

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

**25 SEPTEMBER 2007
CITY HALL, ROOM 578
9:30 A.M.**

PRESENT

Suzanne Pentz
Robert Thomas, AIA
Dan McCoubrey, AIA
Vincent Rivera
Daniela Voith
Rudy D'Alessandro

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

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
Tyler Wren, M. Mark Mendel, Ltd
Seth Cohen, VSBA
Kathy Dowdell, AIA
Cletus Lyman, Lyman & Ash
Roberto Diaz, Curtis Institute
Elizabeth Warshower, Curtis Institute
Peter Dobrin, Philadelphia Inquirer
Diana Bonesteel, Kriseman Company
Lenore Mullhollen, Center City Residents Association
Richard DeMarco, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker & Partners
Christina Carter, John Milner Architects
Janet Kalter, Old City Civic Association
Neamon Tgomey, Curtis Institute
Al Rabaday
Robert Spear, E-Z Park, Inc.
T. Holden, Thom & Dave Market Designer
William Alesker, Alesker & Dundon Architects
John Dundon, Alesker & Dundon Architects
Alan Rubin, Spring Garden Civic Association
Salem Shuckman
John Milner, John Milner Architects
Justin Detwiler, John Milner Architects
Thomas Chapman, Esq., Blank Rome
Rosa Esquenazi
Heather Lutzker, Graboyes

Lonnie J. Hovey, AIA, Vitetta Group
Nancy Goldenberg, Center City District
Julie Panassow, Lighting Practice
Mark Alexander, Center City District
Steven Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinski
Brett Webber, Brett Webber Architects
Andrew Krouk
Jonathan Barnett
Alice Gosfield

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Thomas called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Ms. Voith joined him. Ms. Pentz and Messrs. D'Alessandro and McCoubrey later joined the Architectural Committee.

1610, 1612-1616, AND 1618 LOCUST STREET

Owner: HFGLocust LP, The Lenfest Group LLC, H. F. Gerry Lenfest, Curtis Institute

Applicant: Seth Cohen, Venturi Scott Brown Associates

History: 1610: 1893, John H. Converse House, Wilson Brothers, architects
Individually designated 2/28/67, Significant in district

1612-1616: c. 1960, Non-contributing in district

1618: c. 1855, Charles Custis Harrison House, John Notman, architect
new façade, Wilson Eyre, architect, 1888
Significant in district

Project: In concept - demolish all but 1610 and 1618 facades, construct 10-story music and dormitory building; restore historic facades

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to demolish the entirety of the Non-contributing building at 1612-1616 Locust Street and all but the front facades of the Significant buildings at 1610 and 1618 Locust Street. In their places, it proposes to construct a ten-story building to house practice spaces and residences for students and faculty of the Curtis Institute, a music school located on the 1700-block of Locust Street. It also proposes to fully restore the historic brownstone facades at 1610 and 1618.

The demolitions of all but the facades of the buildings at 1610 and 1618 must be considered “demolitions” under the historic preservation ordinance. Therefore, the Commission cannot approve these demolitions without first finding that the buildings cannot be reasonably adapted for any purpose or that the demolitions are necessary in the public interest. The application does not advance a financial hardship claim. The application as originally submitted does, however, advance a public interest claim, albeit implicitly. Additional information was submitted on 5 October 2007; it is not addressed in this overview. The application contends that “Curtis is one of the world’s preeminent conservatories, training exceptionally gifted young musicians.” It also contends that the construction of this building is “critical for Curtis to meet its educational mission and remain competitive with premier music conservatories.” In meetings with the staff, the applicants explicitly advanced a public interest claim, which should be formalized.

The Commission’s ordinance and Rules & Regulations provide little guidance for evaluating or substantiating “necessary in the public interest” claims. The Commission’s past practice regarding demolition deemed necessary in the public interest provides some guidance. The Commission has found that demolitions were necessary in the public interest in four instances

since the adoption of the new historic preservation ordinance in 1985. In 1991, the Commission found that the demolition of Smith Hall, a research building at the University of Pennsylvania, was necessary in the public interest. In 2001, the Commission found that the demolition of an individually designated house was necessary in the public interest for the expansion of the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf at the former Germantown Academy. In 2002 (in concept) and 2006 (final), the Commission found that the demolition of a firehouse in the path of the expansion of the Convention Center was necessary in the public interest. In 2003, the Commission found that the demolition of three buildings to clear a site for a parking garage on the 1900-block of Walnut and Sansom Streets was necessary in the public interest. In his Memorandum Opinion in the parking garage case, Judge Carrafiello stated that “it is incomprehensible that ‘necessary in the public interest,’ used in the context of a grant of power to save historic buildings from the ravages of modern development, would mean allowing development purely for economic gain.”

The Smith Hall and Pennsylvania School for the Deaf decisions are especially germane to the current case. In both instances, the Commission found that the demolitions were necessary to the advancement of the important, non-profit, educational institutions, which provide significant public benefits. The Curtis applicants have provided anecdotal evidence to support their claim that the Institute provides a significant public benefit to the city and beyond. One could extend this argument and claim that educational and cultural institutions like the Curtis Institute are essential to Philadelphia's continued revitalization and prosperity, but such an argument must be articulated in more than financial terms. However, before the Commission considers or accepts such a claim, the applicants should formally document the public's vital interest in the continuation and advancement of the Curtis Institute.

The applicants have also provided anecdotal evidence to support their claim that the proposed rehearsal and residential building is critical to advancement of the music school and its continued provision of significant public benefits. Most importantly, they claim that the school's aging and limited facilities threaten its capacity to fulfill its mission, especially to attract the world's most promising music students. More specifically, they claim that:

- the school lacks adequate and appropriate rehearsal spaces, especially a space for a full orchestra, and must rent space at great expense;
- the school lacks informal socializing spaces, which would aid in building a vibrant and cohesive student community, especially for the school's many young, foreign students;
- the school lacks appropriate student housing and instead places students at disparate locations around the city at great expense;
- the school lacks a communal dining facility;
- the lack of space and facilities results in the overtaxing of the main school building, which is also designated as historic;
- the lack of appropriate facilities has resulted a drop in the enrollment of the most qualified candidates.

The applicants should formalize their anecdotal claims, documenting the ways in which failing to complete this project would negatively impact the school, preventing it from fulfilling its mission and thereby preventing it from providing an important benefit to the public.

Geography is also important in this case. The Curtis Institute's options for expansion are limited by its commitment to its current location. In the Smith Hall and Pennsylvania School for the Deaf cases, the options to expand the institutions were also limited owing to the institutions' investments in and commitments to their established campuses. The Race Street firehouse case is also relevant in this regard; the Commission agreed that, owing to its investment in its location, the Convention Center Authority was not free to relocate, but was extremely limited in

its expansion options. In all three cases, the identifications of significant public benefits provided by the institutions established the “public interest,” but the geographical limitations, combined with the critical programmatic needs, established the “necessity” required by the ordinance. The Curtis application should formally present a similar claim to necessity. The music school has occupied buildings at the corner of 18th and Locust Streets, one block from the site under discussion, since 1924. The Curtis Institute should document its investment in and commitment to its current buildings. It should also document its search for expansion space in the immediate neighborhood, which led to its conclusion that the current site is the most viable option. The applicants noted anecdotally that the Curtis had considered but rejected the Parking Authority parcel on the 1900-block of Walnut, owing to its cost, which exceeded their means. They should formalize this informal claim. The Institute must prove that its expansion options are limited to the proposed site, or others with similar implications for historic resources. The expansion may be in the public interest, but it is only necessary in the public interest if this site is the only viable site for the expansion.

