be the root cause of the problems with these block of Germantown Avenue. He contended that the street paving is a historic resource and complained that PennDOT lacks a comprehensive plan to address the resource. Mr. O'Brien countered that the project will reinstall a significant amount of the granite block.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Commission tabled the last proposal to allow for an opportunity to revisit the conclusions of its Ad-Hoc Committee. He insisted that any discussion of this proposal would be inappropriate until the Commission had concluded its review of the larger issues. He asked how the plans had been presented to the community. He also emphasized that the decisions made in this case would set the standards for all of the streets in the thematic historic district. Ms. Spina stated that the Commission tabled the discussion of the application for the 5200 to 5400 blocks of Germantown Avenue in order to receive certain information from the applicant. That information has been submitted and is part of this application.

Farah Jimenez of Mt. Airy USA and the Philadelphia Northwest Coalition agreed with Mr. Gallery that the Commission's decision in this case would have significant implications. She contended that the Commission the deliberations on this application should be commensurate with the importance of the thematic district. She stated that SEPTA has become the Sam Rappaport of historic streets. She explained that two near neighbors on Germantown Avenue, John Hogan and John O'Connell, had to leave the meeting before the review, but they wanted her to express their concern about the application and their support for the preservation if the historic material. She conceded that many accidents have occurred along this stretch of Germantown Avenue, but that deferred maintenance, not the historic material, was to blame. She submitted a letter from State

Senator LeAnna Washington in favor of preserving the historic material.

Van Strother of the New Covenant Church reported that over 250 accidents have occurred on Germantown Avenue along the church's property. Its historic stone wall has been damaged many times. However, the church is less concerned about its wall than it is about its congregants. The church has 2000 members. Also, 1000 children attend the four schools on its grounds. He supports the rapid reconstruction of the street. Ms. Voith said that many of the accidents could be avoided if the speed limit is lowered. Some in the audience noted that the speed limit is 25 miles-per-hour, but is not enforced.

Mr. Thomas expressed his concern for public transportation, but referred to the letter from Skelton Metal in Canada that reported that 9-inch girder rail, the rail needed to replace the existing rail in kind, is no longer made anywhere in the world and no stockpiles of it exist. He stated that he remains committed to the compromise struck by the ad-hoc committee in 2000. He agreed that the recent paving by SEPTA has clouded the issues surrounding these particular blocks. He remarked that he believes that the applicants have good intentions, but then quipped that "hell is paved with good intentions."

Mr. Lyons asked for a commitment from SEPTA to restore the Route 23 trolley. Mr. O'Brien noted that he represented PennDOT and could not speak for SEPTA. Mr. Thomas explained that the Commission has no jurisdiction over the operation of the trolley line. The Commission's jurisdiction is limited to the cartway, from curb to curb. He presented an analogy: the Commission has the authority review proposals to alter buildings, but it could not insist that those buildings be occupied.

Laura Siena of West Mt. Airy Neighbors asked that PennDOT investigate two important open issues: the availability of 9-inch girder rail and any prohibitions of the purchase of foreign rails with federal funds. Mr. Laspee began to provide an overview of the report submitted with the application about these issues, but the Committee interrupted him and contended that it could not devote sufficient time to the discussion at this meeting owing to the length of its agenda. It noted that this review had already taken more 90 minutes and no resolution was in sight. Mr. O'Brien requested that the Committee make a recommendation other than deferral. Ms. Spina noted that the application, which includes a report on these issues, is available to the public in the Commission's office. Mr. O'Brien said that he would make copies of the report for anyone requesting it.

Ms. Voith asked the applicants if they had presented their plans to the community. Mr. O'Brien stated that his consultant, Mr. Laspee, had held several community meetings. Mr. Laspee reported that the last meeting was held in November 2004. Ms. Voith stated that PennDOT should present its updated plans to the community.

Citing from the Commission's *Rules & Regulations*, Mr. Reuter explained that the Committee must recommend approval, denial, or deferral, with or without conditions. Mr. Gallery requested that the Committee or Commission hold a special meeting. Mr. Farnham explained that the Committee could elect to recommend to the Commission that it table the application for additional review. It could recommend that the Commission hold a special meeting, that it refer the matter to the Architectural Commission for further review at a special meeting, or that it revive the ad-hoc committee to study the matter. Mr. O'Brien objected and claimed that the application included the necessary information and that sufficient time had been provided for its

review. He again requested that the Committee recommend approval of the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Commission table the application and direct the Architectural Committee to hold a special meeting on the application.

Mr. O'Brien expressed his disappointment with the Committee's recommendation, but thanked the Committee and community for their time and effort.

3 RECTOR STREET

Owner: Raymond Labov

Applicants: David Waxman & Alon Barzilay

Project: Demolish roof, add 4-story addition and parking – in concept

History: bet. 1876 and 1879 as the office for Archibald Campbell & Co. textile mills

OVERVIEW: This application proposes in concept the conversion of an industrial building to residential use. In the spring of 2005, the current applicants applied to the Commission to demolish the historic building and erect an entirely new residential building. The Commission denied the demolition application in June 2005. The applicants appealed the denial to the Board of Building Standards, which upheld the Commission's decision. The applicants appealed to the Board of Building Standards decision to the Board of License & Inspection Review; that appeal is pending.

The conversion of the historic industrial building to residential use would entail the removal of most of the historic roof and the erection of a new structure inside the historic walls. The new structure would stand four stories above the historic building and have a contemporary design with banks of industrial-looking, multi-light windows. The east and west facades would have balconies. The project also stipulates parking at the lower level, with the garage entrance on the main façade and a ramp in the interior along the towpath façade of the building.

The building has three highly visible façades: the front, pedimented façade that faces Rector Street and is visible from Main Street; the east façade, also visible from Rector and Main Streets; and the two-story west façade that faces the towpath.

The application includes information on an advertising campaign for Manayunk that highlights the canal and towpath; several articles that emphasize the importance of the canal; financial information and an affidavit from the owner supporting demolition of the property; and support letters for the project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Property Maintenance Code 704.2.3 and 704.2.7.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Architect Jerry Roller, developer David Waxman, and attorney Brett Feldman attended the meeting. Mr. Roller described the structure as a small, unusual building on a desirable location, but inappropriately scaled. He stated that it is too small to use as is. Mr. Farnham showed the Committee a photograph of the block of Rector Street; two similar, occupied, one-story buildings stand directly across the street. Mr. Roller noted that his client does not own the building, but has an agreement to buy it. He explained that only the exterior envelope of the building

is salvageable. The building is currently vacant and Mr. Roller would like to render it usable again. He noted that the addition he is proposing would be set back from the front façade.

Ms. Voith stated that the proposal simply “sticks” a building inside the historic structure. Mr. Roller countered that he is proposing the intersection of an old building with a new one.

