

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Room 578, City Hall
29 March 2005**

Present

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

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

Also

Ryan Tyrell, U.S. Roofing
Matt Ledwith, Philadelphia Rowing Society
Yao-Chang Huang, YCH Architects
Howard Lander
Jackie Gusic, Friday Architects
George Ritchie, Amburn/Jaronsinski Architects
Kristin Mullaney, Amburn/Jaronsinski Architects
Andy Freedman
Scott Cronin, 109 Elfreth's Alley
Jim Campbell, Campbell Thomas and Company
Anne Kinzey, Resident of Lombard Street
Randy Cotton, Preservation Alliance
Robert Vosburgh Jr., Elfreth's Alley Association
Jay Tackett, Tackett & Company
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Theresa Shephard, Klein & Hoffman
Gerry Gutierrez, Group G Architects
Steven A. Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Nate Sanders, Philly Wide Interiors
Kevin Smith, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
Jane Glenn, MNC
David Blumenfeld, 111 South 15th Street
Tuong Huynh, Partridge Architects
Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association
Ethan Fellheimer, 300 North 3rd Street
Daniel Sablosky, 300 North 3rd Street
Sam Hagerman, Northstar Property Group, 1230 Arch Street
Gregory Belew, Northstar Property Group, 1230 Arch Street
David W. O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbor's Association
Maria G. Koulas, 1711 Spring Garden Street
Allan Rubin
Maksym Szpiliczck, 537 Queen Street
John Ryan, Esq., 1426 Chestnut Street

Daniel Collins, Eastern State Penitentiary
Marjorie Samoff, 2120 Green Street
John Bushnell, 2120 Green Street
Jim Rowe, Agoos/Lovera Architects
Eric Deiss, Agoos/Lovera Architects
Tom Kirker, 240 Spruce Street
Becky Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association
Martin Rosenblum, 2019 Pine Street
Hans P. Stein, Architect
Andrew Kaplin, 22 South Front Street
Gie Kim, 8-10 Letitia Street
Michelle Schmitt, Center City District
Charles Jefferson, Old City Civic Association
S. Bradstreet, 18 South Front Street
Peter Miller, 2320 Spruce Street
Scott and Margie Kasher, Owners, 2320 Spruce Street

Daniel McCoubrey, Acting-Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

113 Kenilworth Street

Owner: Jack O'Neill
Applicant: Carolina Pena, Architect
History: c. 1765, rehabilitated c. 1830
Project: 2-story addition at rear, 3rd-floor addition on rear ell, roof deck with stairs

This application proposes additions to a single-family row house in Queen Village. It proposes the construction of a two-story rear addition in the side yard at the piazza; a spiral stairway on the two-story addition; a one-story addition atop the two-story rear ell; and roof deck on the addition on the rear ell. The building was erected in the mid-eighteenth century and then updated in the Greek Revival style about 1830. The addition in the side yard would not be visible from the public right-of-way, but would significantly alter this early building. The characteristic curve at the intersection of the piazza and rear ell would be lost and the shared alley would be partially blocked, destroying historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The construction rear ell addition and deck would not damage the historic character of the property. The roof on the rear ell is now virtually flat; its historic half-gable roof was removed before designation.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the third-story rear ell addition and roof deck, but denial of the side yard addition and spiral stairs, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Yao-Chang Huang and owners Diane and John O'Neil represented the application. Discussion focused on the piazza and curved portion of the ell, which Committee members deemed significant. Messrs. Huang and O'Neil stated that the curved portion of the building was in very poor condition. Mr. O'Neil added that the floor structure was also in poor condition because of chronic water infiltration. He reported that he and his family currently live nearby and wanted to stay in the neighborhood and convert this building into their residence, provided the conversion was cost effective. He suggested that the curved wall might be too expensive to repair. Committee members again asserted that the piazza and ell configuration was a character-defining feature of this very old building. They asked if the neighbors who share the alley and side yard approved of the project. Mr. O'Neil replied that the neighbors had recently purchased the building. Noting the Committee's concern for the piazza and ell, Mr. O'Neil asked if

the parties might craft a mutually acceptable compromise. Mr. Huang suggested that the curved wall be repaired and retained in the interior of the new addition. Mr. Thomas judged that compromise acceptable. Other Committee members agreed.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the third-story rear ell addition, roof deck with spiral stairs, and side yard addition, provided the entirety of the curved portion of the rear ell is retained and repaired, with staff to review details.

4 Boathouse Row

Owner: Philadelphia Rowing Society/City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Tom Ryan, Contractor

History: reconstructed, 1912, C.E. Schermerhorn, architect

Project: Legalize asphalt shingles and vinyl siding

This application proposes the legalization of the reroofing of the Philadelphia Rowing Society boathouse. On 14 March 2005, a contractor submitted an application to the Commission staff to reroof the Tudor Revival style boathouse with Grand Manor asphalt-fiberglass shingles. The shingles are brown, Queen Anne style shingles with clipped corners. The building was historically roofed with rectangular grey slates. It now has an inappropriate asphalt shingle roof. The appropriate asphalt shingle would be a grey Slateline, Grand Slate, or similar shingle. The staff could not approve the application because the brown Grand Manor shingle does not replicate the visual appearance of the historic roofing. The staff informed the applicant that his proposal required a review by the full Commission and the application was placed on the Commission's 8 April 2005 agenda. After meeting with the staff, the contractor began reroofing the boathouse without the Commission's approval or a building permit over the weekend of 19 and 20 March 2005. A permit is required for this type of roofing project regardless of the building's designation status. The staff immediately notified the Department of Licenses & Inspections of the illegal work. The Department dispatched an inspector, who stopped the work. The staff has also requested that the Department investigate the contracting company's licensing and sanction the company if appropriate. The application offers no specifics about the vinyl siding.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Thomas Ryan of United States Roofing Corporation and Matt Ledwith of the Philadelphia Rowing Society represented the application. Mr. Ryan acknowledged that his firm had begun the project without a permit. He stated that it was "a mistake" and "our fault." He explained that the shingle selected by the rowing club was very expensive and that the project was a very costly, high quality job. Mr. Tyler informed them that the staff could approve an appropriate shingle, but not the inappropriate brown shaped shingle. Mr. Ryan agreed to work with the staff to rectify the problem.

Mr. Ledwith reported that the brown Grand Manor shingle seemed appropriate to the club members because it matches the half-timbering of the Tudor Revival building. Committee members informed him that the Commission seeks to promote the restoration of historic buildings to their historic appearances. Mr. Farnham circulated a 1914 photograph of the building that clearly shows the slate roof installed when the building was reconstructed as a Tudor Revival structure in 1912 and 1913. Mr. Ryan, the roofing contractor, agreed that the roof depicted in the photograph was slate. Committee members concurred that the original slate, which no longer exists, would have been grey in color. Mr. Ledwith asked for numerous clarifications about the

Commission's standards and jurisdiction, which the Committee and staff provided. Messrs. Ledwith and Ryan noted that the suggested Slateline asphalt shingle is inferior to the Grand Manor shingle. Mr. Farnham responded that the staff could approve any shingle that replicated the look of grey slate, not solely the Slateline shingle. He suggested that they consider the Grand Slate shingle. Mr. Danta provided them with a specification for the Grand Slate shingle.