Interpretations of “necessary in the public interest” in other jurisdictions may also provide some guidance. In some municipal preservation ordinances, projects that are “necessary in the public interest” are sometimes referred to as “projects of special merit.” The Portland, Maine ordinance (§14-625) is illustrative. It states that a project shall not be designated as a project of special merit unless:

1. The project is consistent with the comprehensive plan...;
2. The project will provide significant public and civic benefits, including without limitation social or other benefits which are significant to the community, and particularly desirable at the location proposed. Such benefits must substantially outweigh the loss of the ... landmark. Such benefit shall not be considered principally on the basis of economic development, property taxes, or other financial return to the city or other parties;
3. The project is of exceptional design, utilizing the highest quality of exterior materials in a manner compatible with the surrounding area, including without limitation any remaining landmark, district, or any portion thereof; and
4. If demolition of a landmark structure or contributing structure is required, reasonable efforts have been to made relocate the structure.

If a project is deemed a project of special merit, the Portland ordinance requires that the demolition permit not issue until the new construction permit issues; binding assurances that the project will be completed are provided by the developer; photographs and measured drawings of the lost resource are submitted to the city; and the lost resource is commemorated with a suitable monument that is prominently and perpetually displayed.

The Curtis application proposes the demolition of all but the front facades of the nineteenth-century rowhouses that flank the non-historic building. Both buildings have architecturally significant brownstone front facades. Both also have altered, relatively insignificant, rear facades. The rear at 1610 was extensively added to and altered in the 1940s. It is currently in poor condition. The rear at 1618 was altered in the 1960s with the addition of a stair tower for the Locust Club and the infilling and altering of many openings. The applicants claim that the historic rowhouses cannot be integrated into their larger development, owing to floor levels, acoustical requirements, and other restrictions. A diagram of the numerous floor levels in 1610 as well as old and new floor-level comparisons are included in the application. The applicants should document their design process and demonstrate that they made every reasonable attempt to achieve their programmatic goals while retaining the exteriors of the historic buildings. They should also demonstrate that the benefits of the new building would substantially outweigh the loss of the relatively insignificant rears of the row houses. The

Commission should take no position on the dispositions of the interiors of the rowhouses, which lay outside its jurisdiction.

The new building would present a four-story façade on Locust Street that would incorporate the two historic facades. The new facade would align with the cornices lines and planes of the historic facades, restoring the street wall lost with the construction of the Locust Club building in the 1960s. The six-story residential tower would set be back about 45 feet from the front façade. Photomontages demonstrate that the tower would be inconspicuous from Locust Street. At the rear, the building would rise ten stories above Latimer Street.

The building would house offices, a dining hall and kitchen, a student lounge, and a loading dock on the first floor. The loading dock would be accessed from Latimer. The loading-dock driveway would double as a drop-off lane. A three-story rehearsal room large enough to accommodate a full orchestra would dominate the second, third, and fourth floors. Those floors would also house practice, teaching, recording, and instrument storage rooms. Dormitory rooms would be located at the rear at the third to ninth floors. The tenth floor would house visiting faculty apartments.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The demolitions of all but the facades of 1610 and 1618 Locust Street are demolitions in significant part and trigger the hardship/public interest test in §14-2007(7)(j). Therefore, the applicant must offer a hardship or public interest claim to justify the demolitions. The staff recommends that the Commission require the submission of a comprehensive report supporting the implicit claim that the demolitions are necessary in the public interest.
2. The staff recommends that the proposed building is compatible with the character of the historic district, neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape, §14-2007(7)(k)(.4). The staff also recommends that, ignoring the demolition, the proposed building otherwise satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards because it will 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.
3. If the Commission finds that the demolitions are necessary in the public interest, the staff would recommend approval in concept with the following provisions:
 - a. the demolition permit not issue until the new construction permit issues;
 - b. the Curtis Institute provides binding assurances that the project will be completed;
 - c. the Curtis Institute submits photographs and measured drawings of the extant buildings at 1610 and 1618 Locust Street to the Commission;
 - d. the Curtis Institute commemorates 1610 and 1618 Locust Street with a suitable monument that is prominently and perpetually displayed; and
 - e. the front facades 1610 and 1618 Locust Street are completely restored to their 1893 and 1888 appearances, respectively.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham explained that the Committee lacked a quorum. Only Mr. Thomas and Ms. Voith were in attendance. He reported that Ms. Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey had recused, owing to their firms' involvements in the project. He stated that Mr. Levy was out of the country, Mr. Rivera was ill, and Mr. D'Alessandro was unavailable. He explained that the review could go forward with only two Committee members, but the resulting recommendation would not be considered a Committee recommendation. He asked if the applicants or any members of the public wanted to register their objections before proceeding.

The applicants did not object to proceeding without a quorum. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated for the record that he objected to proceeding without a quorum. He noted the importance of this project and asserted that it should be reviewed by the Committee, not a subsection of it. He insisted that any advice deriving from the two Committee members not be labeled a recommendation. Mr. Farnham stated that, as is common practice in instances like this, any opinions expressed by the members of the Committee will be noted in the minutes as individual comments and not that as a recommendation of the Committee.

Cletus Lyman, an attorney and a resident of the 1600-block of Latimer Street, raised a point of order and stated that the review must not proceed because the demolition notices had not been appropriately affixed to the three buildings. He reported that all three buildings were posted on Locust Street, but only one was posted on Latimer Street, and that poster was 25 feet from the street behind a locked fence. Mr. Farnham responded that all three buildings were posted at the front and rear. He noted that one of the posters had been removed, but the Commission's staff had replaced it promptly. More importantly, he explained that the historic preservation ordinance only requires posting for applications for demolition permits. This is an in-concept application, not a permit application. The posters were hung as a courtesy to the neighbors, not because of any legal requirement. Mr. Farnham suggested that the review proceed with the objections noted in the minutes.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Committee. Architect Seth Cohen and Curtis Institute administrators Elizabeth Warshawer and Roberto Diaz represented the application.

Mr. Farnham suggested that the Committee members concentrate their review on three architectural issues:

1. Is the demolition of all but the front facades of the rowhouses a demolition as defined in the ordinance?
2. Can the program be accommodated on the site without demolishing the two historic buildings?
3. Is the proposed building compatible with the historic district?

Ms. Warshawer presented background material on the Curtis Institute. She stated that only 5% of applicants are accepted; the school is highly selective and the students perform at the highest level. All students receive full merit-based scholarships. She stated the Institute currently has enrolled students from 38 states and 18 countries. Each student spends four to five years studying at the Institute. The average age of the students is late teens to early twenties, but some are as young as 12. The younger students must be accompanied by a parent or guardian during their stays. When the students leave Philadelphia, they become ambassadors for the city. The school offers 130 free recitals annually to the public. The school also has a strong community outreach program.