Mr. D’Alessandro asked if this proposal differed substantially from Temple University’s recent proposal for Liacouris Walk. It was noted that the Temple proposal had only been approved after a finding of financial hardship allowed the Commission to relax its standards. Ms. Pentz asserted that the current proposal cannot be considered historic preservation.

Mr. Feldman asserted that the Committee must not review this application in a vacuum. He explained that the developers originally wanted to demolish the property, but the Commission and Board of Building Standards denied the application. Many people with whom the developers consulted suggested that they create a development that tells the story of the building. The property has remained vacant for several years and the owner cannot sell it. The developers have an agreement of sale. He concluded, stating that the building has limited possibilities as it currently stands.

Mr. Thomas said that Mr. Feldman’s assertions sound like a claim of financial hardship, which falls outside the Committee’s purview. The Architectural Committee’s purview includes architectural and preservation matters only. He asserted that the proposal does not meet the *Secretary’s Standards*. Mr. Roller argued that adding to the building to bring it up to the scale of the buildings along Main Street is appropriate. He asserted that the proposal does meet the *Standards*. The proposal preserves the piece of the roof at the front to keep the original volume. Ms. Voith stated that she was not convinced that the proposal meets the *Standards*. Ms. Voith explained that the industrial heritage of Manayunk is very important and maintaining that heritage is crucial. She also questioned whether the project could be accomplished without destroying the historic building. Mr. Roller noted that the exterior walls of the historic building would be shored and a new steel structure would be built on the interior to support the new building. Ms. Pentz contended that whether it was possible was not the important question. She rejected the proposal on preservation grounds.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the proposal is being reviewed under the Manayunk ordinance, which has no financial hardship provision. He added that he did not think a financial hardship claim could be supported. Mr. Reuter said that although there is no hardship provision in the Manayunk Ordinance, it does allow for appeals of decisions to the Board of Building Standards. That Board may offer hardship relief when appropriate. Ms. Spina noted that the applicants appealed the denial of the demolition to the Board and the Board upheld the Commission’s decision; it did find that there was a financial hardship.

Mr. Gallery asked the Committee if they believed a four or five-story addition would be feasible for this historic building. Mr. Roller stated that the applicant was not looking for an approval of this particular design, but only of the massing and scale. Ms. Voith stated that the proposed addition’s scale, massing, height, or articulation was inappropriate for the historic building. She concluded that the addition was simply too big. She said that

she could not recommend approval of it.

Ms. Pentz ruminated that perhaps the building could be preserved as a ruin, without windows, and the new building built within it. The other Committee members did not agree. Mr. D'Alessandro posited that an appropriate addition might be possible, but he asserted that this was not it. The Committee refused to design an addition at the meeting, but noted that a much smaller addition might be acceptable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Property Maintenance Code 704.2.3 [Repair: Original architectural features such as cornices and bays shall not be removed.]; and 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.].

Mr. D'Alessandro excused himself from the meeting as Mr. Levy arrived.

421 CATHERINE STREET

Owners/Applicants: Audrey Jaros and Piers Merchants

History: 1832

Project: Demolish rear, add 3-story addition and deck in concept

OVERVIEW: This 2½-story house dates to 1832 and retains its original configuration, which includes a main section with a gabled roof and a small rear ell. The house has an arch-head dormer on the front and a pedimented dormer on the rear, typical of the Greek Revival period. A one-story garage sits at the rear of the property along Fulton Street. The upper stories of the rear of the house are visible from the Fulton Street. In November 2005, the Historical Commission approved in concept a three-story addition on the rear of the house that would engulf the rear ell and shift the rear dormer upward toward the ridgeline.

The applicants now propose three in-concept schemes for the stucco-faced, three-story rear addition. All include a second-floor, elevated walkway that leads to a roof deck on the garage. The garage would be enlarged to the full width of the property and simulated-divided light windows would be installed on the rear facade.

Scheme A, the first of the three rear addition designs, proposes a three-story addition that would be built in the void beside the extant rear ell, leaving the ell in place. At the third floor, the new addition would have a curved wall at the joint with the main block of the rowhouse, allowing the rear dormer to remain in place.

Scheme B proposes a three-story addition in the void beside the extant rear ell, leaving the ell in place. This scheme does not include a notch at the third floor to accommodate the historic dormer, requiring the dormer to be shifted to a point above the historic rear ell.

Scheme C proposes for the complete demolition of the historic rear ell, rear wall of the main block, rear roof, and rear dormer and the construction of a three-story rear addition as wide as the main block of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept of Scheme A, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Audrey Jaros and architect Joseph Brin represented the application.

Ms. Jaros explained that she was presenting three schemes, but preferred Scheme C. She stated that the roof area has deteriorated and needs repairs. Most of the buildings on the block of Fulton Street, at the rear of the house, are garages.

The Committee members discussed the differences between the three schemes and noted that Schemes A and B do retain some of the original 1832 roof structure and the dormer, whereas Scheme C stipulates the demolition of most of the rear roof structure and dormer. The Committee also noted that the in-concept proposal approved by the Commission did include the retention of the rear dormer. Ms. Pentz pointed out that although it involves moving the dormer, Scheme B allows the dormer more visibility than Scheme A.

David O'Donnell of the Queen Village Neighbors Association voiced his approval of the project.

Robert Vosburgh, a neighbor on Catharine Street, asked the Committee to look at the context of the rear of the building. He noted that this is one of six designated houses. Three have intact, historic rear ells. Allowing the rear ell to be altered would set a precedent for the others on the block.

Sherry and Kip Wade, the owners of the house to the west, expressed their concern that the addition will fill some of the open space behind their adjacent houses. They specifically contended that the proposed elevated walkway leading from the second floor of the rear ell to the proposed deck on the garage would disrupt the openness of the rears. Ms. Jaros said that she had decided to delete the elevated walkway from her application, but did not have time to have the drawings revised. She also stated that she was not planning to alter the garage or add the deck to it at this time.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of Scheme B without the elevated walkway, associated door, and alterations to the garage including the deck.

239 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: Fresher Start Corporation

Applicant: Noelle Parris Hueie

History: 1852, Stephen D. Button, architect; cast-iron by Daniel D. Bader of Architectural Iron Works, New York – significant in Old City Historic District

Project: Add roof deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a roof deck on the southern portion of the building for use by the condominium owner who owns the uppermost floors of both 239 and 241 Chestnut Street. A hatch at the rear of the building would provide access to the roof and concrete pavers along the roof would connect the hatch and deck. The deck,

which would measures approximately 24 feet square, would have a metal-rimmed glass railing. It would be situated 18 feet back from the front face of the building. The owner has stated in writing that he will not build a deck on 241 Chestnut Street.