Discussion turned to the proposed vinyl siding. Mr. Ryan explained that he would like to replace the siding on a small west-facing wall. The Committee and applicants examined several recent and historic photographs of the wall. The Committee determined that the vinyl siding would not be appropriate and that further investigation was necessary. Mr. Ryan agreed to work with the staff to identify the appropriate siding.

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.].

1908-14 Delancey Street

Owner: Albert and Rosa Esquinazi

Applicant: Arlene Matzkin, Architect

History: c. 1880

Project: Revise design of approved additions, install metal door

This application proposes significant revisions to three additions (stair tower, middle, and rear) approved by the Commission for the carriage house at 1908-1914 Delancey Street. The Commission approved them in concept at its September 2003 meeting and finally at its November 2003 meeting. In March 2004, the staff approved construction drawings for the project that did not include the rear addition, which had been deleted to reduce costs. In November 2004, the staff approved a revision of the materials for the east façade; brick was substituted for stucco and wood siding. The changes of March and November 2004 were approved under the "staff to review details" aegis. The current proposal exceeds the staff's jurisdiction.

The architect now proposes to redesign the remaining additions. Rather than the approved slate tiles, the architect would like to clad the stair tower with painted Hardiboard, a fiber-cement siding. The middle addition would also be reconfigured and Hardiboard panels would replace the proposed aluminum panels. A steel pergola would be added to the middle addition at the second story. The architect also proposes a flush metal door on the front façade in place of the approved wood door.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the Hardiboard on the stair tower and metal door; approval of the revisions to the middle addition, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Jackie Gusic of Friday Architects represented the application. The Committee and applicant discussed the revisions. The Committee members agreed that the changes to the middle addition were acceptable because the addition would be minimally visible from the public right-of-way. They rejected the proposed large sheets of Hardiboard for the stair tower, but concurred that tower could be appropriately sided with smaller pieces of Hardiboard, provided they are finished to resemble grey slate. Mr. McCoubrey noted that coatings other than paint are now available that might replicate the appearance of slate.

Committee members agreed that the staff could be entrusted to review a slate-like paint or other coating for the Hardiboard.

Ms. Gusic inquired about the Committee's view of the proposed flush metal door for the historic front facade. The Committee contended that the door should be wood, not metal; the previously approved door was wood. Mr. McCoubrey noted that wood is more appropriate than metal. Ms. Gusic then presented a light fixture for the front façade; it had not been included with the present application. Mr. Tyler asserted that he deemed it acceptable because it is sleek and contemporary. The Committee concurred.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the Hardiboard siding on the stair tower, provided it is installed in approximately 1'-9" x 3'-9" pieces (as previously approved) and is coated to replicate dark grey slate; approval of the revisions to the middle addition; approval of the light fixture; and denial of the metal door; 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.]; 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.].

832-836 Lombard Street

Owner: Masada Custom Builders

Applicant: David Amburn

History: 1848, William L. Johnston, architect

Project: Façade rehabilitation, rear penthouse addition – in concept

This in-concept application proposes the rehabilitation of the façades, reconstruction of the flanking additions, the addition of skylights, and the construction of a rear rooftop addition. Important architect William Johnston designed the former church building for an African American Presbyterian congregation.

Front and Side Façade Restoration

The application proposes the restoration of the front and side facades. Some details need reconsideration. The proposed, fully glazed, central doors do not match the historic doors. The historic double-leaf doors were wood doors that related to the extant transoms; each door included a pair of tall, thin glazed openings over two pairs of tall, thin wood panels. The proposed one-over-one windows for the first-story front façade do not match the historic windows. The historic windows were one-over-one wood windows with stained glass and unusual Queen Anne-like framing muntins. The proposed single-light transoms over paired five-light casements at the second-story front façade do not match the historic windows. The historic transoms were divided to relate to the paired casements. The slate roof proposed for the front portion of the building does not match the historic roof, which would have been a standing-seam metal roof.

Rear Alterations

The proposed rear addition would replace the rear section of the gable roof. It would be significantly taller than the historic roof and would exceed the historic roofline at every point. It would be faced with aluminum and glass. It would be minimally visible from both Lombard Street at the north and South Street at the south. The skylights would not be

visible from the public right-of-way.

Staff Recommendation: Approval in-concept of the skylights and all rehabilitation work not addressed below. Denial of the rear addition as submitted; it should be reduced in height and more appropriately clad. Denial of the front doors; the historic doors should be replicated. Denial of the first-story front windows; all surviving stained glass should be restored and the historic windows with framing muntins should be replicated. Denial of the second-story front windows; all surviving stained glass should be restored and the historic windows with divided transoms should be replicated. Denial of the slate roof; a standing-seam metal roof should be installed. These recommendations are made pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Kristin Mullaney of Amburn-Jarosinski Architects and George Ritchie, an equitable owner, represented the application. Mr. Thomas inquired about the planned use of the former church building. Mr. Ritchie stated that he intended to convert it into his residence. Mr. Tyler reminded the Committee of the building's importance. He noted its significant architect, William Johnston, and its original occupants, an African American Presbyterian congregation.

The architect offered to work with the staff to improve the restoration details before the final submission. She offered additional information about several aspects of the project. She stated that the eastern addition would be rebuilt as a conservatory. She noted the new French doors at ground level on the side facades. She also stated that the details of the rear addition had not yet been determined. Committee members agreed that the design of the addition should be improved. Mr. McCoubrey asserted that the cornices on the side facades below the addition should be retained not obliterated. Mr. Tyler reminded the Committee that this is an in-concept review and that the applicant could work with the staff on the details.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept of the reconstructed flanking additions, first-story side French doors, skylights, and rear rooftop addition, provided the front façade, front roof section, and side facades are restored to their historic appearances.

2301 Green Street

Owner: Pearl Properties

Applicant: James Campbell, Architect

History: Benjamin Fleisher House, 1890, Willis Hale, architect

Project: Replace existing roof deck

This application proposes the reconstruction of a series of roof decks on the Fleisher Mansion at the northwest corner of 23rd and Green Streets. The Commission approved the decks at its April 1987 meeting. That approval stipulated that the decks on the rear ell be set back from the side façade behind a line running north-south from the east façade of the rear stair tower. The decks were not constructed to comply with that approval. They extended east of that line toward the side façade approximately 18 inches. As built, the decks were highly visible from 23rd Street.

In late 2004, the current owner, who did not own the building when the non-compliant decks were constructed, dismantled the decks and began to erect new decks without the Commission's approval or a building permit. After calls from neighbors, an inspector from the Department of Licenses & Inspections visited the property and issued violations

for the illegal work. When the work was suspended, the decks had been partially completed. The owner now seeks the Commission's approval to reconstruct the decks to comply with the 1987 approval.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of roof decks not visible from the public right-of-way, with their locations to be determined by a mock-up, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Thomas recused because James Campbell, his partner at Campbell-Thomas Architects, is the architect on the project. Mr. Tyler explained to the applicant and audience that the Committee lacked a quorum without Mr. Thomas. He asked if anyone in attendance objected to proceeding without a quorum. No one objected. Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee, which consisted of Mr. McCoubrey and Ms. Pentz. James Pearlstein of Pearl Properties, the owner, and Mr. Campbell represented the project.