Ms. Warshawer reported that the Curtis lacks the physical space to meet its programmatic requirements. Its competitors, Juillard, New England Conservatory, Eastman, and Colburn, have all expanded recently and now offer superior facilities to their students. To compete for the best students, the Curtis must augment its facilities. Its yield rate of acceptances to enrollment has recently slipped from 100%, where it has always been, to 85%. It lacks rehearsal space for a full orchestra, adequate teaching and practice studios, instrument storage facilities, student housing, and food service facilities. The Curtis hopes to be able to house half of its students in the near future. At the present, all students live in rented apartments. As real estate values have increased around Rittenhouse Square, the students have been housed farther and farther from

the school. Many of the students are very young and should live together to develop social networks. Also, the students have very poor diets because the school has no dining facilities. The new building would satisfy all of these needs.

Ms. Warshawer reported that several other sites had been considered, such as the Parking Authority site on the 1900-block of Walnut Street. That site was cost prohibitive. The Curtis also considered the Medical Tower Building on 17th between Locust and Spruce, the Art Alliance Building, the ballroom in the Barclay, and the vacant lot at 17th and Pine. The Curtis decided that the Locust Club site best meets its needs. It is close to the Institute's buildings at 18th and Locust and between those buildings and the Academy of Music and the Kimmel Center. She concluded that the Curtis does not want to leave its current buildings, but must create a physical environment that is equal to the training it offers.

Mr. Diaz stated that the Curtis currently has four dedicated practice rooms for 160 students. Therefore, the school must use every other available room as a practice room regardless of its acoustics or other properties. He noted that the school should have 60 practice rooms to accommodate its 160 students and 92 faculty members. He also noted that the only room in which the orchestra can rehearse is 1000 square feet; it should be 4000 square feet. He concluded that the school needs new and more flexible spaces.

Mr. Cohen, the architect, summarized the proposal. He displayed a map that showed the proximity of the site to the Institute's buildings at 18th and Locust to the west and the Academy of Music and the Kimmel Center to the east. He noted the many towers in the immediate vicinity. He discussed the plans for the first and second floors. Ms. Voith asked if he had considered rotating the large orchestra rehearsal room to avoid situating it in the footprint of 1610 Locust, one of the historic rowhouses. Mr. Cohen stated that he had considered that option, but had determined that it was not feasible owing to the set locations of the dormitory core and loading dock. He then summarized the plans for the upper floors. He also noted the complexities of designing sound-proof music rooms with good acoustics. They require box-in-box construction. He discussed the residential tower and noted that it was as short as possible and set as far back on the building as possible. He provided accurate photomontages which demonstrated that the tower will be minimally visible from Locust Street. He explained that the front façade would be clad with brownstone, sandstone and Kasota stone. He noted that the façade is proportioned to maintain the rhythm and scale of the block. He contended that the tower will blend with the sky. He noted that the first two stories on Latimer would be brick to blend with the block. The upper stories would be recessive.

Mr. Cohen stated that he had not proposed the demolition of the rears of the historic rowhouses without first considering all options. He stated that the floor heights of the old buildings were not compatible with one another or any new construction. He contended that acoustics was driving the floor to ceiling heights. He noted that he had reduced both the program and the height after meeting with the neighbors. He explained that rotating the large rehearsal hall and moving it away from 1610 would result in a 2000 sf room; 4000 sf is ideal for an orchestra, but they are currently only proposing 3500 sf owing to restrictions. He noted the restrictions of the dorm core with fire stairs and elevators. He also noted that they need to employ a 10" concrete slab for the floor plates for acoustical reasons.

Mr. Cohen stated that 1610 Locust Street was designed by the Wilson Brothers and built in 1894. The front façade has been altered in minor ways and a rear addition was constructed in 1939. The original architectural drawings are available at the Athenaeum and would be used to fully restore the front façade. The rear has been modified and is in poor condition. He proposed

to salvage and reuse interior elements such as mantels. He stated that 1618 Locust Street was built, perhaps by John Notman, in 1855. The front façade was altered by Wilson Eyre in 1888. A modern fire stair was erected in the rear and the interior was gutted for squash courts. The front façade would be fully restored.

Ms. Voith asked about the relations of the historic openings and the new construction behind them. Mr. Cohen explained that the first and second floors would work well and have activity behind the windows. The upper windows at 1610 would open into the rehearsal hall.

Mr. Thomas thanked the applicants for their detailed application. He noted that his comments would be his personal observations and not those of the full Committee. He explained that the Commission would discuss the public interest question; it exceeds the authority and expertise of the Committee. The Committee members would concentrate on the architectural questions. Mr. Thomas stated that he considered the removal of all but the front facades of the rowhouses to be a demolition under the ordinance. He noted that the submission materials for the new building were excellent, but he contended that the search for alternate sites and the attempts to design a building for this site that would not require the demolition must be thoroughly documented for review by the Committee and Commission. He stated that the background material documenting the decisions that led to this site and this design must be presented in a formal manner.

Ms. Voith stated that the private institution must prove that the construction of this building would be in the public interest. She stated that the applicants had not yet offered the proof. She also asserted that the architectural reasoning presented thus far for the current design is not cogent. She noted, for example, that the diagram showing the impact of rotating the large rehearsal is not compelling. She advised that the applicants must demonstrate that their new building cannot be located on the footprint of the Locust Club, but requires the footprints of the historic buildings as well. Mr. Thomas agreed and stated that the application should be considered incomplete without two reports, one documenting the site selection process and another documenting the design process for this site.

Mr. Gallery strongly objected to the deliberations, claiming that the Committee members had reached their conclusions without hearing any public testimony. Mr. Thomas disagreed, stating that the Committee members were reviewing the project as they review all projects. First, they discuss the project with the applicants and between themselves and then they open the discussion to the audience. Mr. Thomas contended that the Committee members had not yet reached any conclusions. Mr. Gallery asserted that it was extremely inappropriate for the staff to recommend approval without a presentation of the public interest case. Mr. Farnham responded that the staff had not recommended approval. It had recommended that the demolitions must be considered demolitions as defined by the ordinance; that the proposed building is compatible with the district; and that, if the Commission found that the demolitions were necessary in the public interest, then a series of conditions should be imposed on the project as part of the approval. The staff's recommendation was conditioned upon the presentation and endorsement of the public interest case. Mr. Gallery stated that the 1610 Locust is a "true three-dimensional object." He acknowledged that the Commission does not have jurisdiction over interiors, but then distributed a series of photographs of the interior of 1610 and contended that the Committee members should factor the interior into the demolition equation. He noted that the interior of 1618 is gutted. He suggested flipping the plan for the new building to preserve the interior of 1610. He conceded that the architectural presentation for the new building was excellent and remarked on the quality of design. Turning to the public interest argument, Mr. Gallery disagreed with the staff overview and asserted that the Institute's mission has no

bearing on whether it provides a significant public benefit. He also asserted that the Curtis Institute is not the applicant; the Lenfest Group is the applicant and has employed the architect and attorney. He contended that the remaining facades would be nothing more than “stage sets.” He concluded that the Curtis Institute is important to the city and are in need of expanded facilities, but have not met the requirements of the ordinance.