In August 2005, the current applicant proposed a similar, but larger deck located at the front of this building. The Architectural Committee struck a compromise and recommended approval of a smaller deck, which would have been set back 18 feet from the front façade to avoid visibility. At the Commission's September 2005 meeting, a motion to approve the compromise deck failed; a motion to deny the application carried. The applicant was not present at the Commission meeting to state her case. The applicant appealed the Commission's denial to the Board of License & Inspection Review. The Board affirmed the City, but suggested that the applicant resubmit the proposal for the smaller, set-back deck to the Commission for a new review.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application and its history to the Architectural Committee. Architect John Wagner represented the application.

Mr. Thomas inquired about the visibility of the proposed deck. Ms. Spina stated that she believed that it would not be visible. The Committee members agreed that the deck would be acceptable with the large setback and the assurances that the owner did not intend to extend to the west onto the 241 building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9 [*New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.*]; Standard 10 [*New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*]; and the Roof Guideline [*Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as decks or terraces so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.*].

515 & 517 S. JUNIPER STREET

Owners/Applicants: Jayant Goyle & Gregory Dudzek

History: c. 1846

Project: Legalize stucco, new doors/frames

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to legalize the removal of the original door frames and the installation of non-historic frames and doors at two adjacent rowhouses. It also seeks to legalize rough stucco applied to the rear facades and paint to the bases of the front facades. Mr. Baron spoke with the contractor and the owner shortly before the work was undertaken and explained that any proposals for exterior work required the Commission's review. The applicant has explained that he based the doorway designs on other buildings in the area. The Commission's staff requested that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issue violations for the illegal alterations at these and other buildings in the area at the same time.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the stucco at the rears and paint at the bases of the buildings, provided the incorrect doors and frames are replaced with historically appropriate doors and frames, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: The owners of the property, Greg Dudzek and Jayant Goyle, attended the meeting. Mr. Baron presented the application and explained how the new doors and frames do not match the historic elements. He presented photographs to the Committee depicting the original door, frame, and transom. Since developing the staff recommendation, he inspected the property and found that the bases had previously been stuccoed. Therefore, the staff is recommending approval of the new paint at the base.

Mr. Dudzek said that they looked to neighboring houses when changing the doors, transoms, and frames. They wanted the new elements to fit in with the block. They did not know that the houses they used as their models had inappropriate, non-historic alterations. Ms. Voith explained that this case exemplifies the reason why property owners should contact the staff and seek a permit before doing work. Any changes should be based on research of the property itself so that the work is appropriate for the particular building.

Mr. Levy expressed concern about the lantern installed next to the door. He asked if the light could be recessed into the transom bar instead. Mr. Baron said that the present light fixture is actually the second one installed. The original fixture was much larger and, after discussions with the staff, the owners changed it for this smaller one.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to approve the stucco at the rears and paint at the bases of the buildings, provided the incorrect doors and frames are replaced with historically appropriate doors and frames, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [*Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*].

20-30 N. FRONT STREET

Owner: 20-30 N Front Street, LLC

Applicant: Mark Wieand

History: built for Girard Estate 1830, additions c. 1850, All significant to district

Project: Demolish rear additions, construct five-story addition on 30 N Front Street, reconfigure roofline on 28 and 30 N. Front Street, rehabilitate facades

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for the conversion of six brick warehouses into residential units with parking at the rear. They were constructed in 1830 for the Girard Estate. The five warehouses to the north were originally four-story buildings with very tall gable roofs. About twenty years after they were constructed, the tall gables at 22-26 N. Front were converted to a fifth floors by extending the brick walls at the front and rear and flattening the roof trusses creating a shallower gabled roof with a lower ridgepole. The buildings at 28 and 30 N. Front retain their original taller roof configuration, but front dormer additions have been added.

This application proposes the demolition of the rear ell of 30 N. Front and the gabled roof structures on 28 and 30 N. Front. A five-story addition would be constructed at the rear of 30 N. Front. New fifth floors would be added at 28 and 30 N. Front in place of the gabled roofs. HVAC units would be added at the peaks of the roofs behind a screen structure at 22-30 N. Front. New storefront windows as well as casement windows at the second through fifth floors of 22-30 N. Front would be installed, but no details have been provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the demolition of the original gabled roof structures at 28 and 30 N. Front; denial of the installation of the HVAC equipment at the peaks of the roofs; approval of fifth-floor additions at 28-30 N. Front Street if designed as full-width dormers leaving the gables intact; approval of the HVAC equipment if installed on the rear roof slopes and screened; approval of the remainder of the proposal; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. He noted that although not explicitly stipulated on the demolition plans, this application proposed the demolition of the forge structure at the rear of 24 and 26 N. Front. Architects Mark Wieand and John Bower of Bower Lewis Thrower, preservation consultant Robert Powers, and Alexander Taylor, Meredith Marshall, and Geoff Flournay of BRP Development Group represented the application.

Mr. Bower displayed two large images for the Committee, a photograph of the east facades of the buildings and a photo-rendering of the proposed complex from the vantage point. Mr. Wieand explained that the proposed alterations, especially the fifth-floor additions at 28 and 30 N. Front would render the various historic buildings more consistent. Mr. Baron explained the staff's recommendation; he suggested that the additions on these buildings be conceived as large dormers, allowing the historic gable roofs to remain in place. Mr. Bower appreciated the suggestion and stated that he would investigate it. He also agreed to relocate the proposed HVAC equipment to the rear slopes of the roofs. He then presented an entirely new proposal for the roofs of the taller buildings; he proposed to construct roof decks with "dog house" stair enclosures on the taller buildings. Mr. Baron stated that the staff had not seen the plans for the roof decks prior to this meeting, but he believed that they would be highly visible from the east. Mr. Wieand stated that his architectural firm was not amending its current application to include the roof decks, but would submit a separate application for them at a later date.

The discussion turned to the windows. The applicants asked if aluminum windows were appropriate. Mr. Baron explained that aluminum windows could not be approved at the staff level, but could be proposed to the Commission. Mr. Bower stated that the aluminum windows would provide better sound insulation. Mr. Flournay explained that aluminum clad windows would require less maintenance. Mr. Baron noted that the current application did not include any window details. The applicants stated that they would submit a separate window application to the Commission.

Mr. Powers redirected the discussion back to the roof gables. He stated that it might be difficult to retain the gables and construct full-width dormers. Ms. Pentz disagreed and stated that the gables could be retained; she reported that the non-historic dormers stand at the points where the new dormers would be inserted and concluded that much of the structural roof work was undertaken when the earlier dormers were added.

Some Committee members objected to the color of the brick proposed for the facades on the additions at 28 and 30 N. Front. The applicants explained that they were open to suggestions for the façade color. They stated that they would not use a brick of the color shown in the rendering. Mr. Baron displayed a photograph of the metal-clad dormer on 28 N. Front. He questioned whether brick was appropriate for the facades. The applicants took a photocopy of the photograph and offered to study the question.