Mr. Campbell displayed plans of the decks and explained the deviation from the approved design. Mr. Pearlstein explained that he had hoped to repair not replace the decks, but his contractor discovered much more deterioration while working. He therefore decided to replace rather than repair the decks. Mr. Campbell stated that decks would be visible even if they were rebuilt to the approved plans. He remarked that a mock-up would not be necessary because the deck would be visible regardless of its position. Mr. Tyler suggested that metal not wood railings be installed to minimize visibility. Ms. Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey agreed that metal railings would be an improvement.

Mr. Pearlstein asked if he could leave in place the rebuilt structure and flooring, which does not comply with the 1987 approval, but install a metal railing along the previously approved line. Mr. Campbell stated that the structure and flooring as currently installed are not visible from the street.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the decks with the structure and flooring as built, provided simple, black, metal railings are installed to comply with the 1987 approval, with staff to review details.

421 Chestnut Street

Owner: 421 Chestnut, LP

Applicant: Jay Tackett, Architect

History: 1857-1859, John M. Gries, architect; rear addition, 1903, Theophilus Chandler, architect

Project: Window and door replacement, revised penthouse design, lighting

This application proposes alterations and additions to the former Bank of Pennsylvania building, a highly significant building on Bank Row in the Old City Historic District by important architect John Gries. At its July 2004 meeting, the Commission approved a penthouse with terrace, front windows, and some new openings and windows in the west façade. This application proposes revisions to that approved project. It proposes the construction of a revised penthouse with terrace; the addition of new windows on the west façade; the replacement of windows and main door on the front façade; the restoration of bay windows on the west rear façade; the conversion of bay windows to balconies on the east façade; and the addition of lighting on the front façade. Many aspects of the application are not completely defined or documented.

Although it would have a very similar footprint, the proposed penthouse would differ significantly from the approved penthouse. The new penthouse would be masonry, not glass. It would be significantly taller. It would be finished with a multicolor starburst motif. It would have small-paned windows with transoms rather than larger fixed windows.

The proposal also revises the treatment of the west party wall near the front façade. The Commission approved five simple one-over-one double-hung windows in the unarticulated party wall, provided they were set back from the front façade of the building behind the front facade of the penthouse. The current application proposes small-paned casements with transoms, one of which is very near the front facade. It also proposes scoring and coloring to ornament the party wall.

The proposal for the front façade windows is incomplete. It does not clearly define the proposed window. Note that the Commission has already approved replacement windows for this façade. It approved double-hung or casement windows that replicate the historic windows, with the staff to review details. The extant double-leaf wood front doors, which may not be original but are historic, would be replaced with non-historic frameless glass doors. Little information is provided on the lighting. The lighting may be approved at the staff level if no historic fabric is damaged or removed during its installation.

At the rear, the application proposes restoring altered bay windows. Insufficient information has been provided. No information is presented on the bays to be converted to balconies on the east façade.

Staff Recommendation:

1. Approval in concept of the penthouse, provided the coloring is simplified, its height is reduced to the height of the previously approved addition, and the windows are simplified;
2. approval in concept of the west party wall revisions, provided the windows are set back behind the front façade of the new penthouse;
3. approval of paired four-light wood casement windows that look like four-over-four double-hung windows for the front façade, with staff to review shop drawings;
4. denial of the frameless glass front doors;
5. approval in concept of the restoration of the west rear bay windows;
6. denial owing to incompleteness of the conversion of bays to balconies;
7. approval of the lighting, with staff to review details.

Recommendations pursuant to the Commission's approvals of July 2004; Standards 4, 6, 9, and the Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jay Tackett represented the project. Mr. Tackett stated that he met with the Preservation Alliance, which holds a façade easement on the building, to develop a penthouse more similar to the historic building than the one previously approved by the Commission. He also stated that he had revised the approved design for the west wall of the historic building for several reasons. First, recent investigations revealed a large structural member where an approved window had been situated. Second, interior planning mandated a window on the west facade nearer the front façade than the approved windows. Third, he sought a wall better integrated with the historic front façade. Ms. Pentz stated that she opposed the west wall design; she contended that the blank party wall was more appropriate than the articulated wall. Randy Cotton of the Preservation Alliance opined that the articulation on the west façade makes the historic building look more like a three-dimensional object than a two-dimensional front façade tacked onto a box. Mr. McCoubrey remarked that he approved of the revised west wall even though it

would have been brick originally. He suggested larger paned windows. Mr. Thomas concurred that the west wall revisions would be acceptable with larger paned windows.

Discussion turned to the penthouse. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he strongly supported the new penthouse design. Committee members commented favorably about the new penthouse design, but rejected its greater height and starburst decoration. Mr. Tackett presented a revised elevation drawing of the front façade of the penthouse; he had reduced the height and simplified the coloration. Committee members approved of the new design, provided the penthouse is colored a dark grey.

Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission had already approved windows like those proposed by the applicant.

Committee members inquired about the proposed frameless glass front doors and the doors in place. Mr. Tackett reported that the extant doors and door surround probably date to the 1893 rear addition. He opined that they are ugly and need replacement. He submitted a new rendering showing the preservation of the surround but the replacement of the doors with frameless glass doors. All Committee members asserted that the extant doors were significant and should be retained and repaired. Ms. Voith suggested that the historic doors could be updated with new hardware.

Mr. Gallery reminded the Committee and the staff of the City's responsibility for eliciting comments from the National Park Service on proposals for properties bordering Independence National Historic Park. Mr. Farnham offered to contact Charles Tonetti of the Park Service.

Mr. Tackett presented his proposal for the replacement of the rear windows at the north or rear façade and the restoration of the rear bays at the west façade. The Committee concurred that it would be appropriate to replace the rear windows in kind, but suggested that the transoms be deleted from the proposed bays on the west façade. Mr. Farnham and Committee members noted the need for annotated elevation drawings; the photo-renderings, which are neither annotated nor to scale, are not adequate for a final approval.

The Committee stipulated that it could not review the balcony proposal without further information. Mr. Tackett offered further information. He stated that windows would be removed at one bay per unit on the rear east façade and those bays would be converted into balconies. He pointed to the bays that might be converted on a plan. Ms. Pentz expressed concern about the bay conversion. Mr. Thomas and Mr. McCoubrey contended that the conversions would be acceptable in concept because the façade is only minimally visible from Ranstead Street, provided that the balconies in the outer or northernmost bay are not altered and that all of the conversions are executed in the same manner and are limited to the same bay. Committee members also asserted that the existing bay projections should be retained and reused as balconies; larger balconies should not be added.