Mr. Lyman stated that he owns 1612 Latimer Street. He maintains a law office on the first floor; he lives on the second floor; his sister lives on the third floor. He opined that the Institute’s current system of housing students in private apartments throughout the city is “a wonderful tradition.” He stated that building a dormitory was not “modern thinking,” but was an outdated scheme. He noted several vacant lots and buildings in the proximity of the site that could be developed. He suggested that the school partner with private developers to meet their needs. He suggested that the rehearsal hall could be accommodated on the Locust Club site without disturbing the historic buildings. He noted that 1610 had been “lovingly restored.” He stated that the proposed building would be “gigantic” on Locust and a “Godzilla” on Latimer. He suggested that the Curtis limit the development to rehearsal and practice spaces and limit the demolition to the non-contributing building.

Kathy Dowdell of the AIA’s Preservation Committee stated that she was not convinced by the architect’s claims that the historic buildings could not be saved. She stated that the architect must demonstrate that his plan is the only feasible plan.

RECOMMENDATION OF TWO MEMBERS OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE: Ms. Voith and Mr. Thomas recommended that the Commission:

1. consider the demolitions of all but the facades of 1610 and 1618 Locust Street as demolitions as defined in §14-2207(2)(f) of the Philadelphia Code;
2. deny the application as submitted, owing to incompleteness; and
3. require a report substantiating the public interest claim that documents but is not limited to:
 - a. the selection of this site and any consideration of other sites;
 - b. the Curtis Institute’s need for new facilities and the establishment of this architectural program;
 - c. the architectural alternatives considered during the design of the proposed building, especially those that would allow for the preservation of some or all of the historic buildings; and
 - d. the proposed preservation of the facades at 1610 and 1618 Locust Street.

48-50 S. FRONT STREET, 103 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: Centra Associates, Cheswall LP, Robert and Harvey Spears

Applicant: Richard C. DeMarco Esq.

History: vacant lot, historic buildings demolished in 2007 under court order

Project: Convert vacant lot to parking lot

OVERVIEW: This proposal proposes paving a vacant lot where, until recently, three historic buildings stood. It also proposes installing a landscaped perimeter and signage to advertise the parking. No drawings have been submitted to illustrate the sign or the planter.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. An open parking lot is not compatible with the massing, scale, rhythms, or materials of the historic district.

DISCUSSION: Mr. McCoubrey joined the Committee. Ms. Pentz recused owing to her firm's involvement with these properties during the review of the demolition applications. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Attorney Richard DeMarco, architect Eric Leighton, and property owner Robert Spears represented the application.

Mr. DeMarco summarized the earlier proposal for a mixed-use structure on this site. The current application proposes an interim use for the site. His client plans to redevelop the site. He does not intend for the parking lot to be permanent. He explained that the Court of Common Pleas allowed the demolitions of the historic buildings that stood on the site until recently. He noted that his clients agreed to continuation of the Commission's jurisdiction over these properties even though the historic buildings have been demolished. He claimed that the Zoning Board would not grant a permanent variance for parking on this site. He contended that the Zoning Board, not the Commission, has jurisdiction over land use. The Commission has jurisdiction over the appearance of the landscaping, but cannot prevent this lot for being used for parking. He suggested that the staff make recommendations regarding the landscaping around the parking lot. He again stated that his client does not intend to use the site for parking forever. He again stated that his client intends to redevelop the site. He explained that his client would "make way more money" if he redeveloped the site.

Ms. Voith stated that the site plan was not sufficient to review the proposal. Mr. DeMarco noted that the staff had requested additional information on the design, but he reported that he was unable to provide the landscaping details for today's meeting. He did provide additional photographs and an elevation drawing.

Mr. Thomas advised the applicants that the Committee bases its review on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He stated that the Committee would only comment on the architectural and preservation appropriateness of the plan. He noted however that the Committee could comment on the massing, scale, rhythms, and materials of the parking lot. He stated that he agreed with the staff's recommendation of denial based on the Standards. He noted that the applicants' claim that they would like to make some money from the vacant lot is a hardship argument. He suggested that the applicant make his hardship argument to the full Commission. He also suggested that he present his request for an interim approval to the Commission.

Ms. Voith stated that the Committee should comment on the architectural aspects of the proposal. She explained that the Committee should comment on the architectural impact of an open parking lot with no real effort to mitigate its impact on the district. Ms. Voith stated that this treatment of the site should never be approved. Mr. DeMarco asked if more details would change her mind. He also contended that she was opposed to the use, not the architectural implementation to accommodate that use. Ms. Voith disagreed. She stated that she opposed the proposed architectural plan. She stated that the treatment of the corner was not appropriate architecturally. She said that a chain link fence is not an appropriate architectural solution. Mr. Spears stated that he is retaining a landscape architect, who would make the site look better. Ms. Voith replied that she could not review a plan that had not been presented. If Mr. Spears has developed a landscape architecture plan for the site, he should present it for review, not simply allude to the fact that he has commissioned it. Mr. DeMarco again contended that the Committee was not reacting to an architectural plan, but was reacting to the proposed use. Ms. Voith and Mr. Thomas disagreed, stating that there may be appropriate treatments for parking on the corner. They again noted that they did not have sufficient information to evaluate the proposal, but what they could glean from the incomplete plan appeared inappropriate from an architectural standpoint. Ms. Voith added that plans for lighting, signage, and walls should be

presented and may make the proposal acceptable. Mr. Baron stated that the plans are incomplete. He also noted that the Commission does not typically approve plastic box signs.

Joseph Schiavo of the Old City Civic Association suggested that the landscaping may be required for the entire parking lot, not only the new section currently proposed.

Mr. Baron asked about the location and condition of the piece salvaged from the demolished buildings. Mr. Spears stated that the salvaged material is stored at the demolition contractor's yard. Mr. Baron asked for the information in writing. Mr. Spears agreed to put it in a letter.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

503 S. 41ST STREET

Owner/Applicant: Ala Rabady

History: c. 1845; individually designated

Project: Legalize through-wall air conditioners

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for the legalization of eleven through-wall air conditioners. The sleeves for the units cut through the brownstone south façade. The application lacks a façade drawing or a photograph of the units that have been installed in the façade. The units would be more appropriately placed on the roof in an inconspicuous location.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Owner Ala Robady represented the application.

New photographs of the mechanical units were distributed to the Committee members. Mr. Rabady stated that the air conditioners were not visible from the public right of way. Ms. Pentz disagreed after viewing photographs of the facade from the sidewalk. Mr. Rabady asserted that the alleyway is not a public right-of-way. He claimed that the public would not see the units unless someone specifically looked for them. Mr. Baron noted that the application did not include any documentation specifying the locations of the units. The application did not include an elevation drawing or complete photographic documentation of the façade in question. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the drainage of the units. Mr. Rabady stated that the plan was executed by an engineer. Mr. Baron expressed concern about exposing what may be a mud mortar and rubble stone wall to water with this type of installation. Mr. Rabady stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections did not object to the units from mechanical or water drainage points of view. Ms. Pentz remarked that, without elevation drawings, it would not be appropriate to recommend approval of this proposal. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the visibility was also a factor.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

119-121 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: Winig Partnership L.L.C

Applicant: Renee Gross, Albert Taus and Associates

History: c 1835, contributing to Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District