Liz Blazeovich of the Preservation Alliance commended the developers for working with the Commission and community. She stated that the Alliance agreed with the staff recommendation. She asked the Committee to review the newly proposed decks at a later time.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the demolition of the original gabled roof structures at 28 and 30 N. Front but approval of fifth-floor additions if designed as full-width dormers leaving the gables intact; denial of the installation of the HVAC equipment at the peaks of the roofs but approval of the HVAC equipment if installed on the rear roof slopes and screened; approval of the remainder of the proposal including the rear demolition; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*]; and Standard 10 [*New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*].

1904 WALNUT STREET

Owner: Church of the Holy Trinity

Applicant: Jessica Zeigler-Cihlar

History: John Notman, architect, built 1857-59

Project: Construct stair and elevator tower at southwest corner of building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes adding a stair and elevator tower to the south side of the church. It will be set back substantially from both the 19th and 20th Street facades. The tower will attach to an existing two-story appendage to the church and will be faced with brown brick. Its arched window design is meant to complement but also distinguishing itself from the historic church.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Jessica Zeigler-Cihlar and Neale Quenzel of John Milner Associates, Inc. represented the application. The Committee members in attendance, Ms. Pentz, Ms. Voith, Mr. Levy, and Mr. Thomas, agreed that the proposal was appropriate and acceptable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend 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.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

31-35 S. 2ND STREET ABD 18-22 LETITIA STREET

Owner: EFL Partners V.

Applicant: Brett Harmon

History: 18-22 Letitia, built c. 1855; individually designated and contributing

31 S. 2nd Street, built c. 1840; individually designated and contributing

33 S. 2nd Street, built c. 1905; individually designated and contributing

35 S. 2nd Street, built c. 1885; individually designated and significant

Project: Add additions and roof decks on main roofs of buildings

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to a number of buildings that face both 2nd and Letitia Streets. They have been combined into a single residential development. The Commission has reviewed aspects of this development a number of times, approving a stair-tower set between the buildings in the middle of the block as well as a deck set back from the front façade on the Letitia Street properties. The Commission has also approved some window alterations on the Blackhorse Alley façade. The stair-tower has been constructed much taller and in a different configuration than the approved plans, making it highly visible.

The new plans seek to legalize this stair-tower and add an additional floor and multiple roof decks on 35 S. 2nd Street. The additions would be positioned very near both facades of the building. These additions and decks would have a high degree of visibility from Front, Letitia, and 2nd Streets and Trotter's Alley because the adjacent buildings are shorter, the lot to the east of these buildings is open from Front Street, and Trotter's Alley is perpendicular to the west façade of 31-35 S. 2nd Street.

On the Letitia Street façade of 35 S. 2nd Street, the applicant originally proposed to remove an older elevator tower and install a new fire-escape rather than constructing an internal stair-tower. The applicant proposed to remove the window infill and install new window/ doors onto the fire-escape.

For the facades of 31 and 33 S. 2nd Street, the plans call for the demolition of existing storefronts and the installation of new aluminum storefronts. Plan A2 shows a new slate paved recessed entry for 31 S. 2nd Street, but the plans provide no elevations. The roof of 31 S. 2nd will be raised and a cantilevered roof-deck will be constructed with a high degree of visibility.

On the Black Horse Alley façade of 18 S. Letitia Street, the applicant proposes to close up a fourth-floor window and open another. These alterations had been discussed with the Commission and then deleted from the proposal that the Commission approved in May 2004.

The applicant proposes to remove windows from existing openings on most facades as well as to cut window openings and installing new windows. No window details have been provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. McCoubrey arrived to join the Architectural Committee. Mr. Baron presented the application. Attorney Brett Feldman and architect Brett Harmon represented the application.

Mr. Feldman began by explaining that the application had been revised since its submission to the Commission. He asked Mr. Harmon to comment on the changes. Mr. Harmon stated that he had deleted the proposed fire escape on Letitia Street. This revision would require a revision to the window-doors as well. Mr. Harmon then provided an overview of the proposal building by building. He noted the addition and decks on 35 S. 2nd. He noted the demolition of the roof, the construction of a raised roof, and the cantilevered roof deck on 31 S. 2nd. Mr. Baron claimed that these additions will be highly visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Harmon acknowledged that his elevation drawing was “a little deceiving.” Mr. Harmon also acknowledged that the proposed deck would be cantilevered out over the front roof on 31 S. 2nd and would be visible from Trotter’s Alley and elsewhere. Mr. Feldman stated that his client was being penalized because the surrounding property owners were not utilizing their properties to their full extents. He asserted that the proposed additions would be visible because the neighbors used their properties for parking lots and had not developed them fully. Mr. Feldman suggested that the Committee assess the views from “the primary view corridors,” not all public rights-of-way.

Mr. Baron displayed photographs of an elevator and stair tower that had not been built according to the plans approved by the Commission. He stated that it was taller and differently configured than approved. Mr. Feldman reported that he had plans for the structure with the Commission’s approval stamp on them. Mr. Baron agreed that the staff had stamped plans for the tower, but maintained that it had not been built according to the plans approved by the Commission. Mr. Harmon conceded that it was taller and shaped differently, but asserted that it was similar to that approved by the Commission. Mr. Harmon offered to “clean up” the tower. Ms. Voith asserted that the Committee needed a clear understanding of the proposal before it could act.

Mr. Baron displayed a photograph demonstrating the high visibility of the extant elevator and noted that the proposed additions would be even more visible. Mr. Harmon conceded that the additions would be visible. Mr. Feldman stated that new buildings would be erected on the underutilized lots, eventually blocking the views of their proposed additions. Mr. Harmon echoed Mr. Feldman, stating that the surrounding undeveloped lots are posing problems for this project. Ms. Voith suggested that the applicants work with the staff to reduce the visibility of any additions or decks.

The Committee asked the applicants to explain their proposals for new windows and doors. Mr. Harmon replied that they would submit a separate application to the Commission at a later date for windows, doors, masonry cleaning, and other work to the historic buildings. He stated that he is not applying for any approvals of doors and windows for the historic buildings with the current application.

Ms. Voith, Ms. Pentz, and Mr. Levy noted for the record that the deck proposed for 31 S. Front is especially awkward. Mr. Baron suggested that these buildings should be held to the same high standard employed to review the proposal for the Girard Estate buildings

on N. Front Street. Mr. Feldman disagreed. Mr. Baron noted that the Commission required a large setback when it approved a deck on one of the Letitia Street buildings included within this complex. He stated that the currently proposed decks and additions would not have similar setbacks, but would be very near the street facades.