The Committee deemed the lights appropriate, with the staff to review attachment details.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend the following:

- 1. Approval in concept of the revised penthouse design submitted at the Architectural Committee meeting (shorter and without the starburst), provided the façade color is a darker grey and the windows have larger panes;*
- 2. approval in concept of the west party wall revisions, provided the windows have larger panes;*
- 3. approval of paired four-light wood casement windows that look like four-over-four double-hung windows for the front façade, with staff to review shop drawings;*
- 4. denial of both versions of the frameless glass front doors;*
- 5. approval of the restoration of the west rear bay windows, provided the transoms are deleted and the pane configurations follow those on the rear, with staff to review details and shop drawings;*
- 6. approval of the replacement of the rear windows in kind, with staff to review details and shop drawings;*
- 7. approval in concept of the conversion of some east rear bays to balconies, provided that the bay windows in the outer or northernmost column of windows are not altered; that all of the conversions are executed in the same manner; and that all of the conversions are limited to one column of windows;*
- 8. approval of the lighting, with staff to review details.*

These recommendations are made pursuant to Standard 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and 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.]; 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.].

109 Elfreth's Alley

Owner: Scott and Caren Cronin

Applicant: Gerry Gutierrez, Architect

History: 1811 for Ephraim Haines, cabinet maker, Significant in Old City Historic District

Project: Demolish 1-story rear addition, construct 3-story rear addition

This application proposes the demolition of a non-historic one-story rear addition and the construction of a three-story addition. The historic building, which stands at the northwest corner of Front Street and Elfreth's Alley, is listed as Significant in Old City Historic District. The rear yard is large and extends to the north along Front Street, which was relocated with the construction of Interstate 95. The small garden between the building and Front Street is owned by the Elfreth's Alley Association.

The Architectural Committee reviewed and recommended denial of an application to erect an inappropriate rear addition in November 2004; the applicant withdrew the proposal before a Commission review. After that recommendation of denial, the owner and his architect worked diligently with the staff and representatives of the Elfreth's Alley Association to forge an acceptable compromise. The design that resulted from those

deliberations would be erected at the rear of the property and would face Front Street, not Elfreth's Alley. It would connect to the historic building at the rear of the rear ell, where the non-historic addition approved by the Commission in 1977 would be demolished. At the second story, the link from new to old would be very slender, thereby maintaining the historic half-gable shape of the rear ell. Along Front Street, the addition would be tied to a non-historic addition approved by the Commission in 1988.

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

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Scott Cronin and architect Gerry Gutierrez represented the proposal. Ms. Voith asked why the first-story Front Street windows were high and small. Mr. Gutierrez answered that they had been designed to maximize security. Mr. McCoubrey complimented the architect on his design. Mr. Gutierrez presented a color rendering to the Committee to show his proposed colors for the stucco. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the colors were too bright for the context. Mr. Gutierrez explained that in reality they would not be as bright; he promised to work within the palette in use on the Alley. Mr. Vossburgh, the director of the Elfreth's Alley Association, voiced similar concerns about the colors, but praised the overall project. He noted his letter of support.

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

604 South Washington Square, Hopkinson House

Owner: Hopkinson House

Applicant: Dominic Aspite, expediter; Theresa Shephard, engineer, Klein & Hoffman, Inc.

History: 1961, Oskar Stonorov, architect, Contributing to the Society Hill Historic District

Project: Replace windows and patio doors

This application proposes replacing 2,170 windows and doors in Hopkinson House, a residential hi-rise on the south side of Washington Square. The building was designed in 1961 by famous architect Oskar Stonorov as part of the redevelopment of Society Hill and is classified as Contributing to the Society Hill Historic District.

The proposed windows and doors would match the historic windows and doors in material, configuration, color, and operation, but the detail dimensions would deviate significantly. In many cases, the daylight openings would be reduced by several inches horizontally and vertically. The applicant has supplied an elevation of a typical window and door system keyed to a comparison chart with detail dimensions for the historic windows and doors, replacements approved by the staff in 2003, and the currently proposed units.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Theresa Shephard, the engineer, represented the project. She enumerated the many reasons for selecting the proposed window. The new windows would be double-paned, have thermal breaks, and would meet the new, more stringent building code for high-rise residences.

She stated that the wind loads, the forces experienced during operation, and the weight of the windows themselves mandate the much heavier frames. She also explained that she needed a very flexible system that could account for the significant dimensional deviations from opening to opening. She added that the dimensions that appear on the comparison chart would never be larger, but they may be significantly smaller, depending on opening variations. Mr. McCoubrey asked what company would manufacture the windows. Ms. Shephard replied that Graham would.

Steve Wexler of the Society Hill Civic Association reported his organization's support of the project. He asserted the importance of consistency across the building; he contended that the deviations from historical to new windows would not be significant once all of the windows were replaced.

Ms. Voith stated that the added width of the horizontal mullion separating the panel below from the window above was primary problem with the new windows. She asked the engineer to explain the detail. After a review of the detail, the Committee stated that the detail should be redesigned to reduce the width of the mullion. Ms. Shephard offered to undertake an investigation into the possibility of redesigning the mullion.

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.]. It suggested that the engineer redesign the horizontal mullion to better replicate the historic mullion before resubmitting the application to the Commission.

4163 Main Street

Michele David, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Legalize new front façade

In November 2003, the owner of 4163 Main Street, who also owns the neighboring commercial building at 4161 Main Street, applied to Historical Commission to demolish the front façade of this building and construct a new contemporary façade. At the Architectural Committee, his attorney argued that the historic façade was not conducive for commercial use. The Committee recommended denial of the application, but noted that the first floor was non-historic and offered suggestions for a more open storefront design. The owner then withdrew the proposal before the Commission voted.

On 11 March 2004, the owner submitted an engineer's report to the staff that the front wall was unsafe and required reconstruction along with a violation from the Department of Licenses and Inspections. On 5 April 2004, staff approved a permit application to rebuild the front wall to match the historic wall at 2nd and 3rd floors with segmentally-arched, two-over-two windows, re-installing the historic cornice and a stucco finish. The first floor would have had a central, double-leaf, fully-glazed door flanked by large storefront windows.

In April and May 2004, staff also approved new interior walls and roof framing, interior demolition and breaking through the party wall to 4161 Main Street.

Instead of building the front wall according to the approved plan, the owner built a front façade similar to the proposal denied by the Committee in 2003. The owner now requests legalization of that new front façade.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to § 4.2-104 of the Property Maintenance Code which governs the Manayunk Historic District.

Mr. Farnham presented the application. Committee members expressed dismay at the applicant's disregard for the permit process. Ms. Pentz commented that the historic facade was rendered unstable by the owner, who demolished structural elements.

Michele David, the owner, and Nate Sanders, the contractor, attended the meeting. Mr. David stated that he had tried to preserve the front façade, but had not been able to. However, he believed that the new facade was an enhancement to the streetscape. He offered that the alterations received support of his neighbors. Mr. David stated that his decision to ignore the rules and regulations of the Historical Commission was predicated on economics. He said that his business decisions had to supersede the preservation decisions of the Committee and Commission. Mr. Thomas noted that the Commission's ordinance includes financial hardship provisions. He asserted that Mr. David should have replied to the Commission after his first plan was rejected by the Committee. Mr. David rejected the notion of working with the Commission with either a hardship or revised design application. He asserted that his building was compatible with other recent construction on Main Street.