OVERVIEW: This application calls for the installation of two awning-like signs over the doors of the storefronts at 119 and 121 S. 18th Street. The awning over 119 S. 18th Street extends above the storefront.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided size of the awning over 119 S. 18th is reduced to fit within the non-historic storefront, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Tom Holden, the awning designer, represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the applicant originally proposed an awning to stretch across the two buildings, but was advised to divide the awning to maintain the individuality of the each building. He was also advised to keep the awning within the stucco band of the non-historic storefront. The proposed awning does not project as far over the sidewalk as does the existing awning. Mr. Holden stated that his client wanted to indicate that the store spanned the two buildings; however, he had divided the awning into two as the staff had suggested. Mr. Baron noted the difference in the drawings as presented and asked about the storefront window divisions in the new elevations. Mr. Holden explained the display inside the store would be visible through the windows and it was this that is seen on the drawings. Ms. Voith asked the applicant how the awnings would attach to the buildings. Mr. Holden explained that the aluminum structures would be bolted to the buildings. Ms. Voith doubted that this was feasible. Committee members thought that the appropriate awning would be a traditional shed type awning with open sides and bottom to allow views of the transom and decorative transom bar on the restored storefront now visible at 121 S. 18th Street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend the approval of the proposed awning for 119 S 18th Street, slightly reduced in scale to fit within the stucco band, but denial of the proposed awning for 121 S. 18th Street. They recommended the approval of a traditional shed type awning for 121 S. 18th Street, with the staff to review details.

320 S. 19TH STREET

Owner: Salem Schuchman and Barbara Klock

Applicant: Christina Carter, Milner & Associates

History: 1895, Furness Evans, architects;

individually designated and significant to Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District

Project: Cut brick and terra cotta wall to make parking area and garage type gate.

OVERVIEW: This building constructed as a house has long been used for law offices. The applicants are considering the purchase of the building to use as a single-family residence but wish to have parking. The historic carriage house and most of the yard have been previously sold off to another private home owner. The proposal calls for cutting a parking area into an existing brick and terra-cotta fence wall and installing a mechanical painted-metal roll-up door. Other work includes removal of fire-escape and work to a stair well hidden behind the fence.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the removal of the fire escape; denial of the parking area and new gate, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Architects John Milnor and Christine Carter and attorney Tom Chapman represented the application.

Mr. Chapman explained that his client, who has not yet purchased the property, plans to restore the building, which was converted to offices, back to a private residence. Adding parking to the property is challenging. The purchase of the property is contingent on an adequate resolution of the parking issue. Mr. Milnor described the project and commented that the adjacent property has an existing curb cut. Approving this curb cut would not set a precedent. Mr. Chapman stated that the Preservation Alliance has an easement on this property, but it allows for adding a garage door. Owing to the tight space, swinging doors would not be feasible and would not be approved by the Streets Department. With the roll-up doors, an additional structure such as a garage or pergola to hold the door when open would be unnecessary. Mr. Chapman noted that the Alliance had expressed concern about a roll-up door and asked them to explore other options. He stated they considered a sectional door like others on Delancey Street. He stated that John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance was enthusiastic about this design. Mr. Thomas approved of this type of door, with the staff to review details. Ms. Voith opposed all parking at this location, noting that it is would detriment to the pedestrian experience.

Rosa Esquenazi, the owner of the adjacent property to the west on Delancey, stated that she has concerns about the proposal. She stated that the garage door should not be treated as an isolated element, but should instead be treated as part of the whole and relate to the architectural style of the house.

Mr. Baron asked if the garage door would be stained or painted. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that it should be painted, not stained, to reduce its visual impact.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised proposal with the painted wood, sectional garage door, with the staff to review details.

1832 GREEN STREET

Owner: 1832 Green Street, LP

Applicant: Wayne Egolf

History: c. 1875; contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Install lighting fixtures and illuminate façade.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize façade alterations including paint removal, powerwashing, pointing, and the painting of lintels, sills, watertable, and door surround.

This application also proposes the demolition of a later first-story addition on the rear ell and construction of additions on the first and third stories. The first-story addition would have modern French doors with transoms and a deck. The first-story rear is minimally visible from public rights-of-way. A deck would be added to the rear of the second-story bay. The third-story bay addition would be flush with the existing second-story bay with one-over-one windows. The entire rear elevation would be stuccoed.

An addition is also proposed in the side yard of the rear ell at the second and third-story levels. This addition would have no windows and would be stuccoed.

This application proposes all new windows and doors; however, shop drawings have not been submitted for review.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of windows and doors, owing to incompleteness; denial of the masonry painting at the front façade and the stuccoing of the rear facade, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9; approval of all other aspects of the proposal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect William Alesker represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that masonry work had begun on the project without a permit and the Department of Licenses & Inspections had issued a stop-work order. He asked Mr. Alesker if he could provide the mix of the mortar used for the pointing. Mr. Alesker explained the owner intends to remove the paint from the sills and steps. He would provide the requisite information on the mix to the staff at a later time. The Committee members agreed that the inappropriate pointing should be removed. They also agreed that the paint should be removed from marble.

The visibility of the back was debated and established through photographs. The Committee members did not object to the demolition at the first floor or the construction of the additions or decks, but suggested that the rear additions and existing bay should be clad in wood, not stucco.

Mr. Baron stated that the windows could be reviewed at staff level. He suggested that the applicant withdraw that part of the application, which is incomplete, and provide the requisite details at a later time.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of windows and doors, owing to incompleteness; denial of the masonry painting at the front façade and the stuccoing of the rear facade, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9; approval of the proposed demolition and construction of side and rear additions, provided the rear additions are clad in wood, the historic rear bay is restored, and the paint is removed and the masonry at the front façade is restored, with the staff to review details.

217 CHURCH STREET, UNIT 4

Owner: Adam Schran

Applicant: Charles Loomis

History: 1835

individually designated 10/30/1974, contributing to Old City Historic District; 12/12/2003
Project: Expand roof deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the expansion of an existing wood roof deck about six feet closer to roof edge on the main block of a four-story building. The existing deck has two levels, an upper level toward the rear and a lower level toward the front façade. The deck would be rebuilt at one level, about two inches above the current height of the lower or front section. A painted metal guardrail, planters, and a spa are also proposed.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. No one represented the application.

The Committee members discussed the proposal and agreed that that the deck would be more visible if raised and enlarged.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

100 S. BROAD STREET

Owner: LTB Limited Partnership

Applicant: Nancy Goldenberg

History: north building: 1897, D.H. Burnham & Co.; designated 8/2/1973

 south building: 1902, D.H. Burnham & Co. and Horace Trumbauer; designated 8/2/1973

Project: Install lighting fixtures and illuminate facade

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of LED light fixtures at various levels on the façade of this building. The lights will be mounted into horizontal moldings and ledges with plastic and stainless steel anchors. The introductions of many mounting holes in the masonry and terra cotta will eventually lead to the failures of the materials.

The lighting of the Land Title Building is part of the Center City District's Avenue of the Arts Façade Lighting project, which will light several buildings along South Broad Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Nancy Goldenberg and Mark Alexander of the Center City District, architect Lonnie Hovey, and lighting designer Julie Panassow represented the application.