The Committee concluded that the visibility of the proposed additions and decks along with the continued revisions to the proposal made a recommendation of approval impossible. It suggested that the applicants work with the staff.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6 [*Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*]; Standard 9 [*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*]; and Standard 10 [*New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*].

1215 SPRUCE STREET

Owner 1215 Associated L.P.

Applicant: Allison Fritch

History: built c. 1825

Project: Legalize windows, add roof decks

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing three decks on the rear of the property facing Manning Street, two on the rear ell and one on a garage structure. The dormer window would be converted to a door to access the upper deck. A window would be cut down to a door to access the garage deck. The former owner changed the windows to vinyl and received a violation. The current application proposes changing the front windows to wood, but leaving the back windows as vinyl except for those being converted to doors.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the dormer access to the deck is replaced with a stair house on the rear ell and all illegal vinyl windows at the front and rear are replaced with appropriate wood windows, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. He explained that a recent site had revealed that much of the work proposed in this application is already underway. He displayed photographs showing that the deck nearest the dormer is already completed. He also presented a photograph showing that a large sign had been mounted directly into the front façade, damaging the brick. J. Tackett and Allison Fritch, the architects, represented the application.

Mr. Thomas agreed with Mr. Baron's suggestion that the stairs at the piazza should be

continued up to the roof for deck access, making the dormer alterations for access to the deck unnecessary. He also agreed that the visible illegal vinyl windows should be replaced with the appropriate wood windows. Finally, he suggested that Mr. Tackett remove the sign and repair the brick.

Mr. Tackett stated that he was “shocked” when he learned that the work had begun without the Commission’s approval or building permits. He agreed to replace all visible vinyl windows with the appropriate windows; to investigate building a stair tower on the rear ell for upper deck access; to remove the sign and repair the brick; and to remove the incorrect door to the lower deck and install the appropriate door stipulated in his plans.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of three decks, provided the dormer access to the deck is replaced with a stair house on the rear ell, the illegal alterations to the dormer are reversed, the lower deck door is removed and replaced with the appropriate door, all visible vinyl windows at the front and rear are removed and replaced with appropriate wood windows, and the sign on the front façade is removed and the brick is repaired; with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [*Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*]; Standard 9 [*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*]; and the 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.*].

Mr. Rivera arrived to join the Architectural Committee, which included Ms. Pentz and Messrs. Levy, Thomas, and McCoubrey.

416 S. CAMAC STREET

Owner: William Marsh

Applicant: John Mascaro

History: built 1830

Project: Legalize dormer and front parapet gutter

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of the reconstruction of the dormer and the gutter/parapet. The rebuilt dormer matches the former, but non-historic dormer, which was in place before designation. The gutter has been reconstructed into a tall parapet covered in copper. It is much taller than the cornices of the adjacent houses.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the dormer but denial of the parapet, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. All agreed that the dormer was rebuilt to match the dormer that had been constructed before designation. John Mascaro, the contractor, represented the application. Mr. Mascaro explained the unusual gutters on these buildings. He stated that groups of three rowhouses share a single downspout. Pole gutters direct the rainwater onto and across neighboring buildings and into the shared downspout. He stated that the gutter needs to be very tall to join with the neighboring gutter. He reported that other rowhouses on the block have similar gutters. The Committee examined several photographs of nearby buildings. Mr. Rivera and Ms. Pentz decided that Mr. Mascaro's solution may not have been the best solution, but agreed with Mr. Thomas that the gutter change was relatively insignificant.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend the legalization of the dormer and gutter-parapet.

Mr. Thomas excused himself from the Architectural Committee meeting.

116-118 S. 20TH STREET - 2007 SANSOM STREET

Owner: Jason Nusbaum

Applicant: Sheldon Joe Bell

History: c. 1855

Project: Demolish non-contributing structure, construct stair tower and fourth-floor addition, alter façade

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to combine three structures into a mixed-use residential and commercial building. It proposes the demolition of a small single story non-contributing structure at 2007 Sansom Street and the construction of a stair tower in its place. It proposes the addition of a fourth story onto the visible rear ell and a fifth-story mansard onto the front portion of the corner building at 118 S. 20th Street. The other building, at 116 S. 20th Street, has an historic mansard. The corner building is the exception in a row of Italianate buildings on which fourth-floor mansards were added in the 1880s. The application also proposes the closing of the basement windows and the cutting down of the entry doors to create ADA accessible retail spaces. The current owner purchased the building with a violation that was issued when the former owner installed vinyl windows without a permit. The current owner proposes to install the appropriate wood windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the demolition of the single-story structure and its replacement with a stair-tower as well as the addition of a one-story addition on the less visible ell on 118 S. 20th Street; approval of the appropriate wood windows and the cut-down front doors, with staff to review details. Denial of the mansard and rooftop addition on the rear ell of 120 S. 20th Street as well as closing the basement windows, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Preservation consultant Robert Powers and architect Sheldon Bell represented the application.

Mr. Rivera asked Mr. Baron to explain why the staff recommended denial of the mansard

if the neighboring buildings already have mansards. Mr. Baron replied that the corner building without the mansard tells the story of the development of the row. If the mansard was added, the early years of the row, when none of the Italianate buildings had mansards, would be lost.

Mr. Bell, the architect, stated that the appropriate wood windows would be installed. He then offered his rationale for the additions. He stated that the addition of the stair and elevator tower would be very expensive and would only be profitable with the addition of the extra space at the fourth-floor level. He displayed the floor plan of the addition, which showed that most of the addition on the ell at 116 S. 20th Street would be occupied by stairs. Most of the added living space would be created with the addition on 118 S. 20th. He noted that the HVAC equipment would be hidden at the rear of the stairtower. He stated that he would retain the basement windows as suggested by Mr. Baron. He informed the Committee that two new openings would be cut into the south façade of the 118 S. 20th building, one each at the second and third-floor levels. He concluded, emphasizing that an addition on the ell of 116 S. 20th alone would not be economically feasible. Mr. Powers echoed his concluding statement.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the historic buildings were being asked to accommodate numerous alterations for the addition of one single unit. Ms. Pentz opined that the additional floor was not acceptable from a preservation standpoint. Mr. Rivera disagreed and stated that he could accept the addition of the mansard. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Pentz. Mr. Levy stated that he believed that an acceptable design for the mansard and rear additions was possible, but that this proposal did not provide an appropriate solution. Several Committee expressed concern about the precedent this would set.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the demolition of the non-contributing structure and its replacement with a stair-tower; approval of the appropriate wood windows and the cutting down of the front doors; but denial of the rooftop additions; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [*Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*]; Standard 9 [*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*]; and Standard 10 [*New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*].