Kevin Smith spoke on behalf on the Manayunk Neighborhood Council. He stressed that the new facade is not compatible with the character of the historic streetscape. Additionally, he offered that the neighborhood council does not support the legalization of the alterations.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to § 4.2-104 of the Property Maintenance Code which governs the Manayunk Historic District (iii) Original architecture features such as cornices and bay shall not be removed. Deteriorated features shall be repaired where possible. Replacement material where necessary shall duplicate the original as closely as possible; and (viii) New storefronts shall be compatible with the proportion, form and materials of the original building.

1428-32 Chestnut Street

Chest-Pac Associates, LP, Owner

David Blumenfeld, Applicant

DATE: 1922, Ritter and Shay, architects

PROPOSAL: Temporary signage

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal, which calls for three signs attached to the limestone at the second floor of the building. One will be located on 15th Street and two on the Chestnut Street façade. Signs once hung in these same positions. They were illegally installed by the current owner. After a violation was issued, the owner appeared before the Commission in September 2003. The Commission legalized the three temporarily, until December 2003, provided the owner cleaned and repaired the limestone upon their removal. The owner did not remove the signs by the deadline, but instead came to the Commission for an extension. The Commission denied the extension and the signs were removed in March 2004. The owner has not undertaken the cleaning and repair.

The building is now being converted to condominiums and the owner wishes to advertise them. The owner has therefore submitted the new signage application. The application claims that the new signs will only be attached in the mortar joints, but uses photographs of the previous signs, which were attached with holes in the masonry. Also, the application stipulates that the signs will be temporary, but does not specify a specific time limit.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to the Commission's decision of March 2004.

Architect Tuong Huynh along with David Blumenfeld attended the meeting. Mr. Blumenfeld acknowledged his mistake of installing the previous signs without a permit and their retention for a longer period than approved. He noted that the proposed signs, which are needed for marketing purposes, would be installed within the mortar joints. Mr. Blumenfeld informed the Committee that the building has entered into an agreement with the "House of Blues" as a tenant.

Committee members pointed out that the owner had agreed to repair and clean the masonry after the previous temporary signage was removed, but did not. Mr. Blumenfeld claimed that the building was cleaned and re-pointed; however, Mr. Baron disclosed that dark outlines marking the locations of the earlier signs remain on the building. Ms. Pentz asserted her disapproval of the work performed incorrectly and illegally and emphasized the importance of a proper masonry cleaning and patching to remedy the damage. The Committee entered into a discussion regarding time limits for the signage and how to ensure that the limits would be respected. Mr. Blumenfeld stated that the signs would be in place for six months; he later stated that they would hang for nine months. Mr. Thomas suggested an escrow account. Ms. Voith thought that the submission lacked details as well as visuals of the proposed signage. Mr. Blumenfeld suggested that the Committee look at the advertisement in a recent issue of *Philadelphia Magazine*. The Committee concluded that it is important that the approval of the signage be subject to a specified time.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the temporary signage for a maximum of six months, provided they are removed by 25 December 2005 regardless of the date of installation and provided the masonry is cleaned and patched, with staff to review details, immediately after the signs are removed.

1428-32 Chestnut Street

Chest-Pac Associates, LP, Owner

Tuong Huynh, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1922, Ritter and Shay, architects

PROPOSAL: Legalize Chestnut Street storefront

At the time of designation, the Packard Building's Chestnut Street storefront had a non-historic aluminum revolving door flanked by two single-leaf doors. Without a permit or Historical Commission approval, the owner replaced the storefront assembly with a central, plate-glass window and two new single-leaf doors. This storefront will probably change again when the owner secures a tenant for the first floor space in the next couple months.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal to the Architectural Committee. David Blumenfeld and Tyong Huynh, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Blumenfeld informed the

Committee that an historic consultant has been hired and that the existing storefront is a temporary circumstance until a tenant is secured.

Committee members discussed the proposed legalization and concurred that the most expeditious solution is to restore the historic doors and cure the violation. Mr. Blumenfeld replied that there is no evidence of the design of the historic doors and he expressed concern that the doors would be damaged during the renovation period. Mr. Thomas suggested that the doors be stored until the construction ends. Mr. Hyunh alluded to the fact that the original doors were 30 inches and that the current doors are 36 inches wide.

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 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials].

300-14 North 3rd Street

300-14 North Third Street Associates, LLC, Owner
James Hellyer, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1835 for the Manufacturers & Mechanics Bank; extensively rebuilt in 1870-1871 for the Bank of the Northern Liberties, James H. Windrim, architect, and James Rorke, contractor; additions, 1880-1885; addition, 1985 – significant in Old City Historic District

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations, 5-story side addition

This significant bank building at the corner of North 3rd and Vine Streets has two additions, one added in the 1880s and a larger one next to it in 1985. The proposal calls for the conversion of the property into condominiums with a 5-story addition to the north with underground parking and the façade rehabilitation of the existing building.

The proposed addition has a rusticated base with modular brick on the upper floors, aluminum windows and a flared fiberglass cornice. The balconies at the northeast corner and on the north side will have aluminum railings. The ingress and egress to the underground parking will occur on Wood Street and the openings will have aluminum and glass overhead doors with jack arches.

The façade of the 1985 addition will be changed to match the elements of the new addition. The roof section will have rooftop terraces for the penthouse units. Last, the rear façade will have a door cut for the second means of egress, though this only shows on the plans and not on the elevations.

The 1880-85 addition will be altered in two ways. This section of the building will become the primary pedestrian entrance for the property. The large storefront window at the monumental first floor will be altered to a wood, double-leaf, fully-glazed door with side-lights and transom; cascading stairs with railings will be added. The second alteration occurs at the rear façade. Three casement windows will be cut in the stuccoed façade.

The original building will be restored. The section of the Vine Street façade that had been altered for a storefront in the 20th century will be removed and restored with stone

and two-over-two windows to match the originals. The original staircase leading to the front door will be cordoned off with a metal railing.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 6, 9, and 10. One staff member objected to the flared cornice on the new addition.

Daniel Sablosky, Ethan Fellheimer, James Hellyer, and Richard Thom attended the meeting. Mr. Sablosky gave an overview of the project. He said that the historic building would be retained and cleaned and that the Vine Street façade would be restored with granite to match the historic stone. Mr. Sablosky noted that the mechanical venting would occur at the rear.

Committee members discussed the ground floor treatment on the North 3rd Street elevation at length. They recommended adding a new opening on the North 3rd Street façade to break up the solid wall along the parking garage. The applicants offered to install a window with opaque glazing below the existing openings on the upper floors. Committee members believed that its treatment should reflect its usage. The Committee suggested a more open design, which would allow light to filter through. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the design should not resemble a closed up storefront. Ms. Voith had a problem with the proposed spandrel glass at this location. Ms. Voith disapproved of the proposed cornice also; she believed that it should be more contemporary. The Committee concurred. Mr. Tyler said that without the flare, the cornice would read differently, since the proposed cream and brick better represents Victorian architecture.

The Architectural Committee recommended conceptual approval with modifications to the cornice and the openings on the North 3rd Street ground floor elevations, with staff to review details.

213 Chestnut Street

Eli Gabay, Owner

Todd lean, Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Legalize kitchen fan

The Committee tabled this application last month pending more information. In 1993, the Historical Commission approved ductwork and an interior fan with a grill that would be flush with the window frame. This application calls for legalizing a new, projecting dome and fan for the kitchen ductwork. The tenant claims that a pre-existing projecting fan was damaged by a truck and he simply replaced it.