Mr. Farnham explained that the staff had recommended denial because of the proposed attachment method for the light fixtures. He stated that introducing many new holes into the horizontal surfaces of the masonry and terra cotta cladding would place these facades at risk. He explained that water would eventually find its way into these holes and, during freeze/thaw cycles, spall the surfaces, destroying the masonry and posing potential safety hazards for pedestrians walking below. Mr. Farnham stated that the staff did not object to the lighting itself proposed in this application. He reported that the Commission had already reviewed the overall lighting proposal and approved lighting for three buildings of the group.

Nancy Goldenberg stated that she would not review the entire project. She asked Mr. Hovey to address the attachment concerns. He distributed revised drawings with additional reference details. He pointed out the locations for the mounting of fixtures. He explained that the lights would be mounted in masonry ledges or window sills in all but two locations. In the other two, they would be mounted to terra cotta sills. He explained how the fixtures would be mounted. The fixtures have an integral mount. The fixtures will be mounted to the terra cotta with adhesive, not screws.

Ms. Voith asked why the Center City District was proposing lighting for the building. Ms. Goldenberg provided a very brief overview of the project. Mr. Farnham explained to Ms. Voith that the Committee and Commission had reviewed the overall project last month.

Ms. Pentz asserted that the installation of the fixtures would result in "destruction." Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. Mr. Hovey stated that the fixtures on the terra cotta would not cause damage. The conduit would be run through the wood window frames, not terra cotta or masonry. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that each fixture would require several holes in the stone and the proposal calls for many fixtures. He contended that the stone would be severely damaged with the installation. He stated that "it would not survive." Ms. Panassow offered to reduce the number of fixtures. Mr. Baron noted that lights mounted on a horizontal granite surface on a building on Chestnut Street recently caused the granite to crack and fall off. He stated that the falling granite nearly hit someone. He stated that such an installation may put the building and the public at risk. He added that it is impossible to guarantee the maintenance over years. Mr. Hovey stated that they are not mounting at cornices, but at sheltered ledges below cornices. Ms. Voith noted that those ledges are also subject to the weather. Ms. Voith observed that the fixture may become obsolete quickly, leaving many unneeded holes in the building. Mr. McCoubrey commented that several of the proposed attachments would take place on very narrow masonry ledges.

Ms. Voith asked if the light colors would be varied. Mr. Hovey replied that the light fixtures can produce any color light, but that they are currently proposing to light the building with white light. Ms. Goldenberg stated that the Center City District would control the programming of the light. Ms. Voith asked the staff if the Commission had approved the overall lighting scheme. Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission had not been asked to review the overall scheme, but to review proposals for three of the 14 buildings to be lighted. He noted that some, but not all, of the properties within the project are designated as historic. Ms. Panassow stated that the lighting would be designed as a unified scheme; individual property owners would not be allowed to have "crazy lights and flashing lights." Ms. Goldenberg stated that Center City District is developing a programmatic policy. She stated that lighting schemes would be developed for special events, but the lights would be white "most of the year." Mr. Baron stated that the Commission, not the Center City District, should control the lighting schemes. Ms. Voith contended that the lighting would debase the historic fabric; she stated that the historic fabric should be treated with dignity and respect. Ms. Pentz reminded the Committee that, regardless of the color, this proposal, if implemented, would certainly damage the building. Ms. Voith stated that the buildings are very important historically; they were designed by "a giant of American architecture." She contended that protecting the buildings "far outweighs any aesthetic improvement we may gain in the short term." The other Committee members agreed. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the applicants could offer a full presentation on the project. Ms. Goldenberg stated that she could provide a full presentation. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that an expert in masonry preservation should evaluate this proposal before it is reconsidered.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

108 PINE STREET

Owner: Murat Aslansan

Applicant: Rustin Ohler

History: c. 1766, restored c. 1968,

individually designated 2/27/1967, Significant in Society Hill Historic District 3/10/1999

Project: Legalize rear addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a second-story rear addition. The addition extends the second story to be flush with the rear wall of the existing first story. The addition and first story were stuccoed to match the existing stucco on the third story. A cornice is proposed for the new addition. The existing nine-over-twelve windows were removed from the rear of the main block and installed in the rear second-story addition. No information about alterations to the rear wall of the main block at the second floor, which is now encapsulated, has been provided.

Photographs from 1914 and 1957 show this building as part of a row. Circa 1930, a storefront was installed in the first-story facade. Between 1957 and 1967, during the Redevelopment Period, the adjoining structure at 106 Pine Street was demolished by the Redevelopment Authority exposing the east wall of 108 Pine Street. In 1967, 108 Pine Street was restored and rehabilitated. This building has maintained the same design and configuration through the time of the Society Hill Historic District designation in 1999.

The current owner was aware of the Historical Commission's jurisdiction. He obtained the Commission's approval for a permit in June 2007 for interior work only. In August 2007, the staff observed a second-story addition under construction and notified The Department of Licenses & Inspections, which issued violations on 14 August 2007.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The illegal addition should be removed and the rear wall restored.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Architect Brett Harman and property owner Murat Aslansan represented the application.

Mr. Aslansan apologized for the illegal work. He expressed his support for historic preservation and noted that he had donated a facade easement on this property. He also reported that he is currently rehabilitating four buildings in Old City and will donate the easements on them. He stated that he would not have altered the rear of the building if it had been historic fabric. He stated that the rear of the building is stucco on CMU. He explained that he needed to build the addition immediately because family members were moving into the house. He was not able to wait to get the Commission's approval or building permits. The staff noted that he is familiar with the Commission's process because the Commission reviewed his Old City rehabilitation project.

Ms. Pentz asked Mr. Aslanson to explain the conditions at the rear. He stated that the one-story rear addition was constructed in 1967. He added a second story onto the addition. He moved the wood windows from the rear of the main block to the rear of the new addition. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the Committee should never recommend legalization.

Stephen Wexler of the Society Hill Civic Association remarked that the Association routinely objects to illegal modifications, but this project was acceptable. He noted that the rear is important because it faces the New Market site, which will be redeveloped and include a new public walkway along the rear of this property. He stated that Mr. Aslanson has met with the

Association. He observed that the material lost during the illegal work was not historic. He did object to the employment of a historic cornice on this non-historic addition.

Mr. Harman stated that he would be willing to redesign the cornice. Ms. Pentz inquired about the material of the second-story rear wall that was removed. Mr. Farnham noted that the Commission reviewed and approved the 1960s rehabilitation and holds the architectural drawings from that project. Those drawings do specify the reconstruction of the rear wall in CMU with stucco.

Mr. McCoubrey acknowledged that the building had been altered many times. He suggested that the history and materials of the building should be documented. Ms. Pentz agreed with Mr. McCoubrey and asked for a study of the history of the house. She stated that she is not comfortable recommending the legalization without it. Mr. D'Alessandro concurred.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

219-229 SOUTH 18TH STREET

Owner: Rittenhouse Regency Affiliates

Applicant: Richard Stokes

History: 1929, Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects;
contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Alter storefronts

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter two facades on 18th and Locust Streets. The Committee reviewed a similar proposal to add a French bistro to this building last month. The applicant has made the following revisions to the proposal. The continuous retractable awning has been broken up into three sections on Locust Street, with gaps between the window openings, and three sections on 18th Street, with similar gaps. At the Locust Street side, the slate and wood panels have been removed. On the 18th Street façade, wood panels have been removed from above the doors at two openings, and from the two brick piers between the doors. However, two back-painted signs would be attached on either side of the larger pier. The application still proposes to install new folding painted wood doors with rounded glazing for all the existing openings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Restaurant owner Stephen Starr, attorney Carl Primavera, and architect Richard Stokes represented the application.