1833 PINE STREET

Owner: Devin Aronstam

Applicant: Larry Kozlowski

History: built c. 1855, front bay c 1895, Individually designated, contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District

Project: Demolish rear wall, add garage, 2nd story addition and roof decks

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to the visible rear of this townhouse. The alterations include the construction of two decks, the demolition of the original rear second-floor wall to create a greenhouse addition, and the cutting of the rear fence wall and the construction of a garage behind the wall.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the garage and the upper deck; denial of the cutting of the rear wall and construction of the second-floor addition, pursuant to Standards 5, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect James Garrison represented the application. Mr. Garrison explained that this building stands one building east of 19th Street and backs onto Panama Street, which is a true service alley on this block. He stated that the brick would be removed at the first and second-floor rears, but that the brick at the corner of the ell would be retained to evidence the former wall. He stated that the addition is needed for kitchen space and that the interior plans preclude moving the kitchen elsewhere in the rowhouse; the house has a very significant period Old English dining room that would be impacted if the kitchen was placed elsewhere in the house. Mr. Levy stated that the architect was proposing a significant modification for a small amount of added kitchen space. Mr. McCoubrey agreed. Mr. Rivera and Ms. Pentz disagreed and deemed the kitchen addition acceptable.

The Committee members agreed that the garage and the upper deck, which is entirely on the rear ell and obscured by the taller building to the west, are acceptable. The Committee also noted that the side deck was acceptable, but was inaccessible without the addition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of all aspects of the proposal except the second-floor addition; it split on the addition.

532 N 22ND STREET

Owner: Loonstyn Brothers

Applicant: Gerry Gutierrez

History: built c. 1855

Project: Rebuild side and rear walls

OVERVIEW: This application proposes demolishing the side and rear walls of this house. The Commission had previously approved rebuilding the badly bowing front wall and covering the side wall in stucco. The community organization and neighbors strongly objected to the stucco. The owner attempted to save and restore the brick wall by removing the existing stucco. He found the brick damaged from the stucco and more importantly leaning significantly. He now seeks to rebuild the wall in brick including the

rear wood portion of the structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the window and door openings are relocated to reflect the original openings now visible in the wall with the removal of the stucco, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Gerry Gutierrez and developers Joseph and Michael Loonstyn represented the application. Mr. Gutierrez explained that the wall was badly damaged by the application of the stucco and is leaning significantly. He proposes to use the same brick that was approved for the front façade. He noted that he has deleted one of the parking spaces at the rear and now is proposing only one parking space.

Alan Rubin represented the Spring Garden Civic Association. He explained that the building has been deteriorating for years and the civic association supports the current rehabilitation. He voted with the Committee to recommend approval of the proposal.

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

2403 PANAMA STREET

Owner/Applicant: Diane Henze

History: built c. 1830

Project: Replace windows and frames

OVERVIEW: The applicant seeks to install new wood windows that match her current twentieth-century windows. The correct windows would have a wider plank-type frame. The owner does not want to install the historic-type frame because she wishes to order standard sized windows and does not want to change her interior molding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Diane Henze represented the application. She explained that her current windows have rotted and are moldy. She would like to install standard sized windows and replicate the current, not the historic, brickmold and frame. Mr. Baron explained that the current windows are installed at the wrong plane and should be moved forward. She agreed to install the new windows at the appropriate plane. Mr. Baron explained that her back windows are not visible to the public. Mr. McCoubrey stated that she could redesign the interior molding to easily accommodate the appropriate frames. Ms. Henze reiterated that she wanted to use stock windows because the custom windows are too expensive. The Committee explained to her that they could not break with precedent and recommend approval of inappropriate windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposed rear windows, but denial of the front windows, pursuant to Standard 6 *[Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and*

physical evidence.].

2044 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: David Nazarian

Applicant: Rachel Schade

History: c. 1885, attributed to G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, architects

Project: Build roof decks & HVAC on main roof of house

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the addition of a roof deck on this large house at the southeast corner of 21st and Spruce Streets. The ornate house has a very large, complicated mansard roof. At its February 2005 meeting, the Commission denied an application for a larger deck and other alterations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Dr. Nazarian, the owner, and architect Rachel Schade represented the application.

Dr. Nazarian noted that the current proposal was a scaled down version of a previously submitted deck and that the redesigned deck would not be placed on the mansard, but rather on a flat-roof portion. Mr. Nazarian also noted that he is painstakingly restoring the house and its interiors and that he believes the current design would not detract from the aesthetic qualities of the property.

Ms. Schade explained that given the location of the proposed deck existing air-conditioning units would have to be moved further south on the roof, which would make them less visible. She also noted that there is currently a mock-up on the roof, which shows how little visibility the deck will pose on the roofline.

Lenore Millholen, representing the Preservation Alliance, and also speaking as a concerned neighbor expressed her objection to the proposed deck. Ms. Millholen also noted that the Zoning Commission had previously objected to his original deck proposal.

Mr. Rivera inquired about the material of the railing. Ms. Schade stated that it would be metal. Mr. Rivera also inquired about the new location of the air-conditioning units. Ms. Schade answered that the units would be placed in the area between the deck and the elevator housing, making them completely invisible from the street.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired whether the deck would be less visible from the corner of Spruce and 21 Streets if it was pushed further south on the roof. Ms. Schade answered that doing so would actually make the deck more visible, since the southern elevation has the most visibility.

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

320 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: Carpenter's Company

Applicant: F. Neale Quinzel

History: 1770-1774, Robert Smith, architect

Project: Install ADA Ramp

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install an ADA accessible ramp to the south entrance of the Hall. The ramp would wrap around the eastern side of the building, but would not touch the building. The only point of contact with the building would be at the south entrance. The steps leading up the entrance are not the historic steps. The proposed ramp would be a masonry ramp faced in brick and paved with bluestone. The proposed railing would be black-painted steel posts with a bronze cap. The ramp would not be visible from Chestnut Street and the perimeter fence around the Hall would be raised slightly to further shield the ramp on the eastern side.

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

RECUSAL: Mr. McCoubrey and Ms. Pentz recused owing to their relationships with the Carpenter's Company.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Neale Quinzel represented the application. Mr. Danta explained that, with the recusals, the Committee lost its quorum. He asked if anyone objected to proceeding. No one objected.

Mr. Quinzel explained that the National Park Service had verbally approved of the project and would put its approval in writing. He also explained that he had presented the proposal to the state's Bureau of Historic Preservation, but it did not review it because there is no federal involvement; the site is owned by the company, not the National Park Service. He explained that the ramp is held away from the building to protect the watertable and to allow the shutters to swing. He stated that there currently is no handicapped access. At the request of the Committee, he offered to study preserving the rear steps, which are not original, and moving the gate post away from the building.