The Department of Licenses and Inspections notes that exterior ventilation of kitchens is not required by code; interior ventilation can exist. However, the exterior “mushroom” vent as proposed is the most common and easiest form of ventilation.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The louver should be installed to match what the Commission approved in 1993.

Mr. Baron presented the application. No one was present to represent the proposal.

Committee members discussed the application and concurred with the staff recommendation.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]. The louver should be installed to match what the Commission approved in 1993.

1228-32 Arch Street

North Star Property Group, LLC, Owner

John Tucker, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1909, Charles Bolton, architect

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitate façade, construct 1-story roof top addition, and install new storefront windows and doors

This multi-faceted proposal calls for a penthouse addition and façade rehabilitation for this Beaux-Arts Classical loft building to convert it into condominiums.

The penthouse addition will stand fourteen feet above the roof, which will have setbacks from Arch and North 13th Streets as well as the rear façade. Access to the penthouse will occur within the individual condominium units, precluding the need for an elevator to extend the height of the penthouse. A roof deck will wrap the penthouse; the cornice sits high enough to act as the railing for the deck on the Arch and North 13th Street facades. At the south elevation, a metal railing will be installed. The penthouse will have painted, corrugated metal facing with aluminum-clad windows.

On the upper floors of the building, the window frames will be repaired and retrofitted with new, insulated sash-kits. The terra cotta and brick will be cleaned and pointed. The Philadelphia fire escape on the 13th Street façade will no longer be used, but the proposal calls for fixed, half-glazed doors.

At the first floor, the historic easternmost entrance that led to the upper floors remains. All other bays have been altered. The plans call for removing the non-historic metal storefronts, signage and lighting. The paint on the cornice and pilasters will be removed. The Arch Street façade will receive two new doors, one leading to the first floor commercial space and one leading to the upper floors. The historic entrance will act as the second means of egress as required by the fire code, since the old fire stair on North 13th Street will now be blocked off. The two new entrances have double-leaf, fully-glazed doors with transoms. The North 13th Street elevation also has one entrance with a similar design leading to the commercial space. All of the other bays on the first floor have a storefront configuration based on an historic photograph of July 1914. The historic storefront windows had a single plate glass window topped by operable three-light transoms with the middle window wider than the side ones as at the upper windows. The proposed storefront windows have tripartite windows topped by three-light transoms.

On the south elevation, the proposal calls for cleaning the brick, including the removal of painted signage, and rehabilitating the steel windows.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the penthouse addition, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and Roofs Guideline. Approval of the masonry cleaning and pointing, except for the south façade, with staff to review samples, pursuant to Standard 7. The staff requests additional information on the painted sign on the south façade before commenting on its removal. Denial of the first-floor design, pursuant to Standard 6. The design of the first floor should be reconsidered.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal.

Gregory Belew, Sam Hageman, Fred Duling and John Tucker, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Tucker described the proposed project. He offered that the windows on the Arch and North 13th Streets' elevation would be replaced in wood while the southside and eastside would remain steel. Mr. Tucker said that the egress at the base of the building is dictated by the fire code. In response to suggestions by the Committee about relocating the means of egress, he cited the floor level changes and the importance of floor space for marketing purposes.

Committee members questioned the screen walls which extend 2 feet 6 inches above the cornice line. They suggested a sloping of the screen walls to minimize visibility. Some members thought that a paint analysis should be performed for a determination of the color of the historic spandrels, while other members thought that a light stucco for the addition would be more appropriate. Ms. Voith took issue with the cornice's being the same color as the top of the building. Mr. Hageman said that he is willing to change the color. Ms. Voith also questioned the window configuration. She believed that a tripartite window configuration at the top level is more appropriate and that the windows as designed, introduced a third rhythm. Mr. Rivera thought that the color of the addition should be divorced from the cornice and suggested a masonry color for the corrugated metal. It was noted that the spandrel above the head door is different. The Committee concluded that the design at street level should be re-addressed as well as the consideration of the color of the secondary cornice. The Committee gave the applicant design suggestions for the treatment of the ground level.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal above the ground floor level with sloped screen walls on the rooftop decks and research for a determination of the color for the spandrels and cornice; but denial of the ground level design as submitted. The Committee acted pursuant to Standards 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.], 7 [Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.], 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and 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].

537 Queen Street.

Owner: Maksym Szpilczck

Applicant: Maksym Szpilczck

History: c. 1825; third story and cornice added c. 1855, demolished and rebuilt 2004

Project: Roof deck and penthouse addition.

The applicant proposes to construct a roof deck and penthouse addition. The Department of Licenses and Inspections declared the original rowhouse imminently dangerous in 2003 and it was demolished with staff's approval. In 2004, the owner

rebuilt a close replica of the original rowhouse on the lot. The Commission approved a third floor addition to this property at its February 2005 meeting.

The proposed roof deck and penthouse addition is a scaled down version of the addition approved by the Commission at its February 2005 meeting. The earlier design proposed a cubic, full-width penthouse addition with a setback from the front façade. The new design would be an 8'5" by 3'8" addition opening onto a 30'3" by 16" roof deck. The deck would have a 7' setback from the front façade and 2' from the back façade.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the roof deck and penthouse addition pursuant to Standards 9, 10 and the Roofs Guidelines.

The meeting was attended by Mr. Maksym Szpilczek and Mr. David O'Donnell, president of the Queen Village neighbor's Association. Mr. Danta presented the proposal.

The committee reviewed the proposal and concurred with the staff's recommendation to approve the proposed roof decks. Mr. O'Donnell did not raise any historic preservation objections. Mr. Tyler reiterated that this building is a new structure that replicates the demolished historic building. Mr. Herbert Levy suggested that this property should be removed from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; 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 Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as decks so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

1711 Spring Garden Street.

Owner: George and Marie Koulas

Applicant: George & Marie Koulas

History: c.1878, Second Empire rowhouse - contributing to Spring Garden Historic District

Project: Rebuilding of second floor roof deck and construction of new third floor roof deck.

This property is located in the middle of the 1700 block of Spring Garden Street. The row originally extended to the corner of 17th Street, and has been subsequently shortened. Currently, 1711 is second in from the end of the row. The rear of the property faces Brandywine Street, which in this block is considered an alley with only backyards and garages facing it. The proposed work would be located on the property's rear ell facing Brandywine Street.

The proposed two decks would both be located on the rear ell of the property. The deck on the second floor would replace an existing one, which appears to have been in place at the time of designation. This second floor deck would measure 9' by 10' with a 36" wood picket railing. It would have a setback from the rear wall and rest equidistant from the sides of the building and flush with the third floor wall. The proposed new third floor deck would be accessed by an existing door at the rear of the mansard and measure 11'4" by 12' 3" with a 36" wood picket railing. This third floor deck would have a

considerable setback from the rear wall of the ell and rest flush with the west parapet wall.

Note: L & I Code may require railings of 42" in height. Applicant should confirm this measurement with code regulations.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the proposed roof decks, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9, 10 and the Roofs Guidelines.