Mr. Primavera introduced the project to develop a French-bistro-themed restaurant on Rittenhouse Square.

Mr. Starr explained that his restaurant was developed to fit the theme of the condominium building, which is being marketed as the Parc Rittenhouse. He stated that the exterior of the restaurant is essential to the concept; the exterior must mirror the interior, which will look exactly like an authentic French bistro. He contended that all of the alterations to the exterior, such as the folding doors, signs, and awnings, would be completely reversible.

Mr. Stokes stated that he had complied with the recommendations offered by the Architectural Committee last month. He had divided the very large awnings into groups of smaller awnings over the storefront bays. He had removed the applied woodwork, allowing the masonry to reveal itself. The signs will now leave four inches of masonry exposed around the edges. Mr. Stokes stated they are not removing any historic fabric, but are instead restoring the corner back to its original condition. The corner was significantly altered when the Sheraton Hotel moved into the building in the 1970s. The columns would be clad with salvaged brick and a new granite base to replicate the historic corner exactly. Also, salvaged brick will be used to restore altered storefront openings. The new canopies will replace existing canopies. The signs will be mounted on clips and will be easily removable. The signs will be attached to the brick in the mortar joints. On Locust Street, they will remove inappropriate awnings and replace them with more appropriate ones. He stated that he intends to create a richer pedestrian environment with more lighting and more life.

Mr. Primavera stated these revisions to the plans derive from the Committee's comments at the last meeting. He stated that all of the alterations will be reversible and removable.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the awnings should relate more directly to the storefront openings. He noted that they extend out beyond the openings in arbitrary ways. Mr. Stokes explained that they are intended to shelter diners. Mr. McCoubrey questioned the two different colors of wood, dark and light, within each storefront opening. Mr. Starr agreed and asked his architect to make the storefront monochromatic. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the signage should be reduced at the corner to allow more of the masonry to be seen. He also suggested removing the awning at the main entrance at Locust Street. It hides too much of the stone surround.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance praised Mr. Starr's contributions to Philadelphia. He listed several of Mr. Starr's restaurants including Jones, Buddakan, Washington Square, and the Continental and extolled each one of them. Mr. Gallery suggested that this restaurant could be more like Buddakan, with a rather plain exterior and a wonderful interior. He suggested simplifying the exterior design. Mr. Starr replied that Buddakan is a different type of restaurant concept. He stated that that concept would not work in this instance. He explained that the French bistro stage set must begin at the exterior and continue on the interior. It must be seamless. Mr. Gallery asked that the scallops on the awnings be deleted.

Messrs. McCoubrey and D'Alessandro suggested simplifying the storefront designs. They proposed that the decorative scroll shape of the folding doors be replaced with a simple square shape to echo the very rectilinear building. Seeking a compromise, Mr. Primavera agreed that the scallops could be removed from the awnings, the storefronts could be limited to one darker color, not one dark and one light, and the window openings in the folding storefront doors could be squared off. The Committee members suggested that the awnings be further reduced in size and the signage be reduced at the corner to allow more masonry to be seen.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the storefronts are one darker color, not two-tone; the window openings in the folding storefront doors are squared off; the awnings are reduced in size; and the signage is reduced at the corner, with the staff to review details.

231-235 N. 2ND STREET

Owner: Zeev Shenkman

Applicant: Adam Laver

History: constructed c. 2004, approved by the Commission in September 2002

233-235: individually designated

Project: Construct one-story rooftop addition, alter side façades and storefronts

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a one-story addition, clad in vertical standing seam zinc and recessed from the front façade, on the roof of this parking garage. Also proposed is the enclosure of floors five through seven with an infill of translucent panels and a “green screen” for the lowers floors on the side elevations. At the first floor, the wood panels and pilasters would be removed and replaced with metal and glass storefront with zinc panels and structural columns faced in stone veneer.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the storefront pilasters are retained and incorporated into the new storefront design.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Attorney Adam Laver and architect David Amburn represented the application.

Mr. Laver displayed photographs of the building and stated that it is not historic. Mr. Amburn answered a question that had been posed by the staff before the meeting. He stated that the addition would be clad in natural zinc, not the blue aluminum used at the elevator tower. The openings in the side would be infilled with a translucent material; the community had asked that interior light be visible from the exterior. Mr. Amburn noted that they had obtained permission from the DRPA to plant fifteen trees on the south side of the building. He explained that they are seeking to make the lobby more visible from the street; they would like to open up the awkward storefronts. Mr. Amburn displayed a revised design for the storefront that retained the non-historic pilasters. Mr. Baron stated that he thought that the pilasters should be retained, as is shown in the revised storefront plan. He asserted that they are substantial and appear appropriate for the large façade above. Mr. Amburn noted that they do not align with the structural members above, but agreed to retain them in the Commission required it.

Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the pilasters should be retained. He contended that adding a glassy, open storefront to this building, which is already an ungainly hybrid, would make it even more awkward.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised design, which retains the storefront pilasters.

1838 GREEN STREET

Owner: Elinore Cataleno

Applicant: Kevin Clark

History: c. 1859; contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Install vinyl windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace three aluminum sash windows at the rear mansard dormer windows with single-light fixed vinyl windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Kevin Clark of Casey Contracting represented the application.

Mr. Clark stated that the building originally had two rear dormers with one-over-one double-hung sash in them. In the 1960s or 1970s, the dormers were altered and a large center window was added. He would like to complete the earlier work and add large single-pane windows to take advantage of the view.

Ms. Pentz noted that the alterations had occurred before designation. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the combination of rear windows was extremely varied specifically. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Committee must base its recommendation on the Standards. He stated that the windows in the dormers should replicate the original, wood, double-hung sash. He suggested a wood, double-hung, one-over-one window for the non-historic center opening.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

2500 S. 17TH STREET

Owner: Bill Bechtel

Applicant: Bill Bechtel

History: 1908; contributing to Girard Estate Historic District, 11/10/1999

Project: Install windows, construct second-story rear addition, replace concrete stairs

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a second-story addition at the rear of the property. This property is located on the corner of S. 17th and Porter Streets and the addition would be highly visible. The addition would be set back from the side elevation of the main block and cantilever over the rear garden, supported by columns that would stand on the rear garden wall. This proposal offers two options for the treatment of the rear wall of the main block. Option one proposes to place the addition one foot way from the rear wall of the main block. Option two proposes a six-inch reveal and infilling the second floor rear windows. The addition would be parged in stucco and topped with a simple brick corbelled cornice. This application also proposes to replace the concrete steps at the side entrance with an open concrete stair to allow light in the basement window. The installation of windows is proposed but no details are provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the addition is not cantilevered, but instead is located above the existing first floor, with the staff to review details, especially window details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Property owner William Bechtel represented the application.

Mr. Bechtel explained that the property is zoned for two residences. He intends to move to a portion of the building and rent the remainder. The second-floor rear addition would accommodate his family. Mr. Bechtel stated that the cantilevering would allow one extra foot of space at the rear of the addition. He stated that the corbelling would not duplicate the historic corbelling but would complement the character of the building. Mr. McCoubrey suggested articulating the cantilever to appear more like a bay.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of a cantilevered addition, provided the cantilevered section looks like a bay clad with clapboards, with the staff to review details.