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

227 S. 6TH STREET, LIPPINCOTT BUILDING – UNIT 3 NE

Owners: Joye & Bruce Lesser

Applicant: Michael Shannon

History: Built 1900 by William B. Prichett, architect, Contributing in the district in 1999

Project: Cut down window on Randolph Street side façade

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to cut down a third-story window which faces the

rear of the property. Prior to the conversion of the building into condo units, this register of windows held vents. The windows on the lower two floors were cut down to accommodate larger vents. However, the upper floors, including this window on the third floor, were never cut down. The window retains its original sill and lintel.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Bruce Lesser and designer Michael Shannon represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about Randolph Street onto which this window faces. Mr. Farnham reminded Mr. McCoubrey that the rear of the Dilworth House faces Randolph. He also noted that the fronts of houses in the St. James Court complex face this section of Randolph.

Mr. Shannon explained that this window is in the living room of the unit and that his client would like more light. Mr. Rivera asked if the openings had louvers originally or if they were later additions that were removed during the rehabilitation. Mr. Danta stated that the louvers were probably not original.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

1906 RITTENHOUSE SQUARE

Owner: Philadelphia Ethical Society

Applicant: Charles Loomis

History: Built c. 1870

Project: Install ADA ramp on rear

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an ADA ramp on the rear of the property facing Manning Street. The ramp would be four feet wide and thirty feet long. The location of the ramp would require modifications to an existing door and would block three basement windows. The applicant proposes to face the ramp with bluestone and paved with concrete. The proposed railing would be steel.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects J.P. Donahue and Charles Loomis represented the application. Mr. Donahue noted that they had revised the design since the submission. He distributed new drawings. Mr. Farnham noted that the staff had recommended approval of the original submission and that this submission appeared even better from a preservation perspective: it preserved the basement windows and did not abut the historic façade. Mr. Loomis explained that he had changed the material of the knee wall because trucks using this alley for deliveries would have damaged the bluestone. He also explained that he preferred the mesh to the solid ramp because it would not collect ice and snow.

Mr. Levy stated that the steel mesh ramp would collect blowing trash. He said that it would present a maintenance problem. Mr. Loomis stated that the owner has a maintenance plan. Mr. Levy rejected that statement, asserting that maintenance plans

are never followed. He worried that the area under and around the ramp would not be cleaned regularly. He proposed that the revised proposal be denied because of the potential maintenance problem. Mr. Farnham suggested that the Committee review the ramp from a preservation perspective. He counseled the Committee not to recommend denial based on a perceived maintenance issue. Mr. Levy noted that the original proposal would not have the maintenance problem. Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Rivera stated that they preferred the original ramp design for architectural reasons; the knee wall was sloped and was of bluestone, not concrete. Mr. Farnham again noted that the revised proposal would preserve the basement windows; the earlier proposal would not.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the originally proposed design with either a solid or mesh ramp.

218 S. DELHI STREET

Owner: David Buriak

Applicant: Nana Ritchie

History: Built c. 1830; Designated 31 January 1961.

Project: Construct deck and stair tower on main roof of house

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck above the ridge line that will extend over the main roof of the house. The applicant previously received approval for the construction of a bathroom addition on the rear of the property. The deck would be constructed over this rear addition and would cantilever over the half gable main roof of the house. The deck would be accessed through a spiral stair case constructed in the side yard and not visible from the street. In addition, the applicant proposes to install a six feet high perimeter fence on the deck and a shed, approximately nine and a half feet high.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application. The meeting was attended by Mr. and Mrs. Ritchie. Mr. Ritchie explained that because of the narrowness of the street that the overhanging deck will have little visibility. Mr. Danta said that the staff does not object to a deck over the rear addition but that the overhang and the tall fence would likely have visibility. Mr. Riviera agreed that the deck needs to be pulled back and lowered. Other Committee members agreed and stated that the deck should sit on the addition and the total height of the rail should reach no more than three feet over the height of the ridge of the current roof.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 2 [*The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*]; 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 historic property and its environment.*].

2401 FAIRMOUNT AVENUE, EASTERN STATE PENITENTIARY

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Friends of Eastern State Penitentiary

History: Built c. 1831, John Haviland, architect, National Historic Landmark

Project: Install playground at 22nd Street and Brown Street

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a playground at the corner of Brown and 22nd Streets. The Commission granted this playground proposal conceptual approval in April 2005. The applicant now returns for final approval. The design of the playground has not changed significantly. The only significant change is the addition of a concrete plinth on which the playground would sit. Previously, the application showed a grassy knoll. The grade slopes down away from the wall of the Penitentiary at this location.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Dan Collins of the Friends of Eastern State Penitentiary Park represented the application. The Committee members agreed that the current design complied with the approval in concept and that the proposed work was appropriate to the site.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the project, 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 historic property and its environment.*]; and Standard 10 [*New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*].

26TH STREET AND BENJAMIN FRANKLIN PARKWAY, PHILADELPHIA MUSEUM OF ART

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Michael Schade

History: Horace Trumbauer and Borie, Medary & Zantzinger, architects

Project: Install underground parking garage with sculpture garden - in concept

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an underground parking garage on the north side of the Fairmount for the Philadelphia Museum of Art. Currently this area is landscaped with rocky outcroppings along its slope and matured plantings. The garage would include four levels and would be completely underground except for the entrance, vents, and a glassy elevator access building. The entrance to the garage would be faced in masonry based on the surrounding rocks and museum cladding and would be approached from the east. A series of terraces and a sculpture garden would be set into the reconstructed hill over the garage. The landscape design would include the reconstruction of the rocky outcroppings as well as curtains of trees and shrubbery along the perimeter of the garage, which would screen it from Kelly Drive. In addition, the existing parking lot between the grounds of the museum and the Azalea Garden would be eliminated and landscaped.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Gail Harrity, the operating officer of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, Robert Maloney of the museum and architect Mike Schade from Atkin, Olshin, Lawson Bell represented the application. Mr. Schade explained the museum's great need for additional parking. The proposal will provide 450 spaces on four stories. The garage would be built into the hillside, but will have visible masonry walls, particularly facing the river and the steps between the museum and the Italian Fountain. The masonry would correspond to the rusticated base of the museum and the sandstone on the site. The current parking lot south of the Azalea Garden would be removed. The primary goal of his design was to produce a garage that was as invisible as possible.

Mr. Baron asked if the parking lot to the south of the Azelia Garden would be removed. Mr. Schade stated that it would. Mr. Baron asked about the pedestrian path from the museum to the garden. Mr. Schade stated that there would be no direct path; he added that there is not one currently. Mr. Baron asked if the garage walls would be visible from the north and west. Mr. Schade conceded that they would be visible. Mr. Maloney stated that they would retain as much natural landscape as possible.