The meeting was attended by Mrs. Maria Koulas and Mr. Allan Rubin from the Spring Gardens Civic Association. Mr. Danta presented the project.

The committee reviewed the project without any objections to the design and concurred with the staff's recommendation to approve the proposal. Mr. Danta mentioned to the applicant that the 36" railing on the drawing might not be compliant with the Building Code and that the applicant should verify this prior to requesting a permit.

The Architectural Committee recommended 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 Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as decks so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

1424-26 Chestnut Street.

Owner: Sunny Spring LLC

Applicant: CVS Pharmacy

History: Built 1904, Arts & Crafts Commercial, William L. Price architect

Project: New flat wall mounted sign

This property is located in the Chestnut Street commercial corridor and directly across from an empty lot, currently used for parking. Prominent Philadelphia architect William Price, one of the best known practitioners of the Arts & Crafts movement in the region, designed the building. Originally constructed in 1904 as the Jacob Reed's Sons men clothing store, this building was among the first reinforce concrete structures for public use in Philadelphia. It is also one of the most accomplished and best preserved examples of the Arts & Crafts in center city.

The applicant proposes to install a 4'9" by 20" sign on the entablature that delineates the ground from the upper floors. This sign would have the CVS logo on it. Currently, the tenant has four signs on the façade of the building. There are two bronze plaques with the CVS logo on the pilasters at either end of the façade. These plaques replaced two identical signs with the Jacob Reed's Sons logo that were of the same dimensions, material and location. There is a CVS Pharmacy sign over the entrance, which mimics the original, Jacob Reed's sign and a CVS banner hangs from the left balcony. In addition, the front alcove has a stained-glass fanlight with the CVS logo visible from the sidewalk.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the proposed sign pursuant to Standards 9 and 2

The meeting was attended by Ms. Susan Mariano and Mr. John E. Ryan, Esq. Mr.

Danta presented the proposal.

Mr. Ryan requested an explanation of the standards on which the Staff's recommendation for denial was based. Mr. Danta explained *The Secretary of the Interior Standards* 9 and 2. Mr. Ryan mentioned that the sign would be of bronze and that if taken down in the future the holes would be patched. Mr. Levy mentioned that CVS possessed several signs already and that it seemed unnecessary to attach yet another sign. Ms. Mariano responded to this point by explaining that the CVS banner on the left balcony would be removed. Ms. Mariano also provided the committee members with an updated drawing of the proposed sign. Mr. D'Alessandro mentioned that the new drawings were incomplete owing to their omission of electrical work. Mr. Danta explained the staff's concern with drilling holes into an undisturbed marble frieze and suggested that the applicant place the sign internally at the mezzanine level. Mr. Rivera and Mr. Levy expressed the uniqueness of this building and the importance of symmetry on this harmonious façade. Mr. Rivera supported the staff's recommendation, which was also supported by Mr. Levy and Mr. D'Alessandro. Mr. Ryan expressed his willingness to take this recommendation back to his client. However, Ms. Mariano mentioned a possible accessibility conflict with the current second floor tenant.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.].

2100 block of Fairmount Avenue, Eastern State Penitentiary.

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Friends of Eastern State Penitentiary Park, Daniel J. Collins

History: undeveloped green space adjacent to Eastern State Penitentiary's perimeter wall

Project: Installation of new playground.

The applicant proposes the approval in concept for the installation of a new playground on undeveloped green space at the SE corner of Brown and 22nd Streets. The entire block is owned by the City of Philadelphia. The penitentiary complex that occupies this block predates the expansion of Thomas Holme's grid; this open space is a direct result of the development northward of the city.

The proposed playground would contain a children's playground area encircled by a 4' high planted fence screen, which would rise to 12' in height at the corner of Brown and 22nd Streets. The enclosed area would have a toddler play area, water play, small children's ride and a play structure. This in turn, would be surrounded by various trees and planting circles.

Staff Recommendation: Approval in concept of the proposed playground, pursuant to Standard 9.

The meeting was attended by Mr. Daniel Collins from Friends of Eastern State Penitentiary Park. Mr. Danta presented the proposal.

Mr. Collins began the discussion by explained what the planning process for this project. He mentioned the sources of funding and the support the project has received from the

community and Eastern State Penitentiary. He also mentioned the benefits this park would provide to the Bache Martin School across the street, which currently does not have its own K through 8 playground. Mr. Ryan explained the necessity of performing grading work at the site, which would not extend beyond the third pier of the Penitentiary's wall, per an agreement with the managing staff of Eastern State. Mr. Rivera requested an explanation of the staff's suggestion to change the 12' high fence to 8'. Mr. Danta explained that the staff believed Eastern State's perimeter wall to be an imposing streetscape feature and that a 12' high planted fence would create a strong visual barrier to the wall. Mr. Ryan agreed with this comment and mentioned that this fence would most likely change in the final submission.

Mr. Levy requested clarification for the proposed stabilized crushed stone covering on the access ramp. Mr. Collins explained the crushed stone covering would be fine gravel resembling the covering found at Logan Circle. Mr. Collins asked the committee members if the Historical Commission would review changes to the fixed play equipments. Mr. Levy answered that this would be a concern of the Recreation Department and its guidelines. However, the Historical Commission would be concerned with drastic changes to the massing of the play equipment.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired].

2120 Green Street

History: built 1845

Owner: Marjorie Samoff

Applicant: John Bushnell, architect

This proposal calls for rebuilding much of this row house that suffered a fire. In particular, the applicant would like to alter the now largely demolished rear ell to extend the full width of the lot to allow for a larger kitchen. The rear addition would rise three stories along the lot line, removing the historic side yard. These four foot wide side yards built in pairs have historically provided an eight foot wide court that gives light to the windows along the sides of row houses. The new rear ell would have visibility only from Wilcox Street which is a service alley.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standards 9 & 10.

The meeting was attended by Ms. Samoff, the owner, and her architect John Bushnell. She explained that her house suffered a fire. The house had been reconfigured in the 1980s with a new rear ell; the kitchen, however, remained in the cellar. Unlike others in the block, this house has a rear garden which she wishes to preserve. Building a wider rear addition into the side yard will allow her a first floor kitchen. Mr. Bushnell explained that the relatively short addition will fill in the area in front of just a few windows of the adjacent property, one of which is in a stair hall. Other rooms in the neighboring building will benefit from the view of the garden.

Mr. Bushnell said that the Zoning Board will review the proposal on April 5.

Mr. Tyler said that he had visited Wilcox Street behind the house and found it lacks

historical integrity and consistency.

Mr. Rubin, representing the Spring Garden Civic Association, said that that group supports the proposal as presented.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval.

3905 Spruce Street

History: Joseph Potts Mansion, built 1850, altered 1876, architect Wilson Brothers

Applicant: Jim Rowe, Agoos Lovera, architects

Owner: University of Pennsylvania

This proposal calls for removing a non-original front door and replacing it with a door more in keeping with the architecture of the building. It bases the new single-leaf door on the double-leaf interior vestibule door.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of a new door, provided it is wider to fit the opening, has solid panels or taller single glass panes, and is based on the historic door, pursuant to Standard 6.