2420 GREYS FERRY AVENUE, NAVAL ASYLUM

Owner: Toll Naval Associates

Applicant: Chris Pienkowski

History: 1830s, William Strickland, architect

Project: New design for four-story townhouses

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

The current proposal pertains to blocks 3, 5, 6 and 8, which are located towards the rear of the campus. The revised design is very similar to that approved by the Commission in 2004. The size of the building's footprint has been reduced slightly. Also, the rhythm and detailing of the front façade has changed slightly; the most noticeable change is the reduction of applied ornamentation to the facades, creating a simpler aesthetic. However, the new design is no more or less compatible with the historic site and nearby historic buildings than the earlier design approved by the Commission.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Chris Pienkowski of Toll Brothers and attorney Brett Feldman represented the application.

Mr. Feldman explained that the project is changing slightly owing to the changing real estate market. The buildings will now house stacked townhouses. The footprint and ornamentation will change slightly, but the overall massing, arrangement, style, and materials of the buildings will remain the same.

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

5335 KNOX STREET

Owner / Applicant: Tom Hemmerick

History: c. 1890, attributed to George Pearson, architect; designated 3/29/1966

Project: Add screen porches, decks, and parking area at rear

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct rear screened porches and decks as well as parking. The proposed work would be at the rear of the property but visible from Penn Street. The screened porches would be attached to non-historic additions to the building. The proposed decks would be on top of these non-historic additions. However, access to the decks would require cutting down two historic windows at the second-floor rear. The owner proposes two

detail schemes for the railings. One scheme proposes extending an original pent roof that delineates the ground and second floors to the two non-historic additions. This pent roof would block visibility of the railing. The other scheme proposes extending the pent roof only to the rear addition closest to Penn Street and installing a wood picket railing on the second deck. The proposed doors to both decks would be French doors with a lite configuration reminiscent of the existing Queen Anne window. Finally the applicant proposes to construct a five-car parking area at the rear of the property. The property is encircled by a historic iron fence, which has a historic gate with granite posts. The parking area would use this gate as an access point along the fence and would not require any cuts into it.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of parking area and screened porches; denial of decks as submitted, pursuant to Standard 3; approval of decks with simple metal picket railings instead of the pents, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Property owner Tom Hemmerick represented the application.

Mr. Hemmerick described the non-historic rear addition as not attractive. He hopes to better integrate it into the rest of property. He also noted that it is deteriorating. Mr. McCoubrey objected to the proposed design, which would give the addition a false historic appearance. Mr. D'Alessandro concurred. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the unattractive addition could be improved without giving it a false appearance. He suggested that the railing and coping could be designed to better harmonize with the historic building. He objected to the non-historic pent and advocated for retaining the original pent. Mr. Danta explained to the applicant that the Standards are clear that historic features should not be replicated on non-historic additions.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of parking area and screened porches; denial of decks as submitted, pursuant to Standard 3; and approval of decks with simple picket railings instead of the pents, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

231 S. 24TH STREET

Owner: Andrew J. Krouk

Applicant: Brett Webber

History: c. 1835, contributing to Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Restore main block, convert rear addition to restaurant, add signage

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to largely restore the main block and alter a rear addition on this corner property. This property was historically used for commercial purposes and that use continues today. The applicant proposes to remove unsympathetic additions to the façade of the main block, such as a pent roof, window grills, air conditioned units and signage. The applicant proposes to install new shutters, a new attic window and a new door. Translucent film will be applied to two existing doors and one existing window. The proposed restoration details need some modifications, but the overall design is in keeping with the period of the property. The rear of the property currently has a non-historic wood-clad addition. The applicant proposes to replace the street-frontage of this addition with a new storefront system. The addition will be accented with a fiber cement rainscreen system and a decorative glass panel. Planters are proposed for the sidewalk and parapet level. A sign is proposed, which would extend both the addition and the historic main block. This sign would be metal and would attach to the historic main block at four attachment points.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the signage does not attach to the brick at the historic main block and the first-floor front window on 24th Street is blocked with closed shutters rather than plywood, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Architect Brett Webber and property owner Andrew Krouk represented the applicant.

Mr. Webber summarized the proposal to rehabilitate this building with restaurant. He explained that the rear addition currently houses the kitchen and the tables are in the main block. He is proposing to move the kitchen to the main block and the seating to the rear. The primary entrance will be on the Locust Street. The rear addition will be reclad in a material that is compatible with the original brick and will be detailed to demarcate it from the original. The windows in the main block will be restored.

Mr. Baron asked if the double-hung window could be restored in the blocked opening; the shutters could then be permanently closed, blocking the view into the kitchen. Mr. Webber noted that this was possible. He seeks to close the window because his client does not want to disturb his neighbors with light and noise from the kitchen.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the storefront system proposed for the rear addition. Mr. Webber stated that it would be metal storefront system, but the final details remain to be resolved. Mr. Webber noted that there is a roof deck on the rear addition currently. He is planning a new roof deck with a parapet railing. Mr. Webber stated that he has determined that he does not need an ADA ramp. Mr. Webber noted that the façade of the rear addition will remain in the same plane.

Jonathan Barnett, a neighbor and architect and city planner, submitted a letter to the Committee detailing his objections to the project. He asserted that the proposed design for the rear addition is not compatible with the neighborhood. He described the materials and scale of the streetscape. He asked the architect to redesign the project to better fit into the existing context, which is masonry with punched windows. He opined that the proposed storefront would be intrusive. He reported that this is the only commercial establishment in the neighborhood and it now closes at 4:00 p.m. James Keller, the owner of the properties directly opposite the site, echoed Mr. Barnett's sentiments.

Alice Gosfield, also a neighbor, stated that the storefront would be out of character. She also noted her concern about trash and how it will be collected at the site. She noted that there are rats along the river.

Tim Kerner, a neighbor on the block, asserted that the storefront window would be too large for the context. He stated that he deemed the signage appropriate. Mr. Danta clarified that the staff was not opposed to the sign, but to any attachment to the historic brick.

Mr. Webber stated that he was not seeking to replicate the historic, but to restore what is historic. Mr. Webber assured that they would not use any fluorescent lighting and that the dinner lighting would be low and intimate.

Mr. Barnett reiterated his hopes that the architect would create a new design that would be more appropriate for the neighborhood. He reported that the applicant has applied for an amusement license; he is concerned that it would be a bright and noisy place. Mr. Webber refuted the neighbor's statement, claiming that the license is a technicality of the liquor license;

there will be no live entertainment. Brett Feldman, the attorney for this application, stated that the neighbors are only concerned about the potential for noise and trash, but had cloaked their concerns in architectural terms. He asserted that their objections are not really related to architecture or preservation, but are zoning matters best addressed at a zoning hearing. Mr. Barnett responded that his objections are architectural in nature.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, provided that the sign does not attach to the historic building and the blocked window is replaced with the historically appropriate window, frame, and shutters with the shutters latched in the closed position, with the staff to review details.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Reconstruction Standard 4: Reconstruction will be based on an accurate duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by documentary or physical evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different features from other historic properties. A reconstructed property will re-create the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color, and texture.

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

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

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

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

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

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