Ms. Pentz inquired about the potential for blasting rock from the hillside. It was explained that the north side of the hill is mostly fill. The garage foundations will be located at the bedrock. Mr. Riviera said that he would prefer to see a natural landscape at the top rather than a sculpture garden. Ms. Harrity said that they have not concluded their investigations of the design for the top of the garage, but that they want to make the view of the river an amenity for the public. She stated that the terrace may have natural or more formal gardens. She said that the garage will be ventilated naturally without the need for noisy fans, which can be disturbing.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance praised the applicants for many aspects of the design, but asserted that the garage will be an "imposing fortress." He said that the drawings are not clear or complete; he added that the renderings are not accurate representations. He rejected the long, tall wall of the garage, which would have a "ziggurat" shape. He contended that the wall would be harsh and imposing. He opined that the view of the museum from the river must be protected. He suggested that the garage should be terraced into the hill side to minimize its height.

Mr. Schade said that the garage would not be out of scale in relation to the very large museum building. He reported that large sewer tunnel under the site prevents them from digging deeper. He noted that the maximum wall height above grade would be about 20 feet. He claimed that the grade would swallow most of the garage when seen from the west.

The Committee members suggested that, when the applicants present their plans for final approval, they bring a model and complete elevation drawings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept, pursuant to Standard 2 [*The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*]; Standard 9 [*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction*

will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize 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 historic property and its environment.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

205-09 ARCH STREET

Owner: Yaron Properties, Inc

Applicant: Richard Thom

History: Built c. 1925. Contributing to the Old City Historic District. Designated in 2003

Project: Add roof top addition, canopy, ramp, replace windows in concept

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rooftop addition on this two-story industrial building in Old City. The addition would consist of three glazed bays that would extend the entire width of the building. It would be approximately fourteen feet high with a set back of approximately seventeen feet. The roof of the addition is based on early twentieth-century sawtooth industrial roofs. This third-floor addition would also have a recessed deck, set back from the facade approximately eight feet. This deck would be accessed through doors on the eastern and western bays. The applicant also proposes to install new windows and a new storefront. This would require the removal of the original windows at the second floor. In addition, the applicant proposes to install an ADA ramp leading up to the main entrance, a canopy sign, and lights.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of addition, ADA ramp, canopy sign and lights, pursuant to Standard 9; and denial of removal of historic windows at second floor, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Robert Down of Yaron Properties, Inc. and Aileen Banner of Richard Thom, AIA represented the application.

Ms. Banner explained that the addition would be contemporary in style, but sympathetic to the historic building. She asserted that the extant glazing at the first and second floors is not stylistically compatible with the proposed addition. She stated that this office space for a high-end development company needs a very clean feel.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that he agreed with the staff that the proposed addition should not drive the design decisions for the historic window openings, but that the historic fabric should drive the design of the addition. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Rivera agreed. Ms. Pentz suggested that they retain the original windows.

Some Committee members questioned the practicality of a sawtooth roof that does not face north. Ms. Banner stated that it is the most significant architectural feature of the addition.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance claimed that the alterations proposed would render this charming building bland. He suggested that they retain rather than dispense with the industrial flavor.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the architect either restore the missing first-floor windows or design new windows in the flavor of the original second-floor windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended approval of addition, ADA ramp, canopy sign and lights, but denial of removal of historic windows at second floor, pursuant to Standard 5 [*Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*]; Standard 6 [*Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*]; and Standard 9 [*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize 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.*].

1420-22 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: 1420 Chestnut Street Associates

Applicant: Dorann Mathews

History: 1896-1897, Frank Miles Day & Brother, architects

Project: Install internally illuminated plastic sign

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a plastic, internally-illuminated sign on the Chestnut Street façade of this building. Currently, the ground floor of the building has no signage. The ground floor is three bays wide; it includes an entrance to the office tower in the eastern bay and two bays of retail space at the west. A mattress store is moving into the retail space. The existing ground floor is a reconstruction based on historic photographs and documentation and it is not original.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application. Barry Jacobson of the sign company represented the proposal.

Mr. Jacobson objected to the description of the proposed sign as a plastic box sign. He explained that it is not an internally-illuminated box faced in plastic. Instead, each letter spelling "MATTRESS GIANT" is an internally-illuminated box faced in plastic. The letters would be mounted on a raceway.

The Committee stated that the proposed sign is not compatible with the building. Mr. Jacobson asked for an elaboration. Members of the Committee and staff explained that an internally-illuminated plastic sign, the scale of the sign, and the location of the sign relative to the arched storefront are not appropriate. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the sign is scaled for a suburban storefront, not Chestnut Street. Mr. Jacobson stated that he faced a very tight schedule. Mr. Farnham defined the types of signs the staff could approve.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to 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.*]; and 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.*].

2028-2030 FAIRMOUNT AVENUE

Owner: Savvas Navrosidis

Applicant: Aaron Childs

History: Built c. 1859, later consolidated into one property

Project: Construct 2nd and 3rd floor addition with deck and staircase

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a second and third-floor addition atop an existing one-story rear addition. The property consists of two rowhouses that have been consolidated into one property. The extant one-story rear addition is not an ell, but instead extends across the entire rears of both rowhouses. The addition would add two stories to the extant one-story rear addition. The addition would be faced with stucco and would have a bay window on the rear facade. The applicant also proposes a roof deck, which would be set back from the front facade approximately fifteen feet. This deck would be accessed by a penthouse addition, which would be set back approximately eleven feet from the front façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the deck and penthouse are relocated to the rear addition exclusively, pursuant to the Commission's roof deck policy and Standards 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Engineer Mark Jacket and owner Savvas Navrosidis represented the application.

Mr. Jacket presented an overview of the project. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the rear of the building to the east. Mr. Navrosidis explained that it has a three-story rear ell that would abut their addition. He also noted that he owns the vacant lot to the west.

The Committee questioned the applicants about the penthouse, which would be partially situated on the main blocks of the rowhouses. Several Committee members noted the Commission's policy about decks and suggested that it should be relocated to the rear addition. While reviewing the deck proposal, Ms. Pentz, the Committee's structural engineer, began to question the completeness and accuracy of the drawings. First, she noted that two chimneys that appear in photographs of the party wall are not shown in the drawings. Then she noted that the gable roof, which is visible in photographs, is shown as a hipped roof in the roof plan and as a flat roof in the proposed drawings. After some discussion about the existing roof conditions, the applicants conceded that they planned to demolish the entire gable roof structures on the main blocks and replace them with flat roofs. The Committee asserted that the applicants must present complete and accurate drawings of the existing conditions and the proposed work. They stated that the gables and chimneys should be preserved.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided the deck and penthouse are relocated to the rear addition exclusively and provided the historic gable roofs and chimneys are retained, pursuant to the Commission's roof deck policy and 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.]*.

ADJOURNMENT: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron
Jorge Danta
Jonathan E. Farnham
Karen Gonski
Laura Spina