Jim Rowe and Eric Delss of Agoos Lovera described the proposal. They explained that it has been difficult to find any images of the door because of a porch that existed on the property that hid that feature. Partial demolition has uncovered the historic stained glass transom which they intend to expose.

Committee members applauded the effort to install more appropriate doors and understood the need to build a single door that looks like a double door. They said that the applicant should try to replicate better the historic doors by enlarging them to fit the original opening appropriately and by installing an astragal down the middle of the door. They noted that the side panels could be wide enough for the card reader and should be simplified to allow the design of the frame and door to stand out. They added that the frame should be researched and made to approximate the original.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval, provided the doors fit the original opening, an astragal is added, the side panels are simplified, and the frame approximates the original, 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.].

The applicant agreed.

240 Spruce Street

History: built c. 1780

Owner/Applicant: Constance Kirker

This application calls for installing a deck on a visible rear roof. The applicant will cut down a window into a door and install a metal railing.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Kirker appeared to represent the project.

Rebecca Stoloff of the Society Hill appeared and expressed that organization's support of the project.

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

2019 Pine Street

History: c.1840

Owner: Salmi Simmons

Applicant: Martin Rosenblum, R.A., and Associates

This application calls for alterations to the rear of a row house which will have visibility from a service alley. The work includes a first floor addition set into the piazza between the rear ell and the wall of the neighboring house. The roof of this addition will intersect the side of a bay. A second greenhouse-like addition will sit on the second floor level at the back of the property. A new door will be cut into a rear addition and several window and door openings will be partially or entirely closed with a panel or shutter design. An existing rear deck will be altered with a new, more open railing.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the second floor rear addition, the new deck rail if it is lowered to code height, and the infilling and cutting of openings. Denial of the first floor addition in the side yard and the deck's skirt and tall railing pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Rosenblum presented the application. He explained that the applicant seeks to legalize a ten year old deck. The Zoning Board approved the deck subject to the railing's being made more open. The owner wishes to maintain as much privacy as possible.

Mr. Rosenblum explained that after discussions with the builder about the need to underpin the rear addition he now seeks to rebuild it instead using the old bricks. Rather than infill openings he would propose their reconstruction with smaller but symmetrical windows.

The addition in the side yard would follow an addition already built on the adjacent neighboring property and create a powder room amenity in what is now a dark and damp space.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval of the proposal including:

- 1. the demolition and rebuilding of the rear one story brick addition with modified windows and doors;*
- 2. the deck without a skirt, subject to a simplification of the deck rail to retain the existing height, but remove every other picket to create a more open design;*
- 3. the first-floor side-yard addition, provided it is shortened approximately eight inches to avoid touching the side bay.*

It made the recommendations 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.]

Mr. Rosenblum agreed with the recommendation.

1708 Pine Street

History: built c. 1840

Owner: Green Park Property

Applicant: Donald Ventresca

The application involves building a deck on the rear ell and an addition facing a service alley.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Ventresca represented the application. Mr. Baron explained that although the deck will have some visibility from South 20th Street, it will follow the pattern of decks on rear ells.

Mr. Rosenblum spoke in support of the application.

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

20-22 S. Front Street

History: 20th century, two-story structure

Owner: Revolution Development Group

Applicant: Bill Harkins

This proposal calls for the demolition of an existing non-contributing structure and the construction of an eight-story residential structure facing on both Front and Letitia Streets. The glass and red brick structure is of a very large scale. It sits on a brick base with no windows lower than six and a half feet above the side walk. The Front Street façade has a tall inset stair and a large garage opening. It has no pedestrian scale windows or openings along the street.

The façade on Letitia Street turns its back on this important streetscape. Half of the façade features a nearly blank brick wall with over-scale openings. The building has an internal courtyard.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The new design should take into account the scale and massing of the adjacent streetscapes on its east and west facades, particularly at the ground-floor level.

The project was represented by Andrew Kaplin, the developer, and Hans Stein, the architect. They explained that the project has Zoning approval already. They had met with the Old City Civic Association. Their initial idea to create an open public plaza was

met with disapproval and a concern that vagrants would frequent the plaza and “illicit activity” would occur. The developer has therefore decided revise the plan and to adopt one that meets “as of right” zoning.

Mr. Stein explained that the building will be seven and a half stories with the parking half underground. He noted that the site slopes nearly three feet from Front to Letitia Streets. He said that they would restore Black Horse Alley. Because of the narrow width of Letitia Street, Mr. Stein explained that Zoning allows a maximum of 25% windows along that street. He explained that the building, which will hold 34 residential units, will be 84 feet 9 inches high. Most other adjacent buildings, he said, are 55 feet with some higher.

Mr. Levy commented that the building seems very tall and out of scale. He asked if the garage could open onto Letitia Street rather than Front Street. He said that the architecture of the building would be fine in another context, but that the design needs to take some cues from the scale of its streetscape.

Mr. Tyler thought that the building needs to have a front on Front Street. Mr. Riviera agreed and said that the focus needs to be changed from the inner courtyard and the view out, to consider the public face of the building.

Mr. Baron, noting the restoration of so many buildings on Letitia and the fact that there were typically two back to back buildings between Front and Letitia, thought it important that the building presents a front face to both Front and Letitia Streets.

Mr. Kaplin explained that the building had been designed to mimic cast iron buildings prevalent in the neighborhood and that it had been arranged so that the maximum number of people could have river views. He said that it was not tall enough to provide many City views over the buildings and thus the elevator core was placed on the west side.

Mr. Gie Lim, a neighbor, who owns the building at 8-10 Letitia Street, expressed his opposition to the current design. He said he supports construction on the site, but thought that the proposal was way out of scale to the streetscape and in terms of windows and openings at the ground floor. He said it seemed a fish out of water in its surroundings.

John Gallery said that he strongly supports the staff recommendation of denial for three main reasons. First, he thought the building tremendously out of scale in height on two very important streetscapes. Second, he thought that the building does not respect the pedestrian level streetscape in terms of the lack of the rhythm and scale of the streetscape and the height of the openings above the sidewalk and the deadening blank walls. Third, he said the building has too much glass. He observed that you can have great views with windows that have more of the ratio of glass and solid wall that is typical of the architecture of the neighborhood.

The Committee members agreed with the staff recommendation and commented that the building needs to respect the scale of its streetscape, both in overall height and in terms of windows and openings at pedestrian level. They said that with the large lot it is possible to build with some setbacks. They added that the building needs to have fronts on the streets and be a better neighbor, preserving a sense of community. They thought that it should have a real entrance on Front and Letitia Streets and not a handicap entrance in a clearly secondary portion of the building.

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

2320 Spruce Street

History: built c. 1870

Owners: Scott and Margie Kasner

Applicant: Peter Miller, Towers and Miller Architects

This application involves the demolition of a small shed addition at the visible rear of the property and its replacement with a larger one story addition. The addition will be somewhat taller and cut into the existing rear bay.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the rear addition, provided it is lowered to fit under the bay, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Miller attended the meeting with Mr. and Mrs. Kasner. He explained that the addition would not cut into the existing bay but rather would flash up against it providing a better slope for water drainage.

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

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron
Jorge Danta
Jonathan Farnham
Diane M. Hughes